ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

CONTROLLING BODIES, SHAPING LIVES: BIOPOWER AND BIOPOLITICAL STRATEGIES IN *BRAVE NEW WORLD* AND *NEVER LET ME GO*

Master's Thesis

Ömer BUDANIR

Ankara-2025

ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

CONTROLLING BODIES, SHAPING LIVES: BIOPOWER AND BIOPOLITICAL STRATEGIES IN *BRAVE NEW WORLD* AND *NEVER LET ME GO*

Master's Thesis

Ömer BUDANIR

Thesis Advisor

Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel İZMİR

Ankara-2025

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis titled “Controlling Bodies, Shaping Lives: Biopower and Biopolitical Strategies in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*” and prepared by Ömer BUDANIR meets with the committee’s approval unanimously/by a majority vote as Master’s Thesis in the field of English Culture and Literature following the successful defense conducted on 24/06/2025

Asst. Prof. Dr. Selen AKTARİ SEVGİ (Chair)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel İZMİR (Advisor)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Melike TOKAY (Member)

Prof. Dr. Şule TUZLUKAYA

Director

ETHICAL STATEMENT

I accept and acknowledge that I have prepared this thesis study, prepared in line with the Thesis Writing Guidelines of Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences;

- within the framework of academic and ethical rules;
- presented the information, documents, evaluations, and results in a way that meets the rules of scientific ethics and morality,
- I have referenced each work from which I have benefited while preparing my thesis, and that
- I hereby present a unique study.

I hereby also understand that I shall accept any loss of rights against my behalf in cases otherwise.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel İzmir, for her ongoing support, guidance and insightful and constructive feedback throughout the research and writing process of this thesis. Her wisdom, expertise and patience together with her assistance and encouragement have always been in the centre of completing the thesis.

I am deeply grateful to my beloved wife, Atiye, for her unwavering support and encouragement throughout this journey. Her continuous support and belief in me made the completion of this thesis possible. Kerem, my beloved four-year-old son has always been there with his energy and joyful presence to motivate me even during the the most challenging moments.

I would also like to thank my mother Ayşe Budanır, my late father Mehmet Budanır, my dear sister Özge Atılgan for their endless support, unconditional love and never-ending belief in me. I want to thank to my parents-in-law, Uğur Gözütok and Yaşar Gözütok for their continuous support throughout the writing process of this thesis.

I am also grateful to have such colleagues as Yunus Emre Alkan, Betül Keskin, Dost Şafak Öztürk and each member of the PD Unit of Atılım Preparatory School, Mine Bellikli, Ayten Özmen, Burçak Şahan and Seda Karadeniz with whom I have always enjoyed working for their persistent support, belief in me and their assistance throughout the thesis writing process.

ÖZ

BUDANIR, Ömer. Bedenlerin Kontrolü, Hayatların Şekillendirilmesi: *Brave New World* ve *Never Let Me Go* Romanlarında Biyoiktidar ve Biyopolitik Stratejiler. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2025.

Bu tez, Aldous Huxley'in *Brave New World* ve Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Never Let Me Go* adlı eserlerinin kurgusal dünyalarında Michel Foucault tarafından ortaya konulan biyoiktidar ve biyopolitika kavramlarını, kontrol mekanizmaları, üreme düzenlemeleri ve normalleştirme tekniklerinin uygulanması açısından incelemeyi ve bu kavramların geçerliğini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Biyoiktidar ve biyopolitika kavramlarını daha iyi anlamak amacıyla yapılan literatür taraması Foucault'nun güç kavramına bakışının analizi ile başlamaktadır. Distopik toplumların anlatıldığı her iki romanda, bireylerin bedenleri, yaşamları ve seçimleri üzerinde hakimiyet kuran dış güçler tarafından sistematik olarak kontrolü ve şekillendirilmesi incelenmektedir. Bu romanlardaki klonların üzerlerinde tam kontrolün uygulanması ve klonların bu tarz toplumlardaki davranışları analiz edilmektedir. Karşılaştırmalı analiz, biyoiktidarın bu kurgusal dünyalardaki anlatımlarının farklılık ve benzerliklerini araştırmaktadır. Tez, kendi boyun eğmelerini içselleştiren uysal bedenler üretmek için biyopolitik mekanizmaların dil, eğitim kurumları ve cinselliğin düzenlenmesi yoluyla nasıl işlediğini dikkate almaktadır. Ayrıca, bu çalışma, bütüncül sistemler içinde ortaya çıkan direniş biçimlerini inceleyerek *Never Let Me Go* eserindeki Kathy, Tommy ve Miss Lucy ile *Brave New World* eserindeki Savage John'un özerkliklerini ortaya koyma çabalarını analiz etmektedir. Bu tür karşı koymalar, özgür irade, biyoteknolojinin etik sınırları ve devletin insan yaşamı üzerindeki kontrolünün ahlaki sonuçları gibi kritik meseleleri ön plana çıkarmaktadır. Bu tezde, bu kurgusal dünyalar biyopolitik bir bakış açısıyla incelenmekte ve çağdaş edebiyatın iktidar biçimlerini dikkate alan bir okuma ve analiz yöntemi ortaya konmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Distopik Toplumlar, Biyoiktidar, Biyopolitika, *Brave New World*, *Never Let Me Go*

ABSTRACT

BUDANIR, Ömer. Controlling Bodies, Shaping Lives: Biopower and Biopolitical Strategies in *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*. Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2025.

This thesis aims to examine the fictional worlds of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* with reference to the concepts of biopower and biopolitics put forward by Michel Foucault focusing on the implementation of control mechanisms, reproductive regulations, and techniques of normalization, and to explore the applicability of these concepts. To better understand the concepts of biopower and biopolitics, the literature review begins with an analysis of the concept of power by Foucault. Both novels, which portray dystopian societies, explore how external forces systematically control and shape individuals' bodies, lives, and choices through mechanisms of domination. These novels examine the exercise of total control over the clones and analyse their behaviours within the context of such dystopian societies. The comparative analysis explores the similarities and differences in the representations of biopower within these fictional worlds. The thesis considers how biopolitical mechanisms operate through language, educational institutions, and the regulation of sexuality to produce docile bodies that internalize their own subjugation. In addition, this study analyses the forms of resistance that emerge within totalizing systems by examining the efforts of characters such as Kathy, Tommy, and Miss Lucy in *Never Let Me Go*, and John the Savage in *Brave New World*, to assert their autonomy. These acts of defiance highlight critical issues such as free will, the ethical boundaries of biotechnology, and the moral implications of state control over human life. In this thesis, these fictional worlds are examined from a biopolitical perspective, offering a reading and analytical approach that takes the forms of power depicted in contemporary literature into account.

Keywords: Dystopian Societies, Biopower, Biopolitics, *Brave New World*, *Never Let Me Go*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Dystopian fiction has been in the centre of attention in literature as it reflects and critiques the societal structures, scientific or technological advancements, and political power dynamics. Throughout the thesis, the analytical framework will focus on the concepts of biopower and biopolitics put forward by Michel Foucault (1926-1984) who explored these terms in *History of Sexuality* and further developed in his lectures at the Collège de France. The investigation will focus on how dystopian societies depicted in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* (2005) can be analysed through the lens of biopower and biopolitics respectively. Biopower and biopolitics will be the centre of examination for the structural mechanisms of power that regulates life itself, ranging from bodily discipline to population management, to uncover how the characters' identities, relationships, and agency are shaped by forces beyond their control. The thesis reveals that the mechanisms of biopower and biopolitics not only sustain the dystopian worlds depicted by Huxley and Ishiguro but also fundamentally shape the characters' understanding of themselves and their roles in society and offers a critical lens through which the political and ethical dimensions of life under systemic control can be explored.

The literature review analyses biopower and biopolitics to be able to provide a more comprehensible insight into these concepts. Before the exploration of these key concepts, the idea of power will be analysed first. According to Foucauldian belief, power is not a means to take life anymore, yet it embodies a system of rules that consist of many complex components. Foucault argues that Western societies have historically reduced power to juridical and prohibitive frameworks, viewing it primarily through the lens of law and prohibition. In *The Meshes of Power*, he explains how power structures are identified as complex systems of rules, and power dynamics remained fixated on legal frameworks and rights. This juridical model of power limits the understanding of how power operates in modern societies, where it functions less through prohibition and more through productive mechanisms that regulate and optimize life itself. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault articulates a fundamental shift in how power operates in modern societies. While traditional power functioned

through visible displays of authority, disciplinary power inverts this relationship as it becomes invisible while making its subjects visible.

It was the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellen who first coined the word biopolitics and Foucault transformed the concept further. As Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose explain in their essay "Biopower Today" that Foucault claims power has transformed into something that is not merely exercised "in the name of sovereign but in the name of the existence of everyone" (196). Foucault in his lectures pointed out power over life as a bipolar diagram. "In this diagram, one pole of biopower focuses on an anatamo-politics of the human body, seeking to maximize its forces and integrate it into efficient systems. The second pole is one of regulatory controls, a biopolitics of the population, focusing on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanisms of life: birth, morbidity, mortality, longevity" (196). Despite the fact that Foucault uses the terms biopower and biopolitics interchangeably on many occasions, biopower simply refers to the broader emergence of power mechanisms focused on life itself. It emphasizes the change in the sovereign power, which was once symbolized by the capacity to impose death. It has been gradually replaced by mechanisms that are designed to manage and regulate biological life. On the other hand, biopolitics appears to be the term for the specific political strategies and practices through which biopower operate, particularly at the population level.

Brave New World and *Never Let Me Go* have been widely studied within the field of dystopian literature, especially in terms of the themes of dehumanization, technological control, and ethical dilemmas. However, the literature review reveals a gap in the comparative analysis of these two novels through the theoretical frameworks of Michel Foucault's biopower and biopolitics. Both novels have attracted attention for their dystopian critiques and philosophical implications but studies that analyse them together within the broader discourse of how biopower and biopolitics operate through the management of life and the body are relatively limited.

After the theoretical background, the second chapter of the thesis will examine how Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* can be examined through the theoretical frameworks of biopower and biopolitics by Michel Foucault. The analysis will focus on the socio-political and historical conditions that may have led the author to write this novel by focusing on the contemporary issues of the time it was written in. Aldous Huxley wrote *Brave New World* during the interwar period and the pessimistic view that the author held towards the future of society can easily be observed throughout

the novel. Rather than focusing on what the technological improvements might bring and create a world in which everyone is happier than ever, Huxley tends to highlight the potential dangers and ethical dilemmas that might be the consequences of such improvements. He criticizes the dehumanizing effects of mass production, consumer culture, and eugenics, which were prominent in the early 20th century.

The aim of the second chapter is to point out how the novel reflects a biopolitical regime in which individual autonomy is suppressed, and life is managed through institutionalised control mechanisms. The Fordian society portrayed in the novel includes many applications of biopolitical governance, such as the use of soma to pacify citizens, the promotion of sexual promiscuity through the idea that "everyone belongs to everyone else," the replacement of traditional religion with ceremonial gatherings like the Solidarity Service, and the institutional enforcement of consumerism. Each of these applications in the Fordian society contributes to the normalization of state control over the body and population. This is a reflection of Foucault's notion of a society that is governed not through repression, but through internalized norms and regulatory mechanisms. These structures help make sure that citizens are obedient, and they accept the system as normal and desirable in the *Brave New World* and this makes it possible for the novel to be explored in terms of the implications of biopower and biopolitics in dystopian context.

The third chapter focuses on *Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro who depicts the lives of clones through the narrative of the main character, Kathy H. The novel was written during a period when scientific and technological advancements, such as the cloning of the sheep Dolly, were already raising ethical and philosophical concerns. This event led to the considerations and questioning of the possibility and morality of human cloning along with the potential consequences of such practices.

In the dystopian world of *Never Let Me Go*, the clones are created with the mere purpose of organ donation. They are genetically identical to their originals and can be harvested for their organs whenever their originals need such an organ transplant. During this process, they tend to submit to their fate without protest and much questioning. To understand how such docility and compliance are possible within the novel's fictional world, it is necessary to examine the concepts of biopower and biopolitics and use the terms as the framework of the study. These concepts help understand how the characters are conditioned from childhood to internalize their

purpose as donors and view it as normal and acceptable. The clones at a young age dream about their future jobs which they will never have a chance to do.

The system of power in *Never Let Me Go* ensures that the clones rarely question their predetermined roles by promoting emotional attachments, obedience through education, and limiting access to alternative worldviews as the only contact they have with the outside world is with the guardians who take care of them at institutions that are isolated from the rest of the world. The education they receive is limited but at the same time aims to prove the fact that these clones are not any different from human beings. With the help of strategies such as psychological normalization, euphemistic language, and institutionalized care, the clones accept that being a donor is not only expected but it is also morally appropriate. There are applications such as Exchanges and the Sales, which help the system regulate the lives of clones. This kind of governance is an example of Foucault's notion of biopower, where power operates not through force but through the shaping of life itself. The clones are told about the fact that they are going to start donations when they grow up since their early childhood, at a time when they fail to grasp the real meaning of what it means. In this world, the lives of clones are ultimately sacrificed for the benefit of non-clone humans, a process that reflects the central mechanism of biopolitics, in which life is administered and regulated for political and social utility.

The conclusion part summarizes the main findings of the thesis by demonstrating how the concepts of biopower and biopolitics can be observed throughout novels. There will be a brief commentary on the authors' differing approaches to dystopia and control, and an emphasis on the time gap between the two novels. Suggestions for possible future studies will be included, together with a reflection on the broader significance of this work.

CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1. Power

Michel Foucault (1926–1984), the French philosopher, was a social theorist whose innovative ideas have significantly shaped contemporary thinking in diverse fields such as philosophy, sociology, literary criticism, and political science. Renowned for his critical exploration of concepts like knowledge, power, ethics, and sexuality, Foucault's work offered ground-breaking perspectives on how institutions and individuals interact. His analyses of power dynamics, knowledge systems, and the human body have been particularly influential, redefining traditional understandings of societal structures.

Foucault also contributed to academia as a teacher at various institutions, inspiring modern thinkers through his development of pivotal concepts such as archaeology, genealogy, heterotopia, biopower, panopticism, and governmentality. Of particular significance to this study is his influence on Giorgio Agamben, who builds upon and critiques Foucault's biopolitical framework. In *Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Agamben argues that Foucault's conception of biopower requires modification by stating that Foucault's hypothesis of biopower "has to be corrected, or at least, completed" (12). This critical engagement with Foucault's ideas demonstrates how biopolitical theory continues to evolve, with Agamben extending the analysis to encompass the concept of "bare life" and the sovereign's power to create states of exception.

Some of Foucault's major works which include *The History of Madness, The Birth of the Clinic, Discipline and Punish*, and *The History of Sexuality* examine how Western institutions, such as prisons, schools, factories, hospitals, and mental clinics have evolved in response to historical transformations. In an interview with Rux Martin, Michel Foucault discusses one of his most significant ideas that concepts often regarded as universal such as the individual, body, sexuality, identity, subjectivity, and knowledge are not innate or timeless. Instead, they are socially constructed, emerging from specific historical developments and societal shifts (Martin et al. 9–15). According to Foucault his goal is to challenge those universal truths and demonstrate to individuals that the assumptions they have are incorrect. According to him, all those

things are merely fabrications based on power dynamics that are present throughout society at various levels.

The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy describes power as "the ability or capacity to compel others to act according to one's aims so that they will do what they would not otherwise have done" (Bunnin and Yu 543). Common definitions in dictionaries usually interpret power as either a form of force or as equivalent to government, which can lead to it being narrowly associated with the state. Foucault, however, argues that this view is both limited and misleading. By treating power as a simple possession or attribute, this view fails to capture its true complexity as a dynamic, relational concept.

Foucault explains in *Religion and Culture* that power has always been questioned in Western societies over the centuries and even the millennia, but the answers may not have been entirely satisfactory. Instead of tracing the origins or the ultimate endpoint of power, Michel Foucault's approach focuses on studying power within its immediate context and its practical applications. He is less concerned with asking, "Where does power come from?" or "Where is it going?" and more interested in examining how power operates in everyday practices and local settings. Foucault stated that he is not asking the questions "Where does power come from, where is it going?" but rather, "In what way does it happen and how does it happen, what are all the relations of power, how can one describe certain of the principal relations of power which are exercised in our society?" (Foucault and Carrette 127). He focuses on describing some of the primary relationships of power as they function within any society.

Foucault emphasizes that power is not confined to institutions like the state or government but exists within everyday social relations. Power operates in various contexts such as families, universities, military barracks, hospitals, or even during a medical consultation. In these settings, relations of power shape interactions and influence individuals' behaviours. He encourages exploring questions like what these power relations control, how they connect individuals, why they persist, and under what circumstances they dissolve (Foucault and Carrette 128). This understanding broadens the conception of power, shifting focus from a hierarchical or centralized view to a more diffused and relational perspective, where power is embedded in all aspects of social life.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault shifted the academic discourse by introducing a "microphysics of power" which is an idea that power is not simply controlled by dominant forces from above but is diffused through complex networks of social relationships, institutions, and discourses (34). Power is not something that is possessed, nor is it a privilege held by a dominant class that imposes its will on a passive, subordinated class. Instead, power is exercised through and by the very people it dominates. It is, therefore, more useful to move beyond thinking in terms of fixed classes, as power is not singular or simply exercised in a binary way. Rather, power exists as an intricate web of "micro-powers", a network of power relations that affect all aspects of social life. For this reason, power cannot be completely dismantled by merely destroying institutions or taking control of state apparatuses. Since power is diffuse and multifaceted, any resistance to it must be localized and focused on specific points of power. As it is stated in *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, his theory challenges traditional views by focusing on how power produces knowledge and shapes individual subjectivities, which has implications for understanding social control, identity, and agency (Dreyfus & Rabinow 184).

Judith Revel states in her article "Power" that Foucault does not prefer to treat power as a "stable, and coherent entity" and he favours the term "relations of power" when discussing the idea of power (377). In *The History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault challenges the traditional view that power is centralized within institutions like the state or government, rejecting the "juridico-political" conception of power. This perspective assumes that power is a possession which is something tangible that can be acquired, held, or transferred. Foucault dismisses this as overly simplistic, emphasizing instead that power is diffuse and relational. It is not monopolized by a single entity but operates through networks of relationships, embedded in everyday social practices, norms, and discourses.

Foucault also writes in *The History of Sexuality* that "Power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations" (94). This reframes power as a pervasive force that shapes society not through coercion alone but also through the production of knowledge and regulation of norms. Here, Foucault views the idea that power is centralized in the sense of the state or government as a narrow presumption and rejects it. As a result, he

does not believe that power is something that a government or other group of people can monopolize. He disagrees with the juridico-political conception of power, which views power as a possession that can be easily acquired, held, or transferred. According to him, power is neither a possession nor a right that one person gives to or removes from another. Rather, power is wielded through a web of relationships that are neither uniform nor hierarchical, and to which every member of society is susceptible. He thinks that in order to analyse power, one must "speak of powers and try to localize them in their historical and geographical specificity" (Foucault and Moore 156).

In a course of lectures titled *Mal faire, dire vrai: Fonction del'aveu en justice* translated as *Wrong-Doing, Truth-Telling: The Function of Avowal in Justice* Foucault describes power relations as follows:

> Power is essentially relations; that is to say, what brings individuals, human beings, into relation with one another, not only in the form of the communication of meaning, not only in the form of desire, but also in a specific form that allows them to act on one another—if you will, in the broadest sense of the term, to "govern" each other. Parents govern their children, a mistress governs her lover, a professor governs, et cetera (201).

It is impossible to identify any individual or space that is free from power relations. This network of power relations encompasses everyone in society, to the point where individuals are not the origin of power but rather instruments through which power is exercised. Since all individuals are subject to power relations, these relations are not separate from, but interconnected with other types of relations, such as those of sexuality or economics. For example, the power dynamics between a king and his subjects differ significantly from those between a husband and wife. A woman may wield power as a doctor over her patients, while simultaneously being subjected to the power of her husband. Power relations, therefore, can shift and even reverse, with individuals who once exercised power finding themselves in a subordinate position. As a result, power cannot be monopolized by any individual or group. Instead, he contends that power has no essence or central source, and power is not concentrated in a ruler or a specific location. Rather, it operates as a network of relations, circulating throughout society and manifesting through individuals

It should be noted that when considering Foucault's many works and lectures, his usage of these terminology is not always precise and explicit. He typically avoids providing definitive definitions of power and does not provide explicit explanations

for every form of power he examines. He occasionally favours using certain phrases over others, occasionally begins to substitute new terms for others that he believes are insufficient and occasionally uses two terms interchangeably while at other times distinguishing them from one another. Even though he gave hazy explanations for the many forms of power, his research often distinguished between traditional and modern power.

As Paul Rabinow states in *The Foucault Reader,* Foucault argues that every society has a specific framework that governs the production and recognition of truth, which he refers to as its "regime of truth" (73) This concept encompasses the accepted types of discourse that are regarded as truthful, the mechanisms and institutions that delineate truth from falsehood, and the procedures and techniques deemed valid for acquiring truth. It also includes the social status of individuals empowered to define and assert what qualifies as truth within that society. These regimes of truth are not universal but are shaped by historical, cultural, and social contexts, illustrating how truth itself is a product of power relations and institutional structures.

It appears that Foucault identifies a form of power he refers to as "sovereign power" with traditional authority. Sovereign power is roughly the hierarchical authority that someone exercises over others; it implies a complete and often absolute power and control over someone. According to Foucault, this power is tied to monarchy and, hence, royal power. It is stated in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* that the legal system, the law, supports sovereign power since, up to the seventeenth century, "right in the West is the King's right." (94). The king or queen has the authority to use appropriate resources such as money, products, labour, time, and life. As Foucault notes, sovereign authority becomes the right over life and death since it gives the monarch the ability to take the lives of her or his subjects as desired, especially in its absolute form. To the extent that death constantly triumphs over life, the sovereign's "right of life and death" is unbalanced. To put it another way, the sovereign always has the right to murder, but only when they do not take lives do they have the right to life. Thus, it may be said that "the right of sovereignty was the right to take life or let live," as Foucault states in *Society Must Be Defended* (241). Even with this unassailable right to take, sovereign authority has drawbacks that make it detrimental to the advancement of capitalism. The inability of sovereign power to regulate the smallest details of people in society allows a lot of

things to escape the sovereign's notice. As a result, the rise of capitalism necessitated the creation of a new kind of authority that allows complete control over every aspect of both the person and the population. Because death becomes a limit for power under the current circumstances, this new form of power emphasizes life rather than the right to kill.

Foucault suggests that the idea of power was sharply articulated and extensively developed by ethnology in the late 19th century. Ethnology sought to identify power structures in societies outside of our own, often viewing them as systems of rules. In contrast, when reflecting on power within our own society, we tend to approach it from a juridical perspective: focusing on where power resides, who holds it, the rules governing it, and the system of laws that power enforces over the social body. He argues that we consistently approach the study of power in our own society through a juridical lens, analysing it in terms of laws and rights. Meanwhile, when studying other societies, we tend to engage in an ethnology that focuses primarily on rules and prohibitions, emphasizing the ways in which power is structured and enforced through these societal norms.

Foucault questions why Western societies have historically understood power in such a limited, negative way, often equating it with law and prohibition in *The Meshes of Power* (154). He suggests that this view is largely shaped by the influence of Kant, who emphasized the moral law and the dichotomy of "you must" versus "you must not" as fundamental to regulating human behaviour. However, Foucault argues that attributing this conception of power solely to Kant's influence is inadequate and fails to fully explain the broader dynamics at play. Foucault refers to Rousseau's theory of the state as an example of how Western thought has consistently linked power to law and legal systems. According to Rousseau, the formation of the state arises from individuals leaving their rights and submitting to laws they have collectively created, thus transforming themselves into both the governed and the sovereign. This process critiques monarchy, but paradoxically, it uses law, the very tool of monarchy, as the foundation for social order. Foucault argues that this legalistic framework is the only system through which Western societies have historically represented and analysed power. Consequently, the Western understanding of power remains rooted in law, limiting the conceptualization of power to a system of rules and prohibitions.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault states that traditionally, power operated in a visible and demonstrative manner; its force was most evident through its public displays, which reinforced its authority. Those subjected to this power remained largely unseen, only experiencing its effects indirectly or through brief reflections of its authority. Foucault did not limit his analysis to traditional institutions such as the state, but he also argued that power is present in many different forms, often being most effective when it is least visible. He emphasized that power is not solely concentrated in institutions or visible forms of control but is diffused throughout society, operating in subtle ways that shape individual behaviour and social norms. This shift in focus highlights how power functions more pervasively through everyday practices and relationships, often going unnoticed yet profoundly influencing people's lives.

When it comes to disciplinary power, it relies more on invisibility, while simultaneously enforcing a principle of mandatory visibility upon its subjects. As Foucault mentions in the *Discipline and Punish*, under disciplinary systems, the focus shifts to the visibility of individuals, which enables the control exerted over them (178). Constant visibility, the possibility of always being observed, keeps individuals in a state of subjugation. Through the examination process, power does not merely display its strength; rather, it objectifies individuals, placing them within a structure that turns them into objects of observation and categorization. In this way, disciplinary power asserts itself less through direct force and more through organizing and monitoring its subjects, with the examination as the ritual that solidifies this objectification.

Foucault describes how hierarchical, continuous, and functional surveillance became central to the operation of disciplinary power, not necessarily as a ground-breaking invention of the eighteenth century, but as a mechanism whose subtle yet expansive reach transformed power relations. This form of surveillance integrates seamlessly with economic objectives and the systems in which it operates, creating an interconnected and self-sustaining network of power.

It is also stated in *Discipline and Punish* that disciplinary power has its own correlative individuality that is not only analytical and 'cellular', but also natural and 'organic' (149). Unlike traditional forms of authority, which might rest visibly on individuals or institutions, disciplinary power operates anonymously and

automatically. It functions through a relational network that extends vertically, from top to bottom, but also laterally and even from the bottom up. This network ensures cohesion, creating a system where those who supervise are themselves perpetually supervised. Foucault likens this power to a machine when he states, "the power in the hierarchized surveillance of the disciplines is not possessed as a thing or transferred as a property; it functions like a piece of machinery" (168). Although it may appear to have a central authority or "head," the true force of power lies in the system's comprehensive and ongoing operation.

In traditional forms of power, visibility played a central role. Power was something openly displayed and demonstrated, drawing its strength from its ability to project force and authority. Those subjected to this power often remained in the shadows, illuminated only by the portion of power granted to them or reflected momentarily through their actions. Disciplinary power, however, operates differently. It thrives on invisibility, concealing the mechanisms through which it is exercised. At the same time, it enforces a compulsory visibility on those it governs. In this system, the subjects of power must always be seen. This constant observation ensures that individuals remain under control, as their awareness of being perpetually visible sustains their submission as "It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection" (178).

Institutionalized power structures function to regulate and control individuals by exerting societal pressure and keeping bodies under constant surveillance. Foucault draws an analogy between the way governments monitor and regulate society and the panopticon. In the chapter "Panopticism" of *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault introduces the concept of the panopticon, drawing on social theorist Jeremy Bentham's late 18th-century architectural model. Bentham's panopticon is a design for a prison featuring a central observation tower surrounded by a ring of cells, enabling a single observer to monitor inmates without being seen. Foucault uses this model as a metaphor for modern systems of power and surveillance, illustrating how disciplinary mechanisms extend beyond physical spaces to regulate behaviour and maintain social control. In this setup, the observer in the central tower can see all individuals in their cells, but the individuals cannot see the observer. This creates an environment where the subjects are unaware of when they are being watched, instilling a sense of continuous observation and self-regulation.

Foucault extends this concept to illustrate how power operates in society. Like the invisible observer in the panopticon, power is pervasive and unseen, influencing behaviour without individuals being fully conscious of its presence. This invisibility of power renders its control more effective, as people self-discipline under the assumption that they are always being monitored. Foucault emphasizes in *Discipline and Punish* that the panoptic structure encapsulates the ways power operates to identify, label, and modify individuals deemed "abnormal," reflecting broader societal tendencies to regulate and normalize behaviours (200).

The Panopticon symbolizes a broader societal mechanism, highlighting the internalization of surveillance and self-discipline in individuals. It exemplifies how power operates effectively, even in the absence of direct supervision. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault explains this dynamic, noting that the Panopticon's design induces a state of "conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (201). He emphasizes that the effects of surveillance are long-lasting, even when its application is not constant, as individuals begin to regulate their own actions under the assumption of being observed.

The transition from traditional notions of power to the concept of biopower marks a significant evolution in the understanding of governance and control in modern societies. Michel Foucault's analysis of power emphasizes its relational and pervasive nature, laying the groundwork for the emergence of biopower, which shifts the focus from sovereign authority to the management of life itself. Foucault argues that sovereign power, historically characterized by the right to take life, has been replaced by mechanisms that seek to regulate and optimize life, thereby introducing the concept of biopower. This transformation reflects a broader societal shift where power is exercised not merely through coercion but through the normalization and administration of populations. This shift emphasizes the importance of understanding how power dynamics operate at both the individual and collective levels, as biopolitics governs through disciplines that normalize individual bodies while simultaneously regulating populations as biological entities. Thus, the exploration of biopower and biopolitics is crucial for comprehending the contemporary landscape of power relations, where life itself becomes the central concern of governance.

1.2. Biopolitics and Biopower

Rudolf Kjellen, the Swedish political scientist, who had an ecological perspective on the state and saw it as a living organism, is credited with coining the phrase "biopolitics," which first appeared in the philosophical context of the philosophy of life in the early 20th century. He developed the term in his book *Staten som livsform* (The State as a Living Form) in 1916 and according to him, the state is similar to a human being "which precedes individuals and collectives and provides the institutional foundation for their activities" as Lemke states in *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction* (10). Kjellén argues that the same biological drives that cause individuals to struggle for survival also manifest at the societal level, producing civil and social unrest. In this view, the state functions as an organism with its own survival imperatives. The state battles for its own survival and development as well. Kjellén was therefore prompted to coin the term "biopolitics," using this biological analogy as his conceptual foundation. For Kjellén, biopolitics specifically referred to the study of the state as a geographical organism or living form existing in constant tension and struggle. Unlike later theorists who would focus on the regulation of populations, Kjellén's original conception of biopolitics emphasized the state as a biological entity that exists beyond individual citizens, with natural drives toward territorial expansion, resource acquisition, and self-preservation. He positioned biopolitics as one of five branches in his comprehensive theory of the state, alongside geopolitics (the state as geographical entity), demopolitics (population and ethnic composition), sociopolitics (social conflicts), and kratopolitics (governmental forms and power). Within this framework, biopolitics specifically addressed how the state functions as a biological entity with organic needs that go beyond those of the citizens living within it. For Kjellén, this biological view explained why states inevitably engage in competition and conflict, viewing international relations as fundamentally a Darwinian struggle for existence.

Following the late seventeenth century, life itself became a central concern of political power, marking a fundamental shift in governance that Foucault directly connects to the rise of capitalism and the emergence of biology as a scientific discipline. Foucault explains that sovereign power, once symbolized by the capacity to impose death, was gradually replaced by mechanisms designed to manage and regulate life itself. This transformation represented more than a simple change in

tactics; it constituted a new modality of power that focused on administering, optimizing, and controlling the biological processes of the population. This transition marked the advent of "biopower" which Foucault describes in *The History of Sexuality* as involving "an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations" (140).

Nikolas Rose explains in *The Politics of Life Itself* that the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries witnessed a politics of health, with an emphasis on birth and death rates, diseases, epidemics, and the regulation of water, sewage, food, and cemeteries, demonstrating how politics has always been centred on the vital lives of those under its control (3). In the first half of the twentieth century, this focus expanded to include understanding the inheritance of biological constitution and the effects of differential reproduction of various subpopulations. During this period, politicians employed forceful measures to control population quality, ostensibly for the sake of the race's future, manifesting in eugenic programs and policies across numerous nations. However, Rose argues that contemporary biopolitics has undergone a significant transformation. Rather than emphasizing the eradication of disease to safeguard the future of the nation, modern biopolitical practices focus on our expanding technological and scientific capabilities to govern, manage, design, alter, and modulate the vital powers of humans as living beings. This shift represents what Rose terms "molecular biopolitics", a fundamental reconceptualization of life at the submicroscopic level where human biology becomes increasingly malleable, programmable, and subject to intervention. Through this lens, Rose suggests that biopolitical power now operates less through overt state control and more through individual self-governance, where citizens are encouraged to take responsibility for optimizing their own biological existence through various technologies and practices.

Foucault first articulated biopolitics in his 1974 lectures in Rio de Janeiro, later expanding the concept in his College de France lectures, *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Throughout his works, Foucault used the term with varying emphases, including its connection to capitalist developments, its role in redefining sovereignty, and its distinctive application within neoliberal governmentality. These shifts illustrate biopolitics as a dynamic process rather than a fixed system, highlighting the historical and conceptual broadness of the term. By focusing on life itself, biopolitics integrates disciplinary practices at the level of individuals with broader regulatory mechanisms

for populations. This dual structure, which links the anatomo-politics of individual bodies with the biopolitics of populations, underpins Foucault's ground-breaking analysis of power in modern societies.

For a very long time, choosing who would live and who would die was one of the benefits of sovereign power. By the classical period (17^{th}-18^{th} centuries), however, this power of life and death had become more limited as sovereigns could only legitimately exercise it when their own existence was threatened, whether by external aggressors or internal rebellions. This was the legal expression of sovereign authority; it was the right of a ruler to seize things, time, bodies, and eventually the lives of subjects. The definition and generalization of power in ancient political thought generally stayed the same when the "king's head" was transferred from sovereign to state. However, Foucault contends that since the classical era, deduction has evolved into only one component of a variety of systems that create, provoke, strengthen, regulate, observe, optimize, and arrange the forces that are under it. As Foucault mentions in *The History of Sexuality,* although external conflicts are more brutal than ever and governments commit genocides against their own people, these conflicts are fought for the sake of everyone's existence rather than the sovereign's:

> Entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of the wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity… It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many men to be killed (137).

Foucault argues that one of the most significant developments in eighteenth-century political thought was the recognition of "population" as a distinct object of governance and control, shifting power's focus from individual bodies to the collective biological existence of the social body. In *The Meshes of Power,* Foucault defined a population as "living beings, traversed, commanded, ruled by processes and biological laws," (6) rather than a mass of people made up of legal entities. A population can either die or, conversely, increase. It also has a birth rate, a mortality rate, an age curve, a generation pyramid, life expectancy, and a state of health. It is seen as a living creature with unique biological characteristics and activities, and it is evident that population is essential to its biological side. Similar to humans, a population may continue to exist or may suffer and eventually disappear. Due to the consequences of the Industrial Revolution in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Europe experienced unprecedented population growth, which brought demographic concerns

to the forefront of political consciousness. This rapid growth made population dynamics impossible to ignore as both a social and political phenomenon, necessitating new forms of knowledge and management. The science of demography has emerged as a result of the population's rapid growth, and when combined with biology, it has enabled population control. Contemporary governments have recognized that a sizable and productive populace benefits the state, underscoring the significance of maintaining collective biological well-being through public health initiatives and medical interventions. As a result, population is now seen as a biological and political issue, affecting both science and authority. Knowing the birth rate, mortality, illness, life expectancy, longevity, reproduction, fertility, etc. is the main focus of biopolitics since a healthy population is intimately related to the rates of biological processes like birth and death.

Foucault traces the emergence of *state medicine* to Germany in the eighteenth century, emphasizing its role in shaping modern governance through the systematic production and accumulation of knowledge about populations. He explains how, in large part because of the distinct political structure of disjointed quasi-states, the Staatswissenschaft, or "science of the state," evolved in Germany before it did in France or England. He notes in *The Birth of Social Medicine* that Germany "developed more rapidly than France and England as an object of study, as an instrument and locus of acquisition of a specific body of knowledge" (138). Economic stagnation and the incapacity of German bourgeoisie to prosper in business and industry were major factors in this historical development. The establishment of state apparatuses and their integration with knowledge production were accelerated as a result of the alignment of this class with sovereign rulers and contribution of administrative and governance competence. The basis for biopolitical mechanisms that would subsequently influence population control, public health, and social control was established by this "discursive consciousness of the state-directed functioning of society" (138). The close connection between medical knowledge, bureaucracy, and the functioning of the state foreshadows later developments in public health policies and social hygiene, reinforcing Foucault's broader argument that modern power functions not only through repression but through the optimization and regulation of life itself.

Foucault highlights the historical transformation in how power governs life, particularly through the increasing role of medicalization and public health in state

governance. In *The Birth of Social Medicine*, he identifies three major developments beginning in the eighteenth century: *biohistory*, referring to the imprint of medical interventions on human existence; *medicalization*, or the expanding network of medical control over human life; and the *economy of health*, which integrates health policies into economic systems. As he explains in *The Birth of Social Medicine*, "starting in the eighteenth-century human existence, human behaviour, and the human body were brought into an increasingly dense and important network of medicalization that allowed fewer and fewer things to escape" (135). This process, which involved expanding health institutions, hospitalization, and urban infrastructure, was central to the biopolitical transformation of governance. This insight reinforces Foucault's argument in *Society Must Be Defended*, where he describes the transition from sovereign power, focused on the right to take life, to biopower, which controls, monitors, optimizes, and organizes life itself. By embedding medical research, sanitation policies, and health institutions into the fabric of governance, modern states increasingly sought to regulate populations on a biological level, anticipating later developments in public health policies, social hygiene, and eugenics.

The era of biopower, in which life is taken into account when calculating power, both succeeds and is constrained by sovereign power while simultaneously changing it. Foucault re-examines the gradual and significant change in these power structures, showing how the sovereign right over life and death is relativized, rendering the asymmetrical right to die only one component of power rather than the primary one. It is structured within the power of life management, which should not be seen as only labour power but rather as a component of a bio history wherein the scientific potential to convert life into health or well-being is acquired.

Foucault's concept of biopolitics points out a transformative change in the way which power operates, and it focuses on life as its central concern. Biopolitics governs through normalization of individual bodies and regulations that are targeted at populations as biological identities. This form of power has its roots in the rise of capitalism and in the advancements in medicine and it reflects a new operational and relational modality of power that produces political effects through what is referred to as dispositifs or apparatuses (Mendieta 37). Power functions through networks of relations together with the mechanisms that are used to normalize and regulate.

In *Society Must Be Defended*, Foucault identifies two poles of biopolitical development: the anatomo-politics of the human body, concerned with disciplining and optimizing individuals, and the biopolitics of the population, which focuses on regulating collective phenomena such as birth rates, public health, and longevity (243). These mechanisms functioned through institutions such as schools, barracks, and hospitals, which sought to standardize and control both individuals and communities. Furthermore, Foucault highlights how Western societies began to understand human beings not only as juridical subjects, but as biological entities embedded within species-level processes. He emphasizes this transformation in *The Meshes of Power* by stating "Once, there were only subjects, juridical subjects from whom one could take goods, life too, moreover. Now, there are bodies and populations" (161). This marks a significant transformation in how power operates, which is shifting from the sovereign's right to take life or resources to a dispersed focus on the management and optimization of life itself.

Biopolitics operates through two primary mechanisms, according to Foucault. The first is the disciplinary mechanism, which emerged in European institutions like prisons, schools, and hospitals during the 17th century, focusing on individual bodies and their training, optimization, and control. The second is the security or regulatory mechanism, which developed toward the end of the 18th century, targeting the biological processes of the human species as a whole, birth rates, mortality, public health, and demographic trends. (Cayuela 2). These two mechanisms must be understood in relation to a third component: sovereignty, or the traditional juridico-political power of the state. Together, these three elements, which are disciplinary power, regulatory power, and sovereign power, interact in varying configurations to produce different historical manifestations of biopolitics. These manifestations are always connected to specific forms of governmentality, which Foucault defines as the "conduct of conducts", the ways in which authorities shape, guide, and manage the behaviours of populations within historical contexts.

As Judith Revel and Christopher Penfield explain in the article "The Literary Birth of Biopolitics", obtaining productive benefits from individuals requires going beyond the conventional legal framework of sovereign power and instead integrating people's bodies, gestures, and very lives into networks of regulation and control. Foucault refers to this shift as the "birth of the disciplines", a form of governmentality

rooted in the rationality of political economy. The control of "populations" is achieved through various "biopowers" that govern life on a broad scale managing hygiene, sexuality, demography in order to maximize the reproduction of value through cost-effective production (Revel and Penfield 115). She further clarifies that the notion of biopolitics is initially fully integrated with that of biopower, which often makes their distinction conceptually difficult. According to Foucault, "biopolitics" refers to the transformation of power at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, when governance began to focus not only on the disciplining of individual bodies but also on the regulation of entire populations (Revel and Penfield 117). Biopolitics, exercised through local biopowers, involves the political management of health, nutrition, hygiene, sexuality, birth, and other biological aspects of life. As life itself becomes a central concern of power, biopolitics functions as a kind of "social medicine" that manages populations, whereas discipline, also termed the anatomo-politics of the body, operates primarily at the level of the individual. In this framework, biopowers are best understood as capacities to control, optimize, and exploit life, or the *bios*.

According to Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, the term "biopower" represents a comprehensive, global system of domination which they conceptualize as "Empire". In their neo-Marxist framework, the Empire is not defined by national borders or centralized sovereign rule, but by the diffuse and decentred control exercised across the globalized world. Their interpretation of biopower rests on the idea that contemporary power structures derive "surplus value" not merely from labour but from life itself, meaning that human existence, relationships, and affect become sites of political and economic extraction. As Hardt and Negri argue in *Empire*, biopolitics is the foundational logic of modern governance, a "form of power that regulates social life from its interior" (23). This totalizing view of biopower draws conceptually from Gilles Deleuze's essay "Postscript on the Societies of Control", which in turn builds on Michel Foucault's theory of disciplinary societies. Foucault had previously defined disciplinary societies as those organized around institutions such as schools, prisons, hospitals, and factories, which normalize behaviour by shaping both the body and the soul through surveillance, examination, and routines. These institutions, according to Foucault, aim to produce docile, regulated individuals, an effect he calls anatomo-politics. Deleuze argued that we have moved beyond this

disciplinary phase into "societies of control", more fluid, decentralized networks in which power is no longer tied to fixed institutions but is continuous, modulating, and immanent in everyday life. Hardt and Negri build upon this insight by claiming that biopower now extends throughout the consciousnesses and bodies of the population, as a diffuse, internalized form of governance (Hardt and Negri 24). They suggest that multinational corporations and transnational entities have, since the latter half of the 20th century, begun to structure global territory biopolitically, shaping life according to market and productivity imperatives (31). While Foucault emphasizes the historical emergence of biopower through institutional practices, Deleuze, Hardt and Negri radicalize the concept, shifting it from a focus on institutional discipline to networked, decentralized forms of control. Yet all three agree that modern power operates by managing life, not simply through repression or sovereignty, but by regulating bodies, desires, and populations through subtle, internalized mechanisms.

Antonio Negri argues that biopower and biopolitics are the two intersecting dimensions of modern control. Biopower refers to the mechanisms through which life is organized and exploited, while biopolitics is about both the productive activity and potential resistance of living labour. According to Negri, this shift requires a rethinking of sovereignty and political theory. In his essay "At the Origins of Biopolitics" he states that "Here the biopolitical entered the scene: biopolitical as life put to work, and therefore as politics mobilized to organize the conditions and control of the social exploitation of all realms of life" (51). Negri contrasts his view with earlier critical theories such as those of the Frankfurt School, notably Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man*, which saw modern power as creating alienated and passive subjects. Foucault, by contrast, emphasizes dynamic subjectivity, individuals who move, resist, and transform structures from within (54). In Negri's analysis, biopower, the management of life by institutions, inevitably encounters the biopolitical, which he defines as the expression of living labour's autonomous desires and resistance. Rather than functioning through binary oppositions such as ruler versus ruled, Negri sees biopolitical struggle as molecular and immanent as power operates through diffuse and flexible apparatuses (*dispositifs*), but life resists by forming new practices and subjectivities that cannot be fully captured by these systems. In this sense, *dispositifs* are not fixed institutions but mobile strategies of governance that attempt to absorb difference. However, as Negri suggests, the biopolitical field always escapes

total capture, as it is shaped by the lived experiences of subjects who reconfigure power from within (61).

Biopower and biopolitics, while closely related concepts, serve distinct functions within the framework of governance and control over life. Biopower, as articulated by Michel Foucault, refers to the mechanisms and strategies employed by states and institutions to regulate populations and manage life itself. It encompasses a range of practices aimed at optimizing health, productivity, and overall well-being, thus exerting control over individual bodies and collective existence (Scheel 572). The concept of biopower is thus closely tied to the governance of populations, where the state employs various techniques to monitor and regulate the biological aspects of life.

In contrast, biopolitics can be understood as the broader political discourse and ideological framework that underpins these practices of biopower because biopolitics extends the notion of biopower into the realm of political strategies and governance. It involves the ways in which societies conceptualize and respond to issues of life, health, and population management, often reflecting the values and priorities of the governing authorities (Wang & Lei 38). Biopolitics is concerned with the management of populations, often through the lens of social constructs such as citizenship, race, and class. As Rutherford and Rutherford state in "The Confusions and Exuberances of Biopolitics", biopower entails "truth discourses about the 'vital' character of living human beings," (419) while biopolitics encompasses the strategies for intervention and modes of subjectification that arise from these discourses. Thus, while biopower focuses on the actual exercise of power over life, biopolitics addresses the political implications and societal narratives that shape how life is governed and understood within a given context. This distinction is crucial for analysing contemporary governance, as it allows for a nuanced exploration of how power operates at both the individual and collective levels, influencing not only policies but also the very conception of what it means to live and thrive in society. It can be said that a type of biopower that prioritizes the population over the individual body is known as biopolitics. It is in charge of managing life process knowledge and enacting regulations in accordance with it. Despite their close relationship, Foucault contends that disciplines and biopolitics function on different scales and employ different methodologies. Discipline is integrated and modified by biopolitics rather than eliminated or excluded. Biopolitics targets "man-as-species", not the human body.

Because it deals with multiplicity, collective, population, and race, biopolitics is "massifying" and its importance is found in the body of the population rather than the individual.

As Foucault states in *The History of Sexuality*, biopower has two dimensions, two poles of development. The "anatomo-politics of the human body", which first appeared in the seventeenth century, is a power that views the human body "as a machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls" (138). The second pole, which emerged in the latter part of the eighteenth century, focuses on "the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity," and the "bio-politics of the population" (138). This power focuses on maintaining security rather than discipline, and it manages populations rather than excluding them.

In other words, biopower focuses on the means and tools governments can make use of to control individuals and groups. This refers to the application of direct coercion and forces together with the tactics and systems that are used to regulate and manage the behaviours of living beings. The elements of human biology, which can be addressed as birth, death, reproduction and health are at the core of the control mechanism governments have over individuals. According to Foucault, in order to influence both individual behaviour and population dynamics, biopower makes use of both disciplinary and regulatory strategies. On the other hand, biopolitics is more about the relationship between biological facts of life and political power. In other words, it covers how those in power, the decision makers make decisions and apply laws that have an effect on the health, welfare and reproduction of the population. Biopolitics refers to how government controls life through social programmes, immigration restrictions, public health rules and their effect on the body.

As parts of modern era biopolitics, wars and genocides are the examples that can be given to better understand the conflicts that are no longer waged to defend sovereign rulers but to ensure the survival of populations. Foucault writes in *The History of Sexuality* that, massacres have become vital, as entire populations are mobilized to destroy others in the name of life itself. This logic, culminating in the atomic age, reveals that "the power to expose a whole population to death is the

underside of the power to guarantee an individual's continued existence" (137). Foucault's argument highlights that modern power is exercised not only over individuals but also over populations, with biological existence, birth, health, longevity, at its centre. This biopolitical turn makes the species, race, and large-scale phenomena like population growth primary concerns of governance.

Another application of biopolitical control can be racism which is defined as "the appearance within the biological continuum of the human race of races, the distinction among races, the hierarchy of races" (254-255) by Foucault in *Society Must Be Defended.* He explains the relation between racism and the right by stating:

> If the power of normalization wished to exercise the old sovereign right to kill, it must become racist. And if, conversely, a power of sovereignty, or in other words, a power that has the right of life and death, wishes to work with the instruments, mechanisms, and technology of normalization, it too must become racist. When I say "killing," I obviously do not mean simply murder as such, but also every form of indirect murder: the fact of exposing someone to death, increasing the risk of death for some people, or, quite simply, political death, expulsion, rejection, and so on (256).

It is clear that racism can be the justification of the governments or rulers who wish to exercise the power of killing. It is a prerequisite that permits the operation of the modern state and justifies the right to kill within biopower as "killing or the imperative to kill is acceptable only if it results not in a victory over political adversaries, but in the elimination of the biological threat to and the improvement of the species or race" (256). Despite this crucial connection to biopower, Foucault asserts in *The History of Sexuality* that racism did not truly arise alongside the rise of biopower. He does, however, differentiate between the "modern, biologizing, statist form" (149) of racism associated with biopower and the widespread and generic understanding of the term, which most likely appeared long before biopower itself. The distinction between the two is that contemporary racism divides races based on biological characteristics, designating some as superior or good and others as inferior or unpleasant. One of the two roles of racism, according to Foucault, is the division of the biological continuum and the separation of races; the other is the creation of a connection between the life of some races and their demise. Alternatively, the biological superiority of some races and the inferiority of others implies that one race must perish for another to survive and flourish. Foucault acknowledges that this kind of interaction is the relationship of war, in which one person dies in order for another to survive.

Internal or external biological threats to the populace are the goal of the modern state's right to murder. Killing becomes permissible and justified if the goal is to eradicate a threat to the populace or race rather than defeat a political foe. Because of this, racism in biopower becomes a prerequisite for death and murder. Therefore, as Foucault stated in *Society Must Be Defended* "a state must become racist" (256) if it wishes to exercise the right to kill and defend and justify its murderous actions. Thus, according to Foucault, the deadliest nations are also the most racist, or the other way around. Also, Foucault clarifies that when he says killing, he does not simply intend to kill someone. According to Foucault, this killing also entails putting someone at greater risk of dying, exposing them to political measures like rejection or expulsion, or both. It only becomes acceptable and permissible within biopower when there is a biological threat to the population or race, regardless of whether it takes the form of outright murder or more covert means. As long as it destroys or eradicates lesser races and biological threats, one race will endure and grow stronger and purer.

As it is stated in *Sovereign Power and Bare Life* by Agamben, the effort to characterize the extermination of the Jews as a sacrificial act by using the term "Holocaust" reflects a historiographical error (57). Under Nazism, Jews were the primary negative symbol of a new form of biopolitical sovereignty, embodying the concept of *homo sacer*, a life that can be killed without being sacrificed. Their deaths were not a form of capital punishment or religious sacrifice but the mere enactment of their "capacity to be killed," an intrinsic characteristic of their existence under Nazi rule. The harsh truth is that the Jews were exterminated not in a grand, ritualistic sacrifice but as "bare life," as Hitler had stated, "like lice". The extermination occurred not within the realms of law or religion but through the lens of biopolitics, where life itself is controlled and eradicated. According to him, the emergence of biopower in modernity signifies the moment when people's biological lives become fully owned by the state and enter politics. According to him, the Nazis' concentration, work, and death camps serve as an example of the sovereign or state's ultimate control over the lives of its citizens: sovereign nations rely on their ability to establish exceptions. Despite being unique, such states are inevitable in modernity itself.

Without a doubt, one configuration that contemporary biopower can adopt is the Holocaust. In order to create and maintain a variety of dynamic relations in which the exclusion, imprisonment, or death of those who are considered to be inferior can

be perceived as something that will make life in general healthier and purer, racism gives power the ability to split a population into subspecies, to identify these in terms of a biological substrate, and to do so. Racism uses the idea that the death of others makes one biologically stronger insofar as one is a part of a race or a population to justify the death-function in the economy of biopower, as Foucault stated in *Society Must Be Defended* (258). However, he believed that the Nazi dictatorship was unique, "a paroxysmal development":

> We have, then, in Nazi society something that is really quite extraordinary: this is a society which has generalized biopower in an absolute sense, but which has also generalized the sovereign right to kill … to kill anyone, meaning not only other people but also its own people … a coincidence between a generalized biopower and a dictatorship that was at once absolute and retransmitted throughout the entire social body (260).

Adolf Hitler's regime exemplifies the extreme application of biopower and biopolitics, where the management of life and death became central to state governance. Under Hitler, biopower was manifested through the systematic regulation and control of populations deemed racially pure, while simultaneously targeting those considered undesirable, such as Jews, Romani people, and individuals with disabilities. This approach aligns with Michel Foucault's notion of biopower, which emphasizes the role of the state in optimizing life and health for certain populations while exerting control over others.

As Lemke explains in *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction*, the term "biopolitics" evokes diverse and often conflicting interpretations, despite its literal meaning which is politics concerning life (from the Greek *bíos*) (2). For some, this idea seems straightforward, as all politics arguably pertains to life. However, others see a fundamental contradiction in the term. From their perspective, politics, in its classical sense, transcends biological necessities, focusing instead on collective action, decision-making, and the realm of freedom and human interaction. To them, "biopolitics" represents an oxymoron, combining concepts they view as fundamentally incompatible.

Lemke further states that the connection between racial ideology and genocide, exemplified by the Nazi slogan "Blut und Boden" (blood and soil), was a distinct feature of National Socialist biopolitics (Lemke 14). However, the broader concept of a "biologization of politics" extends beyond German history or the Nazi era. The desire of the state to manipulate populations through practices like "gardening, breeding, and

surgery" can be traced back to the 18th century. Between World War I and World War II, such biopolitical visions were embraced by opposing ideologies, from Stalin's vision of the "new Soviet man" to the eugenic policies of liberal democracies. In fact, German racial hygienists collaborated with global geneticists and drew inspiration from American sterilization programs and immigration restrictions. Similarly, Stalinist leaders sought to use scientific advancements to "refine" the Soviet population. Biopolitical ideas transcended national borders and were supported by influential nonstate actors, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, which funded molecular biology research in the U.S. with the aim of generating new tools for social control and optimizing human behaviour.

A fundamental shift in the way power functions, from sovereign control over death to the management and optimization of life itself, is revealed by Foucault's examination of biopower and biopolitics. Beginning in the classical era and accelerating with the rise of capitalism and medical advancements, this change has had a significant impact on social control, public health, and governance. The rise of state medicine, the growing medicalization of society, and the use of statistical knowledge to control people are examples of how power today operates through both more general regulatory mechanisms and disciplinary institutions. Furthermore, as demonstrated by historical instances such as Nazi Germany and Stalinist regimes, when biopolitical tactics were employed to defend exclusion, surveillance, and mass killing, the influence of biopolitics in forming contemporary governments goes beyond governance into moral and political issues. Thus, as modern nations continue to exercise control through laws on migration, healthcare, and reproduction, the relationship between life and politics has become more intertwined than before. Because dystopian fiction frequently depicts severe uses of biopolitical control and highlights the possible repercussions of uncontrolled authority over human existence, this conceptual framework is especially pertinent to dystopian fiction.

1.3 The Relationality of Dystopian Literature to Biopower and Biopolitics

The term utopia first appeared when Sir Thomas More applied the name Utopia to his imaginary republic in 1516. According to the *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (750), the title of the book is a pun on *eutopia*, which is a place where all is well. It is originated from the Greek *ou* 'not' and *topos* 'place' and it can be said that the idea of such a place in which all is well was not a brand-new idea back then. This is because some major works such as the Sumerian epic of *Gilgamesh* (2nd century BC) and *Odyssey* (about 725-675 BCE) had been written earlier. The most inventive utopias were produced in the latter half of the 19th century, including William Morris's *A Dream of John Bull* (1888), Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888), and Buller Lytton's *The Coming Race* (1817). However, H. G. Wells's *A Modern Utopia* (1905) was the main contribution. Wells was the first to see paradise as a global state with population control, state-controlled land, capital, and industry, worldwide governance, and a central bureaucracy.

Due to utopia's apparent impossibility and several failed attempts to realize it, its opposite has emerged: dystopia or anti-utopia; in certain instances, these are gloomy predictions of the impending doom of the humanity. Some of the works depicting dystopias in the first half of the 20th century are Joseph Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem* (1600), George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932). New dystopian visions such as Kurt Vonnegut's *Player Piano* (1952), Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (1962), William Burroughs's *Nova Express* (1964) and J. G. Ballard's *The Terminal Beach* (1964) together with Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* (2005), frequently with significant and unsettling potency, have proliferated in somewhat apocalyptic fiction and film since the 1950s.

The ways that states impose control over people, not just via political and legal frameworks, but also through systems that govern life itself, are commonly examined in dystopian literature. In *The History of Sexuality,* Michel Foucault's idea of biopower, which he defines as the contemporary state's capacity to "incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimize, and organize" life (136), is strongly related to this focus on biological governance. Biopower shapes the conditions of life by influencing populations through disciplined institutions like bureaucracy, hospitals, and schools, in contrast to sovereign power, which is largely focused on the right to kill. This reasoning is frequently taken too far in dystopian fiction, which portrays civilizations

in which genetic engineering, reproductive control, monitoring, and medical exploitation are ways in which authority is expressed. Numerous dystopian novels examine the severe use of biopower by totalitarian governments, which shape and control populations through genetic engineering, public health regulations, and state-sanctioned control over reproduction. It is important to understand the concept of power in order to recognize the systems of oppression in books like *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go*, where people are subjected to systems of control that function through normalization and biological regulation rather than direct repression.

The disastrous effects of biopolitics are often shown in dystopian fiction, especially in relation to the way states impose control over social hierarchies, reproductive rights, and bodily autonomy. Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* is a startling illustration of how women's bodies are turned into state property and treated as nothing more than reproductive organs in a strict biopolitical society. The novel illustrates the perils of biopolitical governance by showing how political and medical institutions collaborate to control people. This supports Foucault's claim that institutions that influence life itself, not only conventional methods of state repression, are the means by which biopolitical power is wielded. The book serves as a cautionary tale about the possible effects of uncontrolled biopolitical power.

Dystopian literature has long served as a lens through which to examine current power relations, depicting societies in which high levels of governmental monitoring, control, and body restriction exist. In this regard, the ideas of biopower and biopolitics provide an essential theoretical foundation for comprehending how dystopian governments control life itself, ruling not just via repression but also through the control and optimization of human populations and bodies. It is possible to discover how dystopian fiction mirrors and challenges contemporary concerns about medicalization, state control, and the commodity of life by examining it through the prism of biopolitics.

Another viewpoint on dystopian control techniques is biopower, which contends that contemporary biopolitical regimes function via influencing social norms, wants, and behaviours in addition to directly oppressing people, thereby enabling them to participate in their own oppression. In their work *Empire* Hardt and Negri explains that in a disciplinary society the relationship between the individual and authority remained static: the individual's resistance matched the disciplinary invasion of power.

The entire social body, on the other hand, is created in the virtuality of power when it becomes wholly biopolitical. This is an emotive, qualitative, and open relationship. Society responds as a single body because it is involved in a power that extends down to the cells of the social structure and its developmental processes. “Power is thus expressed as a control that extends throughout the depths of the consciousnesses and bodies of the population, and at the same time across the entirety of social relations” (Hardt and Negri 24).

This aspect of biopower is frequently reflected in dystopian literature, which portrays societies in which control is exercised through ideological conditioning, surveillance, and the normalization of state authority rather than overt repression. Because they are made to feel that conformity is required for safety, advancement, or the welfare of the group, people in these narratives usually accept or even embrace their subjugation. These pieces demonstrate how biopower works by creating environments where people police themselves, control their own behaviour, and voluntarily conform to social norms rather than just using force. In dystopian societies where citizens internalize state ideologies, the mechanisms of biopower are apparent, making active resistance challenging because power is distributed throughout all tiers of social interaction. By examining these issues, dystopian fiction offers a critical analysis of how contemporary systems of government can establish control by influencing the very foundations of both individual and collective identity rather than by using force.

Ian Hacking’s concepts of biopower and statistical control also shed light on how bureaucratic oversight and scientific categorization are used in dystopian societies to control life. Hacking argues in *Biopower and the Avalanche of Printed Numbers* that modern governance uses “the avalanche of printed numbers” (196) to group people into social categories, allowing the state to intervene and legitimize regulations. Data collection, demographic analysis, and scientific classification are frequently used in dystopian literature to control populations, establish social roles, and eradicate perceived threats to order. Many dystopian stories depict societies where people are reduced to numbers, with productivity scores, genetic markers, or other measurable indicators determining their value. These made-up societies serve as a reflection of how statistical governance can deprive people of their freedom and transform them from free agents into objects of bureaucratic control. These representations draw

attention to the perils of treating human life as nothing more than data, where efficiency and optimization are prioritized over individual liberty. According to Hacking, numerical depictions of populations actively create social hierarchies and uphold control mechanisms rather than merely describing reality.

A powerful instrument for analysing the workings of biopower and biopolitics, dystopian literature shows how governments manipulate life itself. These narratives ask the reader to consider modern power structures by presenting societies in which medicalization, statistical regulation, and ideological conditioning are used to enact governance rather than brute force. From bureaucratic oppression in statistical governance to reproductive control the themes examined highlight the perils of a system that normalizes subjugation by integrating power into daily life. Real-world worries about data collection, algorithmic governance, and biopolitical intervention are reflected in these narratives' interplay between surveillance, scientific classification, and self-regulation. Dystopian fiction, then, does more than just depict gloomy futures; it critically examines the systems governing contemporary society and exposes the subtle yet common ways in which power operates. It is possible to better understand how biopolitical regimes impact human existence by examining these texts via the perspectives of Foucault, Hardt and Negri, and Hacking. This leads to important political and ethical issues regarding governance in the present and the future.

CHAPTER 2: ALDOUS HUXLEY AND *THE BRAVE NEW WORLD*

Aldous Huxley (1894–1963), the British writer and intellectual, was greatly influenced by his own life experiences, scientific discoveries, and philosophical investigations. As stated by Nicholas Murray in *Aldous Huxley: A Biography*, he was born into a prestigious intellectual family and probably inherited his lifelong interest in science and evolution from his family (11). He was the grandson of biologist and passionate Darwinist Thomas Henry Huxley, referred to as Darwin's bulldog as he was "responsible for publicizing Charles Darwin's ideas on evolution" (Reiff 11). Due to an eye condition that caused him to become partially blind, he was unable to pursue a career in science during his early education at Eton, a boarding school where he studied biology as one of the school's academic elites. After regaining vision in his left eye by 1913, he enrolled at Oxford University's Balliol College to study English literature (Reiff 16).

The engagement of early 20th-century philosophical and scientific ideas had a significant influence on Aldous Huxley's intellectual growth. *Brave New World* was greatly impacted by his exposure to the swift developments in behavioural conditioning, eugenics, and psychology during the interwar years. Daniel J. Kevles explains in the preface of his book *In the Name of Eugenics* that it was an English scientist Francis Galton to first use the term "eugenics" in 1883 (ix). The term is used to refer to the study of enhancing the human stock by increasing the likelihood that more suitable races or blood strains will outnumber less suitable ones. However, since Galton's time, the term "eugenics" has acquired negative connotations due to its association with flawed genetic theories that led to oppressive and brutal social policies, most notoriously during the Nazi era.

Growing up in a family that dealt with science deeply, "Huxley respected scientists and regarded modern scientific methodology as one of the most significant achievements in human history" (Baker 8). However, he also believed that science, particularly applied science or technology, could be both enlightening and a potential manifestation of darker forces. He was worried that the combination of technology and bureaucracy would lead to the rise of a managerial class of technical specialists who placed a higher priority on safety and order. That kind of a class is similar to the one depicted in the *Brave New World*.

The novel was written during a time in which profound social, political, and scientific transformations took place. The publication date of the novel, 1932, falls within the interwar period and the dystopian vision of the novel reflects those times. The aftermath of World War I created a landscape of societal trauma and political uncertainty across Europe. The war demonstrated humanity's capacity for industrialized killing on an unprecedented scale, fostering deep anxieties about technological progress and the future of civilization. As David Bradshaw stated in *The Hidden Huxley*, the novel "was written during a period of unprecedented instability in modern British politics and at a time when Huxley daily expected the country to sink into bloody disorder" (xii). In 1929, there was a general economic collapse, the stock market collapse in the USA, and that led to "to the concomitant rise of fascism in Germany, Italy, and elsewhere" (Booker 48). In this context of global political and economic change, Huxley confronted the failures of both capitalist and communist systems as viable frameworks for human advancement. While the novel clearly critiques the capitalist model through its portrayal of engineered contentment and mindless consumption, Booker notes that "Huxley does not present Communism as a cure for the ills depicted in his book. Indeed, he incorporates numerous elements of Communism into his dystopian vision" (Booker 48). Aldous Huxley's first-hand experiences during the British economic crisis can be observed in the novel. In her article "Designing a Brave New World: Eugenics, Politics, and Fiction", Joanne Woiak claims that Huxley "witnessed the effects of high unemployment and monotonous work" (112) in the place named Durham coalfields. She suggests that he observed the effects of unemployment and the dehumanizing assembly line methods pioneered by Henry Ford, who would later become a satirical target in the novel (112).

The themes of genetic engineering and reproductive control included in the *Brave New World* were also influenced by the views of Huxley's brother, Julian Huxley, a prominent biologist and eugenicist. Julian Huxley came to very similar conclusions regarding the ability of humans to alter life on Earth in his early essays and books on the possibilities of applied biology, which served as some of the inspiration for *Brave New World* (Deese 2). In addition to their early recognition of our growing impact on the planet, Julian and Aldous Huxley were among the first public intellectuals to predict that new technologies would revolutionize humanity itself. In his first book, *Crome Yellow*, published in 1921, which is more than ten years

before the publication of *Brave New World*, Huxley briefly described a future society in which infants would be hatched in vast state incubators meaning that the family system will disappear.

Brave New World was greatly influenced by H.G. Wells' utopian novels, especially *Men Like Gods*. H. G. Wells was a well-known author who popularized the notion that advancements in technology would lead to a bright future in works like *Men Like Gods*, published in 1923. Huxley based the *Brave New World* on Well's secular, socialistic utopia, complete with scientific birth control and genetic engineering techniques (Reiff 61). He adopted a more pessimistic position, presenting a dystopian society where technological advancement acts as a tool of control rather than liberation, in contrast to Wells' vision of a logical and scientifically advanced utopia. His book was written with the intention of warning against both current trends and the idea of utopia in general, which supported the idea that one could create a flawless template and then enforce it. The book was a bad utopia, a dystopia, or cacotopia (Murray 265). His exposure to World War I and the mechanization of warfare also contributed to his discontent with modernity by making him doubt the uncontrolled advancement of science without regard for morality.

The story of the novel takes place in the year 632 A.F., where after Christ (A.C.) has been replaced by after Ford, the American businessman who created the first industrial automobile the "Model T". Humans are no longer conceived; rather, they are created artificially. They are no longer born but rather hatched in bottles. These individuals may not be unique, as they are basically clones. The calendar focuses on Ford's life rather than Christianity or the liturgical year, highlighting the shift towards capitalist economics and technological progress as the guiding principles. As a result, Ford is worshipped as a god in this world resulting in using expressions like 'Oh, Ford!' throughout the book instead of 'Oh, God!' and crosses resembling T suggest this.

As mentioned in the previous chapter focusing on the literature review, the phrase "biopower" refers to the ways in which governments exercise control over individuals and groups through the use of direct force as well as tactics and systems that regulate and manage the behaviour of living things. Since the seventeenth century, biopower has evolved into two main poles: disciplinary technology focusing on the individual body and regulatory controls focusing on the population. This technology

treats bodies as a useful and docile machine for force production and extraction. Power is not exercised by the sovereign but has a huge amount of influence on institutions like the army, prison, school, and hospital. In order to govern and make the society better, it entails controlling elements of human biology, including birth, death, reproduction, and health. Conversely, biopolitics studies the relationship between biological realities of life and political power. It covers how decision-makers come up with decisions and enact laws that affect the health, welfare, and reproduction of the populace. The study of biopolitics examines how the government controls life, including how social programs, immigration laws, and public health regulations affect individuals and their bodies.

Through an analysis of the themes of reproductive control, social conditioning, pleasure-based governance, and the potential for resistance, this chapter explores how *Brave New World* can be analysed as a novel reflecting the mechanisms of biopower and its consequences for personal agency and identity. Drawing on Foucault's theory of biopower, it is critical to investigate how literature, particularly dystopian fiction, critiques and recreates these mechanisms. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* is a novel depicting a society in which biopolitical control is absolute. The biopolitical control is achieved through reproductive technologies, social conditioning, and pharmacological regulation.

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* is a powerful illustration of biopolitical control since it depicts a society in which authority is exercised through the strict control of life itself rather than through explicit repression. The novel examines how the state maintains order and stability by controlling bodies, reproduction, and social behaviour, which can be examined through the ideas biopower and biopolitics by Michel Foucault. Power becomes decentralized and moves in various directions. It now shows up as the act of saving life rather than the act of killing. Foucault, in *The History of Sexuality*, explains that "a normalizing society is the historical outcome of a technology of power centred on life" (140). The goal of the global state is to keep people content. People in the Fordian society are normalized in order to keep the state stable. Foucault explains how disciplinary systems, the construction of education, hygiene, and sexuality normalize a population. In *Brave New World*, discipline operates naturally in a Fordian society, which assumes that everyone will follow its rules:

> Till at last the child's mind is these suggestions, and then sum of the suggestions is the child's mind. And not the child's mind only. The adult's mind too – all his life long. The mind that judges and desires and decides – made up of these suggestions. But all these suggestions are our suggestions! ... Suggestions from the State (23-24).

During the tour the Director conducts for new students at the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre, he reveals the fundamental biopolitical mechanism of the World State which is the complete internalization of state power within subjects' consciousness. This scene demonstrates how the World State's conditioning techniques operate not through violent coercion but through the careful engineering of desire and thought itself. The citizens believe they are exercising free will while manifesting the state's programming. This exemplifies Foucault's concept of normalization, wherein power functions not primarily through repression but through the production of particular types of subjects.

The main aim of the Fordian society is to have people who live happily in it. The number of people in their relation to natural resources is not an issue in this society as Huxley states in *Brave New World Revisited* "An optimum figure for world population had been calculated and numbers were maintained at this figure (a little under two billion, if I remember rightly) generation after generation" (10). There are methods of course to make and keep people happy but the idea is that each individual should willingly participate in the happiness of the society through a number of applications provided by the state. In the whole state, there is pleasure, amusement and economy and that is simply the foundation of it. After working all day on Ford-style production processes, people spend their evenings playing electromagnetic golf, going to the "feelies", which are similar to what we know as the cinema in traditional sense, or engaging in recreational sex. Individuals lack romantic relationships, familial ties, and have artificial friendships. Besides labour, the primary activities are enjoyment and consumption. Instead of aging, people live in perfect health until they are in their sixties, at which point they pass away in ecstasy at a special hospital for the dying. Phosphorus and other useful materials are extracted from their remains. The regime has done a great job of implementing the core values of this Fordian society, which are community, identity, and stability. It is clear to see the so-called achievement in the words of Mustapha Mond, one of the world controllers, in the following lines:

> Because our world is not the same as Othello's world. You can't make flivvers without steel–and you can't make tragedies without social instability. The world's stable now. People are happy; they get what they want, and they never

> want what they can't get. They're well off; they're safe; they're never ill; they're not afraid of death; they're blissfully ignorant of passion and old age; they're plagued with no mothers or fathers; they've got no wives, or children, or lovers to feel strongly about; they're so conditioned that they practically can't help behaving as they ought to behave. And if anything should go wrong, there's soma. Which you go and chuck out of the window in the name of liberty, Mr. Savage. Liberty! (Huxley, *Brave New World* 193-194).

Mond's speech represents the culmination of Foucault's concept of biopower, power that manages life rather than threatens death. Citizens gain much more in this world because they are safe, never ill and they are not afraid of death. What they lose, passion and old age, mothers or fathers, wives, or children, or lovers reveals how thoroughly the state has reconfigured human existence. This scene demonstrates that the World State's biopower operates through what Foucault calls a political economy of the body, the strategic management of physical and emotional capacities to maximize certain outcomes, which are stability and productivity, while minimizing others such as suffering, but also transcendence.

By using genetic engineering and reproductive technologies, the World State eliminates natural birth and enforces biological predestination. People are subjected to intense conditioning from birth, which shape their beliefs and desires and guarantees their obligatory involvement in the system. Since happiness and compliance are maintained by soma, which is a type of drug taken by all the citizens whenever they wish to avoid sadness without experiencing any side effects, pleasure, and the internalization of discipline rather than by force, surveillance and governance are subtle but also widespread all over the World State. However, despite the system's ability to totalize, the novel also challenges the boundaries of biopolitical control through the struggles of individuals such as John the Savage, who opposes the systems that govern life in the World State.

Brave New World contains numerous in-depth descriptions of reproductive technology, which suggest that biopolitics is at work in the World State because the regulation of biological processes, or the regulatory technology of life is quite common. The World State maximizes the production, multiplication, and arrangement of life for the entire population. *Brave New World* envisions a society where biological reproduction is entirely subjected to state control, demonstrating Michel Foucault's concept of biopower, in which authority regulates human life at the level of the body and population. In the novel, the traditional family structure is abolished, and

reproduction is mechanized through the Bokanovsky Process, a mass-production technique that ensures uniformity and social stability. From various perspectives, modern technology has terrifying implications, but "only the author of *Brave New World* considered the possibility of a human race engineered in a hatchery, produced on an assembly line, manipulated with chemical substances, and bokanovskified by cell division" (Holzer 2). The process of producing individuals is mentioned in the following lines:

> One egg, one embryo, one adult—normality. But a bokanovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, will divide. From eight to ninety-six buds, and every bud will grow into a perfectly formed embryo, and every embryo into a full-sized adult. Making ninety-six human beings grow where only one grew before. Progress. (Huxley, *Brave New World* 3-4)

This passage exemplifies the state's mass-production conception of human existence, which prioritizes predictability and efficiency over individuality. This demonstrates how political dominance can be achieved through reproductive control. By treating embryos as commodities to be standardized, conditioned, and allocated to particular social roles, the World State rationalizes human life. It is possible to see the objective of biopolitical government, which aims at improving life and making it better, through the motto written on the main entrance "Community, Identity and Stability" (Huxley, *Brave New World* 1). This is quite similar to the Nazis who aimed at perfection in terms of genes of the citizens.

The system works perfectly as the World State has adopted a form of external fertilization in which ova are transplanted into the liquid containing spermatozoa to be fertilized after first being surgically removed from voluntary fertilizers. While many poorly grown eggs are checked to divide and multiply using Bokanovsky's process, the fertilized eggs of Alpha and Beta, which are the better ones, are bottled. The early twentieth century enthusiasm for eugenics, combined with rapid scientific progress, caused ethical debates about the role of state control over human biology. Huxley, who is deeply involved in these discussions, expresses his concerns in *Brave New World*, which depicts a future in which the pursuit of genetic perfection leads to the erosion of individuality and free will. The World State uses eugenics to create citizens who can live harmoniously within its established social structure. Mustapha Mond, the government official and resident controller of Western Europe, oversees the classification and production of citizens to maintain political stability.

In *Brave New World*, psychological training and conditioning are some of the key tools used by the World State to control its populace, illustrating the overwhelming power of technology in influencing people's attitudes, actions, and social mores. In the dystopian society portrayed in the novel, psychological manipulation starts at birth. The eggs undergo several physical conditioning procedures in the Social Predestination Room following fertilization (Huxley, *Brave New World* 7). Based on the information obtained from the Bottling Room, the predestinators plan and design the quantity and quality of socialized individuals that different fields require. Different eggs would be subjected to a variety of physical stimuli in order to help them adapt to future work and life. For example, chemical workers would endure the effects of harmful chemicals, and rocket-plane engineers would experience continuous rotation to improve their sense of balance. Furthermore, in Neo-Pavlovian Conditioning Rooms, lower-caste infants would be violently stimulated to develop an innate dislike of books and flowers in order to achieve certain political and economic goals of the World State. Caste is the foundation of *Brave New World* society. Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons are the five castes. Alphas are the most intelligent and physically attractive, holding leadership and intellectual roles, Betas are slightly less capable but still perform skilled work. Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons follow in descending order of intelligence and physical ability, with Epsilons performing the easiest tasks. Each caste is conditioned from birth to accept their role, ensuring social stability without conflict.

> We also predestine and condition. We decant our babies as socialized human beings, as Alphas or Epsilons, as future sewage workers or future ..." He was going to say "future World controllers," but correcting himself, said "future Directors of Hatcheries," instead (10).

The basic idea behind conditioning is that there should be a pre-destined balance in the World State. Individuals belonging to specific caste must have a dislike for specific things and also they need to be consumers in order to maintain the sustainability of the system. For example, those belonging to higher castes are conditioned to enjoy things like using their helicopters for transportation. Also, they feel the need to keep consuming as much as possible because of the conditioning they have been exposed to:

> But old clothes are beastly, continued the untiring whisper. We always throw away old clothes. Ending is better than mending, ending is better than mending, ending is better… (42).

In addition to the conditioning of individuals, the games they play require many apparatuses to play rather than the so-called old-fashioned games which required only a ball or two accompanied with "a bit of netting" (25). Controllers in the World State do not approve such games because they are simply cheap to play and people do not need to spend any money to be able to play them.

The World State intervenes in the process of reproduction and the hatchery makes sure that it raises a variety of individuals to take part in the society. That would normally be the case if human beings were allowed to reproduce but there is no need to take such risks in this society. The workers and the world controllers are to be predetermined so that there is an order because every one of these individuals are conditioned to be happy because of whichever caste they belong to.

Social conditioning is the primary method used to control the inhabitants of Fordian society. Its people face an "unescapable social destiny" (12) within a Caste System in which they are ranked from intelligent Alpha Pluses to Proletarian Epsilons. As Foucault mentions in *Discipline and Punish* "the distribution according to ranks or grade has a double role: firstly, it marks the gaps, hierarchies, qualities, skills and aptitudes" (172), which underlines the importance of the caste system. Also, in order to maintain the stability of the supposedly ideal society, each caste is given distinct tasks or jobs to complete. In principle, "Every one works for every one else. We can't do without any one. Even Epsilons are useful. We couldn't do without Epsilons. Every one works for every one else. We can't do without any one ..." (Huxley, *Brave New World* 64). The Epsilon caste, which is the least powerful, is comparable to slaves, whereas the Alpha caste is the most powerful and influential. To create Epsilons, which are the lower caste individuals, some modifications like reducing the amount of oxygen given to embryos needed to be made because "The lower the caste, the shorter the oxygen" (11). It is clear that some deliberate methods of creating these castes are at work. Not only the amount of oxygen but also using alcohol when the embryos are in bottles are some techniques that they make use of to reduce the individuals' abilities.

In addition to the physical interference of the production of the embryos, as another method of conditioning hypnopaedia is considered to be an effective tool, which is basically the principle of sleep teaching (20). It is a technique that trains people to unconsciously accept and internalize social norms and values, so it is also mentioned to be the "greatest moralizing and socializing force of all time" (23). The

infants are conditioned through the voice they hear repeatedly coming from under their pillows:

> Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do, because they're so frightfully clever. I'm really awfully glad I'm a Beta, because I don't work so hard. And then we are much better than the Gammas and Deltas. Gammas are stupid. They all wear green, and Delta children wear khaki. Oh no, I don't want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse. They're too stupid to be able to be able to read or write. Besides they wear black, which is such a beastly colour. I'm so glad I'm a Beta.... (23).

The sleep teaching technique is so powerful that despite being high on soma, Lenina does not forget about taking precautions in order to prevent pregnancy. This is probably because of the experience they have gained through years of practice. They have earlier tried to teach textbook information but failed to do so. For example, children have been taught that the Nile is the longest river in Africa by hypnopaedia but when they are asked if they know which river is the longest one in Africa, the children have failed to give any answers (20). That's because they just memorize the sentence or whatever is being taught, but as for the meaning of their memorization, they have no clue. In order to get the answer to such a question, if you start "But don't you remember something that begins: The Nile is the ..." (20), they can continue the memorized structure they had been taught earlier. This distinction between rote learning and meaningful understanding indicates the World State's sophisticated application of what Foucault would term disciplinary technology techniques that shape not just what subjects know but how they are capable of knowing.

These reproductive and environmental practices are biopolitical since politics currently shapes the biological and medical areas and the state controls aspects of birth, death, production, and disease. Such regulations are used to protect the population's overall security while extending the lives of citizens and enhancing their quality of life. Political necessity drives the implementation of such cutting-edge biotechnologies, which are key components of the social stability principle that has been emphasized repeatedly. According to Mustapha Mond, the World State is formed as a result of the early Nine Years' Wars which resulted in various civil wars leading to a total social transformation. There was an unrest due to the war and that is the reason the World State is founded in order to maintain stability.

The genetic engineering of the new world prioritizes physical health over human emotional and spiritual needs. The assembly line birth method, which produces

babies in bottles, distances the mother-child bonds that once existed. Once a desired role, motherhood is now referred to as a "smutty" word (30). According to Matthew Vranicar, this occurred because "the strong bond between mother and child is seen as disruptive to the stability of the state" (1). Lenina mentions this when she says: "When the individual feels, the community reels" (Huxley, *Brave New World* 81). In the World State, becoming a mother is a shameful experience. Linda's experience is a perfect example of society's strong dislike for motherhood. Linda internalizes her upbringing's shame after becoming pregnant and giving birth to John outside of the World State. When she returns, she is humiliated and shunned for having done something so unnatural. She laments, "And I was so ashamed. Just think of it: me, a Beta–having a baby: put yourself in my place" (103). Her intense guilt and self-loathing demonstrate how thoroughly the World State trains its citizens to oppose any form of biological reproduction. She adds "there wasn't anything like an Abortion Centre here" (103). Linda's experience reinforces the biopolitical mechanisms of control, she is no longer regarded as a proper citizen, but rather as a degraded, almost inhuman figure, demonstrating how the erasure of motherhood is critical to stability. It is not only the mother figure that is considered to be inappropriate. When Bernard takes John and Linda back to the World State and introduces John as the son of the director, Tomakin, in front of all the workers, he is obliged to resign from his duty because of the shame of having a son. Here, being a father is also referred to as "smutty" (132) and upon learning that the director is a father, all the workers start laughing.

According to Mary E. Theis, dystopian literature frequently deals with marginalization or the total absence of motherhood. Those in positions of authority frequently use it as a tool to guarantee political stability and the compliance of their constituents. She claims in *Mothers and Masters in Contemporary Utopian and Dystopian Literature* that "to dramatize the extent of the state's total control of an individual, his isolation and oppression are invariably associated with either the complete abolition of the maternal role as primary educator or with the complete regulation of family life that permits neither parent to educate their children or show their love for them as they wish" (34). Even when women get pregnant by mistake, there are abortion centres in the World State so that they can avoid the shame of becoming a mother. There are certain ways the World State make use of in order to

prevent women from giving birth. As for the first application, 70% of all women are freemartins. The online Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines freemartin as "a sexually imperfect usually sterile female calf born as a twin with a male" and obviously Aldous Huxley uses the term not for an animal but to refer to the women in the novel. Most of the women in the World State are already sterile and those who do not need to make use of the Malthusian Belt, which is "a stylish device for contraceptives, essential for all females who are not freemartins" (Bloom 35). According to Bloom, Aldous Huxley named the belt after Thomas Malthus, a late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century philosopher who observed that nature produces more offspring than can realistically be sustained. Malthus applied this observation to the human population, arguing that population control was necessary to prevent famine and poverty (35). Because of the fact that the number of each individual in different castes are predetermined, there is no uncontrolled poverty.

Women in the World State lack a sense of motherhood and rely solely on Pregnancy Substitutes to experience pregnancy hormones during specific times. As women are no longer able to conceive due to the use of artificial wombs for childbirth, they use Pregnancy Substitute to help them feel the emotions and hormones associated with pregnancy. They can take this substitute to simulate pregnancy hormones even when they are feeling ill. The example of this can be observed when Fanny explains to Lenina by saying "Dr. Wells says that a three months' Pregnancy Substitute now will make all the difference to my health for the next three or four years" (Huxley, *Brave New World* 33). Despite the fact that the women in the World State avoid being pregnant, they see the value of the hormones which help them feel better and that is why they make use of this Pregnancy Substitute process, which is compulsory after the age of twenty-one.

Other tools of biopower consist of the abolition of families, mothers, monogamy, and even emotion. These are no longer desired by the Fordian state because eliminating emotion and many traits, typically associated with being human, is the only way the state can achieve social stability. Examples to control and condition the emotions of the citizens can be the Hospital for Dying and Cremation Centre. There is conditioning for death, which helps citizen regard it as nothing to worry about. In order to achieve that, "death conditioning begins at eighteen months. Every tot spends two mornings a week in a Hospital for the Dying. All the best toys are kept there, and

they get chocolate cream on death days. They learn to take dying as a matter of course" (142). From an early age, they are conditioned to think that dying is nothing to worry about, they accept it wholeheartedly.

Even after death, the bodies of the deceased are used to contribute to the World State. Slough Crematorium is the building where the cremation of corpses take place. During the process a chemical called phosphorus, which is necessary for plant growth, is restored and used to contribute to the plant growing "Now they recover over ninety-eight per cent of it. More than a kilo and a half per adult corpse. Which makes the best part of four hundred tons of phosphorus every year from England alone" (63). They consider that being socially useful even after they die by helping plants grow to contribute to the wellbeing of the World State, which helps them accept death as a natural occurrence.

The abolition of the family concept serves as an important tool of biopolitical control in the novel. The D.H.C., the director of hatcheries and conditioning centre, explains that the concepts of home and parents are not to be desired, and they are old-fashioned terms. The fact that there were parents before the invention of hatcheries sound quite unpleasant. As he is giving the tour to the new students, the director explains to them that World State citizens may struggle to comprehend such concepts as family, father and mother, marriage, women giving birth as they are considered primitive.

> In brief," the Director summed up, "the parents were the father and the mother." The smut that was really science fell with a crash into the boys' eye-avoiding silence. "Mother," he repeated loudly rubbing in the science; and, leaning back in his chair, "These," he said gravely, "are unpleasant facts; I know it. But then most historical facts are unpleasant (19).

As for the relationship between the family members, it is also believed to have corrupted the stability the World State currently claimed to have. Beyond personal identity, the traditional family unit is presented as a danger to the stability of society. During the time the families lived together, they acted upon their emotions, which are to be avoided in the current state and there is no need for a mother to take care of her children because then they would be affecting their behaviour in a certain way. Mustapha Mond, the controller and one of the ten world controllers, begins by outlining the attributes that are no longer valued in the Fordian state, making it abundantly evident that these are all traits typically associated with being a human as

we know it. He begins by asking the young men to try to picture what it was like to have a mother and a house.

> Home, home–a few small rooms, stiflingly over-inhabited by a man, by a periodically teeming woman, by a rabble of boys and girls of all ages. No air, no space; an understerilized prison; darkness, disease, and smells… What suffocating intimacies, what dangerous, insane, obscene relationships between the members of the family group! Maniacally, the mother brooded over her children (her children) ... brooded over them like a cat over its kittens; but a cat that could talk, a cat that could say, "My baby, my baby," over and over again (31).

In addition to the regulations targeted at the family structure and reproduction, another biopolitical tool used in the World State is the absence of monogamy. The fact that individuals do not have any partners for life, they do not develop and deep relationships to found a family. Rather than being accepted as the norm, emotional exclusivity is viewed as an abnormality. On the contrary, those who date the same person for a long time are considered to be violating the system. An example of this can be seen while Lenina is talking to her friend, Fanny, about the plans she made to go out with Henry Foster. Upon hearing that she is going out with him again, Fanny replies: "Again?" … "Do you mean to tell me you're still going out with Henry Foster?" (33). She further adds "It's such horribly bad form to go on and on like this with one man. At forty, or thirtyfive, it wouldn't be so bad. But at your age, Lenina! No, it really won't do (34). This is completely against the idea that everyone belongs to everyone else according to many people living in the World State. Once the foundation of human society, traditional monogamous relationships have been outlawed and replaced by a state mandated system, where people are encouraged seriously, if not required, to enter into several casual relationships. In order to ensure that no strong personal attachments threaten the primacy of state authority, this transformation is a purposeful form of biopolitical control. Instead of being just a cultural preference, the transition from monogamy to state-sanctioned polyamory is a control mechanism that makes sure that strong emotional ties don't jeopardize the state's overall authority.

Eliminating strong emotional ties that might threaten the unity of the state is the primary goal of giving up monogamy. Romantic relationships in traditional societies cultivate a strong sense of attachment, which frequently results in defiance of authority for the benefit of a loved one. Since emotional depth is quite similar to unpredictability, and because unpredictability is the enemy of total control, Huxley's

dystopian government makes sure that this system is at work and help avoid any possible strong bound that would ruin the system. The World State successfully stops people from developing deep, exclusive ties by normalizing a system in which "everyone belongs to everyone else" (34). This rule guarantees that no one puts the welfare of society at large ahead of that of a single partner.

Children in *Brave New World* are taught to despise monogamy and get used to having many partners from a young age. They are taught by the World State's educational program that being committed to a single partner is not only out of date but also unhealthy and unnatural. Through gamification such as the one children play called erotic play which takes place between little boys and girls (27). Hypnopaedia conditioning strengthens this belief and makes monogamy seem disgusting. When one of the children seems reluctant to play such a game, he/she might be taken to the Assistant Superintendent of Psychology to see if anything is abnormal (26). In the end, the public accepts enforced promiscuity as a natural part of life rather than a means of control, and they voluntarily engage in this culture.

The World State guarantees that jealousy has no place in interpersonal relationships by eliminating the idea of monogamy. There can be no room for possessiveness, longing, or heartache because no one can claim exclusive rights over another. When these feelings are absent, people become more obedient and concentrate their energies on their designated social roles rather than on personal relationships. Another crucial purpose of *Brave New World*'s promotion of casual sex is to divert attention from more serious existential issues. The government encourages sexual activity as a duty as well as a social norm, which serves to further the notion that physical pleasure, not intellectual or emotional fulfilment, is the true measure of personal happiness. As a result, sexual relationships cease to be emotional and instead become transactional, a source of pleasure rather than attachment.

The two main characters who desire monogamy in the book are Bernard Marx and John the Savage. Bernard is an Alpha but different from those of the same caste psychologically and physically. It is clear throughout the book that he is in search of something different resisting the state's expectations of casual sex. He prefers to have deeper relationships especially with Lenina, who on the contrary is more obedient to the rules of the state. The longing for such desires makes Bernard an outsider and even nearly causes him to be sent to Iceland by the Director:

> By his heretical views on sport and soma, by the scandalous unorthodoxy of his sex-life, by his refusal to obey the teachings of Our Ford and behave out of office hours, 'even as a little infant, … he has proved himself an enemy of Society, a subverter, ladies and gentlemen, of all Order and Stability, a conspirator against Civilization itself. For this reason I propose to dismiss him, to dismiss him with ignominy from the post he has held in this Centre; I propose forthwith to apply for his transference to a Subcentre of the lowest order and, that his punishment may serve the best interest of Society, as far as possible removed from any important Centre of population (129-130).

In contrast, John the Savage is from a society that still practices monogamy. John, who was raised on the Savage Reservation, has a Shakespearean perspective on relationships, sex, and love that emphasizes dedication, selflessness, and intense feeling. He finds it disgusting that the World State is so casually promiscuous. His statement "But I don't want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin" (211) shows his rejection of a system that prioritizes surface-level pleasure over human complexity. John's failure to adjust to the demands of the World State is the main cause of his ultimate tragedy. Monogamy is not only discouraged but also completely outdated in this dystopian future, as evidenced by the confusion and mockery he encounters when he tries to find meaningful, exclusive love. His eventual suicide shows that a world free of love and emotional depth is unbearable for some people and serves as a final critique of the state's policies.

The abolition of monogamy in *Brave New World* functions not as a natural social evolution but as a deliberate mechanism of control. By replacing deep emotional connections with superficial pleasure, the World State ensures that no individual's desires supersede the needs of the collective. Monogamy, which is associated with passion, commitment, and personal rebellion, is replaced by a system engineered to prioritize stability over individuality. As Foucault states in *The History of Sexuality* this is basically "the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life" (140). He further adds that "Broadly speaking, at the juncture of the body and the population, sex became a crucial target of a power organized around the management of life rather than the menace of death" (147). In this context, sexuality is not liberated but repurposed as a tool of governance, instrumental in the biopolitical regulation of both bodies and populations.

The World State's totalitarian control in *Brave New World* penetrates deep into people's minds, controlling their emotions, desires, and even spiritual tendencies. The

biopolitical mechanisms that uphold this control rely on pleasure and conditioning rather than overt oppression or physical force. Soma, Orgy-Porgy, and state-sponsored religious assemblies are the three main components that make up this strategy. There are numerous applications to control the citizens including structuring the caste each one will belong to. Also, the control of reproduction, which would jeopardize the system's distribution of individuals within each caste, together with conditioning the people to even avoid considering becoming a parent are some of the ways the World State make use of in an attempt to sustain the balance it aims to achieve. By eradicating individual suffering, oppressive opposition, and creating a fictitious sense of collective belonging, they guarantee compliance. When combined, they provide a potent tool for controlling the mind and body, keeping people submissive, emotionally reliant on the government, and unable to rebel. While childhood conditioning and hypnopaedia promote obedience from a young age, the system requires ongoing reinforcement. At this point, another element of control comes into being which is called Soma, a drug which offers "All the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; none of their defects" (Huxley, *Brave New World* 46). The drug barely has any side effects which makes it a perfect solution for the difficulties any citizen should ever face.

> Take a holiday from reality whenever you like, and come back without so much as a headache or a mythology… there is always soma, delicious soma, half a gramme for a halfholiday, a gramme for a week-end, two grammes for a trip to the gorgeous East, three for a dark eternity on the moon (46-47).

It is important in this context because it serves not only as a recreational drug but also as a biopolitical tool for ensuring compliance by numbing discontent and suppressing critical thought. Whenever these citizens have a negative feeling such as sadness or disappointment, Soma is always there for them. Soma internalizes submission and serves as an extension of biopower. People actively seek out the means of their own control rather than passively obeying the state. In the absence of this, as in the case of Linda when she was left in the Reservation, they seem to suffer a great deal. Since she did not have access to Soma there, Linda had to drink alcohol called mescal when she did not have even a little bit of soma. She mentions that unlike soma, it makes you feel a lot worse the next day. However, as the ideal drug, soma can take the user to happy, narcotic, and hallucinogenic experiences without causing headaches or stomach problems, which are common side effects of excessive drug use.

In the World State, soma is a daily necessity, meaning that the citizens always carry the drug with them. Workers take it after they finish their works in order to relax, if anything unpleasant should happen, it is always there to get rid of all the emotional problems. It is always served with coffee in cafes and accessible to everyone. By using chemical sedation to maintain stability, the World State makes sure that unrest is not only repressed but also eliminated in advance. The main purpose of the drug is to eradicate pain, both mental and physical, which serves to further the notion that suffering is needless and, thus, abnormal.

Soma regulates both bodies and consciousness, acting as an extension of biopower. Although health, reproduction, and social structures are frequently used in biopolitical governance to manage populations, soma functions at a deeper level by directly changing brain chemistry, which shapes human perception. The desire for obedience and the pleasure that comes from submission are chemically programmed into citizens, who do not simply obey the state. In that context, "Biopower is instrumental in the sense that it has become a means to achieve non-political goals of biological life, such as survival, pleasure and happiness" (Babaee et al. 492). Additionally, the normalization of soma use guarantees that people will never learn coping strategies for real life problems. In this way, soma not only removes pain but also the chance for endurance and emotional development. The state eliminates the very circumstances required for personal growth by chemically numbing the ability to feel discomfort, guaranteeing that people will always be emotionally immature and dependent. Foucault's idea of biopower as a productive force is consistent with this self-regulation through pleasure, which creates submissive individuals who control themselves by pursuing happiness that is chemically induced. Some individuals who refuse to use it, like John the Savage, are considered dangerous or irrational in a few occasions that they do. Because pharmaceutical compliance systematically replaces personal resilience, this dependency ensures that the state continues to be a force in daily life.

While soma uses chemical sedation to control the populace, Orgy-Porgy functions as a collective ritual that eradicates individuality and strengthens collective identity. These events organized by the State, which include group sex and religious chanting, serve as a type of biopolitical regulation by guaranteeing that human intimacy lacks any kind of emotional depth or personal connection. Passion, love, and

exclusivity, which are common components of sexual relationships in traditional societies, can result in personal loyalty that undermine governmental authority. By turning sexual activity into an impersonal, mechanical function with no deeper significance than bodily pleasure and social obligation, the World State eradicates this threat. This ideology is reinforced by the hypnotic rhythm and ritualistic nature of the Orgy-Porgy chant which emphasizes the ritual's goal. The goal is to dissolve individual identity into the collective and prevent anyone from forming exclusive bonds that could jeopardize the stability of the state.

Orgy-porgy, Ford and fun,

Kiss the girls and make them One.

Boys at one with girls at peace;

Orgy-porgy gives release (Huxley, Brave New World 73).

The phrase "gives release" here emphasizes that sexual desire is not forbidden in the World State but rather is directed toward activities that are approved by the state. Orgy-Porgy offers a controlled, approved method for people to enjoy pleasure in a way that eventually strengthens the state's power, as opposed to permitting unrestricted emotions that could cause attachment or conflict. From a biopolitical perspective, Orgy-Porgy is a prime example of how power functions by carefully controlling human desires in addition to repressing them. According to Michel Foucault's theory of biopolitics, contemporary forms of government aim to influence people's conceptions of fulfilment and pleasure rather than always punish or repress them. By making people involved in their own oppression, Orgy-Porgy ensures that they voluntarily engage in a system that rejects individual identity. In this way, it is more than just a tool for imposing control.

The World State uses religious gatherings in addition to soma and Orgy-Porgy to maintain social harmony. However, the traditional theological significance of these rituals has been removed. State-sanctioned religious gatherings are intended to strengthen obedience rather than to address spirituality, morality, or metaphysical issues. This ensures that citizens can only experience transcendence within the boundaries of the state. The Solidarity Service, a religious event that substitutes state approved ecstasy for conventional religious experiences, is among the most important examples of the state control. In order to achieve a collective experience of artificial

unity, participants take soma, chant hymns to Ford, and engage in ritualistic sexual activity. These gatherings are meant not to promote spiritual exploration but to provide people with fleeting emotional sensations that keep them submissive.

From a biopolitical perspective, the religious assemblies serve as examples of how power functions by influencing human consciousness. The state makes sure that people never look for fulfilment outside of the framework it has established by playing on their need for connection and meaning. In this sense, spirituality itself turns into a tool of control, confirming the notion that total submission to the state, rather than personal exploration, is the path to ultimate happiness and purpose.

Religious assemblies, soma, and Orgy-Porgy serve as supplementary biopolitical instruments in *Brave New World*, keeping the populace submissive, obedient, and emotionally reliant on the government. By eradicating suffering, Soma stops any revolutionary sentiment from emerging. By erasing individual identity, Orgy-Porgy maintains the notion that people are only a part of the collective. The human need for transcendence is redirected into rituals that benefit the World State by state-sponsored religious gatherings. The most successful forms of control depend on pleasure rather than force. The World State makes sure that no one even entertains the idea of rebellion by educating and conditioning its citizens to pursue fulfilment through methods provided by the state. In this society, people participate in their own downfall because they do willingly accept the rules of the state.

Another important point to be made while considering the biopolitical reflections in the *Brave New World* can be the absence of autonomy of the individuals. The citizens seem to make their own decisions, but their choices are pre-made by the state itself even before their birth. In other words, the citizens cannot make any decisions such as marriage, having children or choose, maybe change, their jobs. Within the boundaries of the state, they have freedom to do activities such as playing games and going to the feelies, but it is important to remember that they are conditioned to participate in such activities, to be consumers in that society. When they want to go beyond the border, they need to get approval from the Office of the World Controller. When Bernard is about to go on a travel to the New Mexican Reservation he gives the papers to the Director. The papers need to be signed by the director so that he can plan and take action.

> The Director glanced at him sourly. But the stamp of the World Controller's Office was at the head of the paper and the signature of Mustapha Mond, bold and black, across the bottom. Everything was perfectly in order. The director had no choice. He pencilled his initials–two small pale letters abject at the feet of Mustapha Mond–and was about to return the paper without a word of comment or genial Ford-speed, when his eye was caught by something written in the body of the permit (82).

The biggest fear of a citizen in this Fordian society is being considered to be strange. One thing Lenina, Helmholtz, John, and Bernard have in common is the fact that they are unique compared to all the others living in the World State. These characters who differ from the norm, whether voluntarily or not, highlight the consequences of biopolitical control. The subtle mechanisms of resistance, conformity, and exclusion within the biopolitical regime of the World State are made evident by these individuals.

Bernard is very well aware of the fact that he is not normal and has been like that since birth. He is depressed, unhappy with London life, and physically abnormal. He complains about London's lack of individuality and feels alienated in a culture that claims to eradicate self-consciousness rather than taking soma and participating in entertainment arranged by the state. He is ultimately exiled due to his tendency to criticize society, and he was the one who brought John and Linda to London from the Savage Reservation. Because genuine individuality threatens the uniform stability that the state maintains, even slight departure from the norm must be suppressed or eliminated, as demonstrated by Bernard's fate.

Even though Lenina is not aware of it, she finds it upsetting that she is prone to monogamy. She tends to defy the conventional idea exposed by the State, but she cannot succeed in doing so. Although biopower cannot completely eradicate natural impulses, it can shame, repress, and redirect them into acceptable forms, as evidenced by Lenina's emotional confusion and implicit monogamy.

The life path has been predetermined for the residents, and it must be followed. An Epsilon-Minus Semi-Moron is perfectly happy to follow basic instructions and perform the easy, monotonous tasks which he has been trained for. However, compared to an Epsilon-Minus, a citizen like Helmholtz Watson is more conscious. Helmholtz is an engineer who composes hypnopaedic rhymes and feelies for radio. In the Fordian society, he feels alienated. He senses that his life is lacking something but there's nothing he can do about it. Comparing to Bernard, he views his exile as an

opportunity to leave the constrained society of London and eagerly awaits the freedom to explore in his writing. He is ultimately banished by Mond to the Falkland Islands, where he does not threaten the stability of society. Helmholtz is a unique example of resistance that arises from excess intelligence and creativity rather than suffering, traits that are also incompatible with a system based on uniformity.

Also, the son of the Director and Linda, John was born in the Savage Reservation in a way that has been avoided in the World State for too long, which is in natural ways. He is a unique case as he was born into an environment which is nothing like his parents are used to. This savage reservation is described as "a place which, owing to unfavourable climatic or geological conditions, or poverty of natural resources, has not been worth the expense of civilizing" (141). Malpais is the name of the Savage Reservation. One could contend that it is not coincidental that this region is called Malpais. According to Baker in *Brave New World: History, Science and Dystopia*, the term "dystopia" appears to be the same as "bad place" or "bad country" in Spanish (113). His parents are the products of the World State, but he was raised in an unconditioned environment. As a result of this, John fails to find a place for himself in either world. Bernard in his report mentions that the Savage

> … refuses to take soma, and seems much distressed because of the woman Linda, his m -, remains permanently on holiday. It is worthy of note that, in spite of his m -'s senility and the extreme repulsiveness of her appearance, the Savage frequently goes to see her and appears to be much attached to her– an interesting example of the way in which early conditioning can be made to modify and even run counter to natural impulses (Huxley, *Brave New World* 139).

Here, it is possible to see that John does not confine to the rules of the World State as he does not take any soma, which is one of the requirements of being a citizen. He also does not act as a Fordian citizen would normally, he is too much interested in his mother, which is something to be despised as there is no concept of mother in this world order. The incompatibility of biopolitical governance and natural humanity is ultimately revealed by John's incapacity to fit into either world. Giorgio Agamben's idea of the "bare life" is especially relevant in this context since John is excluded from both the state of nature and the state of law. Biologically alive but he is deprived of any social or legal recognition and is trapped in a transitional state where the lines separating inclusion and exclusion are difficult to distinguish. The fate of those who do not fit the biopolitical order is reflected in his eventual demise and they are not only

marginalized but also made disposable. His tragedy lies in being too human for a society that no longer allows it.

The World State in *Brave New World* establishes a complex system of control that uses the hidden processes of biopower rather than explicit force or violence. The state imposes obedience through seduction rather than repression by controlling its citizens' biological lives as well as their desires, pleasures, and sense of purpose. Human intimacy, emotional resilience, and spiritual longing are all transformed into tools of governance by means of soma, Orgy-Porgy rituals, and state-approved religious ceremonies. These control technologies do more than just pacify the populace; they reinterpret what it means to be a human in the context of the state's biopolitical structure. In a culture where even resistance is anticipated, classified, and eventually eliminated, the characters who try to resist, John, Bernard, Lenina and Helmholtz, highlight the boundaries of autonomy. As a result, *Brave New World* depicts the dystopian conclusion of a fully developed biopolitical order: a society where consciousness is programmed, bodies are controlled, and even freedom is confined and commodified. This setting makes rebellion not only pointless but almost unthinkable since power is no longer seen as requiring submission but rather as the source of enjoyment, safety, and purpose.

CHAPTER 3: KAZUO ISHIGURO AND *NEVER LET ME GO*

Kazuo Ishiguro, widely known as the winner of the Nobel Prize in Literature (2017), was born in 1954 Nagasaki, Japan. The Ishiguro family lived in a three generational household in which Kazuo had a happy life and moved to Great Britain in 1960. As Cynthia F. Wong states in the book *Kazuo Ishiguro,* he had strong relationships with his grandfather and always believed that he would one day go back to Japan and reunite with him (1). His grandfather died during the early years when he lived in Britain and not being present at this important death affected him deeply. Even though he led a happy life when he was away from his birthplace, he still had deep emotions regarding those he left behind as he stated in an interview with Maya Jaggi:

> This is the only life I've known. I had a happy childhood, and I've been very happy here. But it's to do with the strong emotional relationships I had in Japan that were suddenly severed at a formative emotional age, particularly with my grandfather (23).

The major protagonists in the books of Kazuo Ishiguro look for identical peace or compensation after experiencing a loss. They are also mainly dislocated and displaced just like the author himself. As they enter an uncertain future, they revisit the horrific events surrounding their past, whether the loss is emotional or bodily. Metaphors for search and retrieval of loss can be seen, among other novels, in *When We Were Orphans* (2000) and *Never Let Me Go* (2005) (Wong 81). In these books, the protagonists are either orphaned or left all alone in the world. Just like Christopher Banks from *When We Were Orphans,* who is briefly reunited with his mother who he was apart for more than forty years. This is similar in *Never Let Me Go* as Kathy H. meets with Tommy in a similar manner through the end of the novel. The author tries to tell the sad story of his characters because in a way he is getting the inspiration from his own life. In an interview with Sebastian Groes, he explains that by saying:

> In *Never Let Me Go* I tried to remember how I experienced that kind of hinterland period between being an adolescent and being an adult in post-student times. To some extent I'm sketching from life – but that's not the same as creating autobiographical characters (256).

It can be understood from these lines that Kazuo Ishiguro does not have any intentions to produce an autobiographical novel while writing *Never Let Me Go* but he makes use of his personal experiences so that he can write more realistically. He uses the terms such as *carer* and *human donor* to convey the terrible situation in which they are supposed to first care for each other and then become donors themselves. Wong

states in her book *Kazuo Ishiguro* that "While these terms of orphan existence bear resemblances to those used in science fiction, Ishiguro casts their story in a realistic, if unsettling context (96)". Kazuo Ishiguro himself, in his speech published by Film Independent, explained that he did not mean to write a science-fiction novel, but he made use of some devices to make the beginning of the story as strange and distant as possible. Hopefully, he states, later the readers would eventually start to recognize that it is in fact their own story. Even though the novel is categorized as science-fiction because of the use of clones in it, Ishiguro mentions that he is trying to focus on something else in the February 2005 interview with Nicholas Wroe:

> But there are things I am more interested in than the clone thing … How are they trying to find their place in the world and make sense of their lives? To what extent can they transcend their fate? As time starts to run out, what are the things that really matter? Most of the things that concern them concern us all, but with them it is concertinaed into this relatively short period of time (Wroe).

Margaret Atwood in her review of the novel "Kazuo Ishiguro's Creepy Clones" published on *Slate* supports Ishiguro's statement by saying that "All this is background. Ishiguro is not much interested in the practicalities of cloning and organ donation. (Which four organs, you may wonder? A liver, two kidneys, then the heart?" (Atwood). There are not many scientific terminology and details as in *Brave New World* and it seems that writing a novel full of science fiction elements is not the priority of Kazuo Ishiguro and he probably makes use of different techniques to make his works more appealing to those reading them. He rather focuses on the emotional, existential and ethical dimensions of the biopolitical world he depicts. In line with this interpretation, Mark Rollins in his article "Caring Is a Gift: Gift Exchange and Commodification in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*" states that the novel does not function to warn the society about the possible future ahead but focuses more on highlighting the tendencies in modern society by imagining their catastrophic development.

> In a contemporary market economy in which required withholdings from workers' salaries are termed "contributions," service workers are compelled to demonstrate their care for each customer or client, handcrafts that might once have been shared with friends and family are sold for profit on Etsy, adjunct instructors are grossly underpaid because, after all, they are following their "calling," and faculty must handle students with extreme care lest they fail to retain and lose their value, the perversion of gift exchange that Ishiguro depicts in *Never Let Me Go* becomes disconcertingly easy to recognize (355-356).

Mark Rollins makes a connection with the contemporary world we live in and the novel and through this comparison, he shows how the clones in the novel reflect the commodification of emotion, labour and identity of our own modern time. Just as the clones accepting their purpose as carers and organ donors, modern workers are also urged to love what they do. The system in which clones live is designed in a way that internalizes the logic of care and sacrifice as part of their natural roles, and this mirrors how individuals perform in modern society.

During the time the novel was written, in the early 2000s, cloning and biotechnology were amongst the popular subjects of discussion. Important turning points occurred in the late 1990s and early 2000s, most notably the cloning of Dolly the sheep, which raised concerns about genetic engineering, cloning, and the possible commodification of human life. Dolly the sheep was cloned in 1997 by Ian Wilmut and his team and there were many discussions regarding this controversial development. These scientific discoveries influenced literature, movies, and public policy debates. As stated by Gabriele Griffin in her article "Science and the cultural imaginary: the case of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*", there were disagreements regarding whether biotechnological developments such as cloning, organ harvesting, and designer babies should be avoided at the time the novel was written. Gabriele Griffin further states in her article that Ishiguro's novel reflects and critiques these contemporary scientific discourses. She argues that while the novel is set in an alternate reality, it resonates with real-world concerns about the ethical boundaries of scientific progress. She also notes that the novel "was gestated... during a period... when cloning, and biotechnological developments and debates associated with these more generally, were much in the public eye" (646). The contemporary issues such as biotechnological developments make it clear that the novel focuses on contemporary issues of the period it was written in.

There were also some movies such as *The Island* (2005) and *My Sister's Keeper* (2009) which revolve around these controversial topics, and they attempt to show what kind of a world we would be living in if these developments have become a reality and applied as a practice for healthcare. These reflections are similar to the ones that can be seen in *Never Let Me Go*, in which the stories of clones are told. Ishiguro shows a picture of a world where organs are raised for the purpose of harvesting. They are raised like spare parts which can be taken as needed and as much as possible and all

the donors in the novel try to do their best to be the best of use by donating as many times as possible. A few years before the publication of *Never Let Me Go*, the movie *The Matrix* (1999), which led to the questioning of reality, autonomy and control in a technologically advanced society, had been released. This movie similarly focuses on the constructed nature of subjectivity and the illusion of freedom under systems of biopolitical control. In *The Matrix*, humans are nothing, but slaves and their bodies are harvested by the system. While doing so, their minds are occupied through an artificial reality. Similarly, in *Never Let Me Go*, the clones are also trapped within a reality which is carefully engineered. This can be observed through institutions like Hailsham, which creates a controlled environment that promote a sense of normalization, even dignity, around their predetermined fate as organ donors.

The world had also witnessed the 9/11 attacks before the publication of the novel and despite the fact that *Never Let Me Go* is not a reflection of this global event that shaped the cultural, political and philosophical climate of the early 21st century, the atmosphere is crucial in understanding the novel's themes of surveillance, sacrifice, and the quiet normalization of systemic violence. During the following years of the attack, there has been an increase in the surveillance, security measures and preventive governance justified in the name of greater good or national safety. Similarly, the novel depicts a society in which lives are silently managed, monitored, and ultimately disposed of without overt violence or protest.

It is evident that Kazuo Ishiguro uses his own experiences and emotional recollections, which has a great influence on the world depicted in *Never Let Me Go*, even if he does not intend to write an autobiographical book. His background, which includes early loss and displacement, influences his characters' inner lives as they look for meaning, connection, and comprehension in a society that deprives them of agency. Rather than emphasizing the scientific aspects of cloning, Ishiguro centres the story around moral and emotional issues. The use of science fiction elements functions not as an end but as a tool to heighten the emotional distance and emphasizes the vulnerability of the characters. These themes have significant connections to biopower and biopolitics, which are particularly evident in the novel's examination of body regulation and the normalizing of systemic control. This chapter's next section will look at how these kinds of power appear in *Never Let Me Go* and the effects they have on the characters' humanity, freedom, and sense of identity.

The characters in *Never Let Me Go* lead a life that has been prescribed for them in advance. Mark Jerng notes in his article "Giving Form to Life: Cloning and Narrative Expectations of the Human" that most cloning narratives describe a process of increasing individuation on the part of the clones, resulting in a transformation from innocence to knowledge of their condition (378). Unlike these, most cloning narratives in which the characters become aware of their situation, Kathy, the narrator of the story, and the other characters of the novel already know about their situation. They are taught and told repeatedly about their situation despite the fact that they could not comprehend the real meaning of what it means to be a clone and donate their organs. They seem to accept their faith, and they do their best to be useful to their originals. Even though they are gradually explained the facts of their life, their teachers at Hailsham, where Kathy, Ruth and Tommy, together with others are raised, would rather protect the students from the unpleasant realities of their lives, which runs the risk of allowing their imaginations to become creative. The protection includes literature which might inspire them to hope for a better life. As Arne De Boever states in *Narrative Care: Biopolitics and the Novel* ultimately "each and every one of them must care, donate and complete" (60). In their brief lives, they need to go on living their lives and donate their organs without questioning much. In other words, the novel shows the exploitation of human clones for the sake of organ donation. The author illustrates how contemporary medical science disregards humanity and reduces human beings to the level of bare life.

The novel depicts a world in which there is an extensive use of organ donation through human cloning in the 20th century England. Kathy H. is the narrator of the story, and the story is told through her perspective and the way she sees everything around her. The story overall can be summarized as Kathy's remembrance of the times she and her friends spend together up until the moment when she herself is about to finish her career as a carer and become a donor in about eight months. Carers are clones who are assigned the duty of taking care of others while they are going through the donation process, at the hospitals specially designed for such operations, and they normally do that for no more than three years but Kathy on the other hand has been a carer for almost twelve years. The clones are supposed to donate as many times as possible and can be said to be gradually killed because of these repeated organ retrievals.

The novel gives a thorough description of the clones' thoughts, actions, and responses while they live at Hailsham, a boarding school in the English countryside. The three main characters form a close bond from a young age. They are raised alongside their peers under the supervision of a group of non-clone guardians who are in charge of their education. One of the benefactors of the school, called "Madame" by the students because they think she is either Belgian or French and because all the other guardians call her so, acts suspiciously toward them. Madame knowing the real situation of the students, the fact that they are clones to be harvested for their organs, feels scared of them "in the same way someone might be afraid of spiders" (Ishiguro 35).

This reaction from Madame reveals the fundamental biopolitical hierarchy operating within the novel's world despite the humane attitude of Hailsham. The clones remain categorized as non-human others whose bodies exist primarily as medical resources. Madame's fear can be understood taking Foucault's explanation in *Society Must Be Defended* into consideration:

> It is a way of separating out the groups that exist within a population. It is, in short, a way of establishing a biological-type caesura within a population that appears to be a biological domain. This will allow power to treat the population as a mixture of races, or to be more accurate, to treat the species, to subdivide the species it controls, into the subspecies known, precisely, as races. That is the first function of racism: to fragment, to create caesuras within the biological continuum addressed by biopower (255).

Biopower divides the human species into subpopulations with different values and rights. This biopolitical division into "real humans" and clone bodies manifests throughout the institutional structures that shape the protagonists' lives and creates a system where some bodies are designated for preservation while others are marked for harvesting.

Never Let Me Go can be analysed on how the control mechanisms, surveillance and normalization influence the human life, identity and death. Taking Foucault's concepts of biopower and biopolitics as the foundation of analysis, the novel can be explored by how the narrative reflects the managements of body. According to Foucault, biopower refers to the methods and strategies by which political authorities govern human existence, especially the way that institutions exert control over people's bodies and populations. In the novel, the mechanisms that control the clones' lives are an embodiment of some of these strategies. In Hailsham, the guardians, the

donation program, and even the educational system serve as biopower tools, normalizing the practice of raising clones for the purpose of collecting their organs.

As Piasentier mentioned in his book *On Biopolitics: An Inquiry into Nature and Language*, the idea of biopolitics, which is the relationship between "biological life and politics" (1) is widely regarded as a means to impose systemic authority over the individual. According to Piasentier, *Never Let Me Go* can be analysed by making use of the idea of Foucauldian anatomo-politics. Foucault explains in *The History of Sexuality*, anatomo-politics as the study of how power functions at the level of the individual body, with an emphasis on controlling and enhancing its physical capabilities (141). This form of governance functions by controlling and educating the body to be more productive, submissive, and helpful within larger social and economic institutions, instead of depending only on force. In addition to being viewed as a biological entity, the body is also seen as a useful part of the social machinery that is watched over, shaped, and enhanced to meet institutional objectives. This anatomo-political framework is particularly evident in the educational structures of Hailsham, where the bodies and minds of clones are carefully conditioned through a strategic balance of revelation and concealment. The lives of the students are filled with ambiguity; as one guardian Miss Lucy puts it, "you've been told and not told" (Ishiguro 79). Kathy, Tommy, Ruth, and everyone else who is similar to them only know a portion of the truth. Kathy explains that they have been told about things somehow when she says: "And it's curious, when we were older and the guardians were giving us those talks, nothing came as a complete surprise. It was like we'd heard everything somewhere before" (81). However, the clones gradually learn to feel the emotions that accompany their lives, which are predetermined by a hidden power. They are raised in a way to willingly accept what is waiting for them in the future.

The characters in *Never Let Me Go* are raised in isolated places with almost no contact with the outside world. They are conditioned to voluntarily accept their fate because they are never exposed to any alternative life. Kathy explains this when she says that "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). Their only connection to the world beyond the fences of Hailsham is through the guardians who supervise and educate them. Although Hailsham is presented as a special institution compared to other centres, its ultimate purpose still aligns with a system of

total control. As Michel Foucault states in *The History of Sexuality*, "Power would no longer be dealing simply with legal subjects over whom the ultimate dominion was death, but with living beings, and the mastery it would be able to exercise over them would have to be applied at the level of life itself" (142), ensuring that individuals internalize their subjugation. In this way, the children at Hailsham, despite being offered education, art and poetry are still governed by a biopolitical system that shapes their bodies and destinies from birth. The children at Hailsham are offered education, art and poetry, and at the same time they are governed by a biopolitical system that shapes their bodies and destinies from birth. This education they receive functions paradoxically as both enlightenment and constraint. This is because while it develops their aesthetic sensibilities and emotional capacities, it simultaneously reinforces their predetermined roles by helping them express themselves in acceptable forms that never question the fundamental injustice of their existence. The emphasis on artistic creation serves the purpose of proving the clones' humanity while providing them with just enough cultural input to feel valued within their limited world, but never enough to imagine genuine liberation.

In addition to the education the students are offered in Hailsham, there are some applications such as the Gallery, Exchanges, Sales and tokens to that they earn by producing art and later to be used in these sales to buy some items that they can make a collection of. As stated by Arne De Boever in *Narrative Care: Biopolitics and Novel* "The fact that these words are capitalized suggests that they function within the community of Hailsham as god-terms: they have been around forever, they cannot be touched" (62). It is reasonable to state that just like the religious gatherings in *Brave New World*, these concepts help the characters have some sort of interactions that would help them feel like social beings and make sense of the environment they live in as they do not have any contact with the outside world. According to Foucault, in *The History of Sexuality*, modern societies operate through "A normalizing society is the historical outcome of a technology of power centred on life" (144). The systems in Hailsham do not use repression but promote self-regulation through emotional and aesthetic investments in daily routines like artmaking. Despite its nurturing appearance, Hailsham is a subtle social control mechanism, which can be understood by Foucault's concept of biopower. It imposes a system in which pupils become

obedient subjects by internalizing values such as merit, pride, and aesthetics instead of using disciplinary force to shape their bodies.

The Gallery is simply made up of the collection of the best artwork produced by the students. These works range from paintings to poetry including pottery and other creative expressions such as sculptures "made from whatever was the craze of the day - bashed-up cans, maybe, or bottle tops stuck onto card-board" (Ishiguro 16). The Gallery is presented as a mystery throughout the story and students at Hailsham tend to attribute different meanings to it. The rumours range from Madame selling them outside the school to using them as proofs for providing three years of freedom for the clone couples if they can really prove that they are properly in love. This is mentioned as deferrals when Kathy mentions "Some Hailsham students in the past, in special circumstances, had managed to get a deferral. That this was something you could do if you were a Hailsham student. You could ask for your donations to be put back by three, even four years" (150). This is another element which makes the characters keep their hopes for their future lives and if they somehow manage to find true love that they can prove, there is a chance of a deferral.

It is also worth stating that there is no mention of Gallery by any of the guardians at Hailsham, just like the deferrals, but the students tend to think that there is one and only then it makes sense for Madame to come and collect their artwork. The Gallery had a huge impact on the everyday lives of the clones. For their art to be picked by Madame for the Gallery is a huge success for the students. They even say, "That's good enough for the Gallery" (32) whenever they want to praise the work of someone. The fact about the Gallery is revealed later in the novel. In fact, the sole purpose of the Gallery is explained by Madame near the end of the novel when she explains: "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). Madame wants to prove that the clones are just like normal human beings who have their own feelings and thoughts, and she thinks that showing the productive work of the students is the best way to do that. The Gallery is a tool of surveillance disguised as care in the context of Foucauldian biopolitics. It's a way to give the clones a feeling of worth and purpose while maintaining the larger control structure. Art is used as a tool of normalization. This is because the ones from Hailsham tend to believe that they will be given some time free that they can spend with their lovers only if they can prove that their love is

real with the help of art they produce. Also, they earn tokens in exchange for the work of art they produce, and they can use these tokens in exchanges and sales. This application is an integral part of the system of normalization at Hailsham because students feel worthy thanks to it.

The Exchanges, which take place four times a year, basically involves students using their tokens they earned because of the work they produced. These are the "kind of big exhibition-cum-sale of all the things we'd been creating in the three months since the last Exchange" (15-16). The tokens, which might be considered as a sort of currency that students use to buy things, can be earned by the work students contributed to the Exchanges. The guardians are the ones to decide how many of the artwork merits and give the tokens to those who they think deserve them so that they can use them to buy the stuff they like at these exhibitions. As Kathy H. states, the Exchanges are one of the ways "of building up a collection of personal possessions" (16). These events are a chance for the students to have something personal, different from the others that they can collect in a wooden chest with their names on to be kept under their beds. They would then be able to open these chests and display each other their collections, which makes it a big deal for the students, and they tend to "take enormous care, bringing things out to display, putting other things away carefully" (38).

Sales are another way for students to add items to their collections, which may help them acquire some things that might stand out from what all the others already have. By purchasing these items with their tokens, the students are able to exhibit their individuality and create personal collections while staying inside the confines of their surroundings. As Kathy says that all the students got excited about the Sales because "that was how we got hold of things from outside" (41). However, the items sold there are usually made up of things that are useless.

> Usually, the Sales were a big disappointment. There'd be nothing remotely special and we'd spend our tokens just renewing stuff that was wearing out or broken with more of the same. But the point was, I suppose, we'd all of us in the past found something at a Sale, something that had become special: a jacket, a watch, a pair of craft scissors never used but kept proudly next to a bed.

There are disagreements at times as to who is to own an item from these Sales which would result in a talk in the assembly the next day by Miss Emily. These assemblies are part of the routine in Hailsham as this is how the day starts there. There

are usually some announcements and maybe a poem by a student. However, “on a morning after a rowdy Sale, everything was different. She’d order us to sit down on the floor - we usually stood at assemblies - and there’d be no announcements or performances, just Miss Emily talking to us for twenty, thirty minutes, sometimes even longer” (42). She states in such meetings that they are special students and if they behave like that they are “unworthy of privilege” and how what they do is indeed a “misuse of opportunity” (43). These suggest that these talks by Miss Emily is the result of the fact that the students at Hailsham are not like the other clones elsewhere and they receive a different kind of treatment, and they should be grateful for that. Despite the fact that their fate is the same with the other clones mentioned, they are raised in a special kind of environment with privileges. As Andrea Kowalski observes in her article “How to Create Inhumanity: Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*”, everything at Hailsham is calculated to keep the clone population “within an exploitable and inhuman underclass” (19). The students are never taught to rebel; even conversations about their fate are framed as abstract lectures or myths so they remain “docile” to the institution’s authority.

Hailsham is a distant place with its own rules and applications and the clones are raised there as boarding school students. The environment they live in is governed by those who are in charge, the students are made to believe whatever they are told without questioning whether it makes much sense or not. These Exchanges, the Sales and sports are all part of techniques used to make clones obedient donors with an attempt to provide them with humane conditions in the isolated world of Hailsham. In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, Foucault states that:

> Each society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (131).

Foucault’s regime of truth explains how the world in *Never Let Me Go* functions. In the novel, those who have authority in Hailsham create their own carefully designed and controlled reality for the clone students. It is the guardians who decide what is valid and acceptable and they filter the outside information they choose to provide the students with. This information control is not merely deception but constitutes an entire system of truth where certain discussions are permitted while

others become literally unthinkable. The students' understanding of their lives is shaped by what the authorities allow them to know, creating a reality where their sacrifice appears natural and inevitable. When Miss Lucy attempts to break this regime of truth by telling students directly about their futures, she is quickly removed from Hailsham, demonstrating how the system protects its monopoly on defining reality. This control over knowledge represents biopower in its most fundamental form, which is managing populations not through direct physical force but by controlling how they perceive and understand their own existence.

The regime of truth in Hailsham is the one made and enforced with the help of the Guardians who are in charge of the students. They observe the students daily and enforce the rules. There are also the authority figures who seem to be the ones behind the founding principles of the school namely Miss Emily (the headmistress) and Madame (Marie Claude). They are revealed through the end of the novel to be the ones trying to prove that clones do have inner feelings and thoughts just like normal human beings. That's why they try to establish the environment in which the clones receive humane treatment while still getting prepared for their faith, which is to accept that they are to be organ donors in the future when their "possibles" need and do their best to donate as many times as possible. Hailsham educates students for their predestined roles in line with Foucault's concept of biopolitics, which holds that power is exerted over life itself and that populations are managed subtly. As Shameem Black states in "Ishiguro's Inhuman Aesthetics" the novel "indicts humanist art because such art works to keep the students unaware of their own inhumanity, it masks their own mechanical condition and serves to prepare them for lives of exploitation (790). By emphasizing self-care, emotional growth, and artistic accomplishment, the school normalizes students' acceptance of their circumstances and exemplifies the biopolitical management of life.

As Foucault mentions in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, disciplinary systems such as schools and hospitals function to normalize behaviour and establish standards. These mechanisms make use of surveillance, examination and well organized and planned routines to shape individuals' actions and understandings of their environments. In an attempt to influence both individual behaviour and population dynamics, biopower uses both disciplinary and regulatory tactics. Biopolitics examines the connection between political power and the truths of life. It

discusses how policymakers make choices and enact regulations that impact the population's reproduction, welfare, and general health.

It is crucial that the students remain focused on "keeping yourselves well, keeping yourselves very healthy inside, that's much more important for each of you than it is for me" (Ishiguro 68) as their only goal is to eventually donate their organs to ordinary people who need them. There is a sports pavilion where the students can exercise, which might help keep them healthy. In such a context, where the guardians help students do everything that they can to stay healthy, smoking is harshly forbidden for the students as it might damage their health and the organs they are raised to donate. Rather than smoking, any idea or image that shows someone smoking makes the guardians all uncomfortable.

> I don't know how it was where you were, but at Hailsham the guardians were really strict about smoking. I'm sure they'd have preferred it if we never found out smoking even existed; but since this wasn't possible, they made sure to give us some sort of lecture each time any reference to cigarettes came along.

If by any chance, the students are exposed to a visual of someone holding a cigarette in his/her hands, the guardians start talking about the negative effects of it for a while and how bad the behaviour of that person is. The cassette Kathy finds at one of the sales, Songs After Dark by Judy Bridgewater, displays the singer holding a cigarette in her hand. That is the reason why Kathy prefers to keep the tape as a secret because she believes that should it be discovered by any of the guardians, they will get mad at her and take it from her. As there were no Walkman she could use to listen to the tape, she had to find a secure place to play it whenever she gets the chance. In one of those days when she got the opportunity to listen to her favourite song "Never Let Me Go", Madame discovers she is listening to that song and dancing all alone in the dormitories and watches her through the door crying. When Kathy suspects that there is someone watching her, she looks at the door and sees Madame crying and looking at her. Kathy asks why she was crying that day and Madame responds:

> When I watched you dancing that day, I saw something else. I saw a new world coming rapidly. More scientific, efficient, yes. More cures for the old sicknesses. Very good. But a harsh, cruel world. And I saw a little girl, her eyes tightly closed, holding to her breast the old kind world, one that she knew in her heart could not remain, and she was holding it and pleading, never to let her go.

Madame here explains how uncomfortable she feels about the scientific advancements of cloning and organ donation. She believes that the world would be a

better place for illnesses, but it would be a cruel one as organ harvesting is what is required to make the better world a reality. This might be the reason why she has become one of the founders of Hailsham, a school in which clones are raised to be normal until at least the time their donations start. The Gallery and her efforts are to put an end to this cruel system of organ donation of clones who are not that different from human beings. Miss Emily explains that Madame, Marie-Claude has always been on their side, did her best to be able to help them.

> Marie-Claude has given everything for you. She has worked and worked and worked. Make no mistake about it, my child, Marie-Claude is on your side and will always be on your side. Is she afraid of you? We're all afraid of you. I myself had to fight back my dread of you all almost every day I was at Hailsham (263-264).

This is simply the justification of their actions at Hailsham. It is indeed reasonable once the rationale behind their actions and the way they behaved the students. In such a world, clones would really be helpful to overcome some serious illnesses but the cost of such a convenience is not something to be taken slightly. *Never Let Me Go* explains one possible outcome of how things would turn out if there were clones to be harvested for their organs. Marie-Claude and Miss Emily are the ones who support the idea that clones deserve a better life:

> We demonstrated to the world that if students were reared in humane, cultivated environments, it was possible for them to grow to be as sensitive and intelligent as any ordinary human being. Before that, all clones — or students, as we preferred to call you — existed only to supply medical science. In the early days, after the war, that's largely all you were to most people. Shadowy objects in test tubes (256).

Their attempts succeeded for a while until the Morningdale Scandal, revealed near the end of *Never Let Me Go*, marks a significant biopolitical turning point in the narrative. According to Miss Emily, the scandal involved a scientist who wanted "to offer people the possibility of having children with enhanced characteristics. Superior intelligence, superior athleticism, that sort of thing" (258). The Morningdale case exposes broader societal concerns about the limits of biopolitical control, because it is seen as an abuse of scientific intervention. As Foucault explains in *The Birth of Biopolitics*, contemporary forms of governance function by regulating life itself instead of merely depending on legal authority. This includes managing bodies, health, reproduction, and the optimization of life processes within a population.

The public's reaction to Morningdale reveals the paradoxical limits of this biopolitical regime. When Miss Emily explains that Morningdale attempted to create children with enhanced abilities, she identifies the moment when biopolitical control became too visible to the public. The clone program already embodied Foucault's concept of biopower through its systematic regulation of certain bodies, the clones, to optimize the biological existence of others, the normal humans. However, Morningdale's experiments threatened to disrupt the carefully maintained boundary between acceptable and unacceptable forms of biological intervention. Therefore, even while society accepts the covert use of clones as "organ donors," the Morningdale affair, with its associations with eugenic enhancement and perfection, goes beyond what is morally acceptable. Projects like Hailsham are eventually abandoned in favour of maintaining bare life in its proper position due to this eugenic goal and the possibility that superhumans would surpass humanity. As Arne De Boever states in *Narrative Care: Biopolitics and the Novel*, "it is ultimately human sovereignty that is defending itself through these movements, and that is producing bare life to keep itself intact" (72). People become fearful that there might be clones that are genetically modified, just like the ones in *Brave New World*, which would jeopardize their own lives. But now that there is a cure for serious illnesses such as cancer, there is no going back from this and the ideology put forward by people like Madame and Miss Emily does not seem reasonable to many people as they do not want to be aware of the situation of the clones where the organs they need come from, the only option left is to raise such clones in the shadows.

> Yes, there were arguments. But by the time people became concerned about… about students, by the time they came to consider just how you were reared, whether you should have been brought into existence at all, well by then it was too late. There was no way to reverse the process. 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? (Ishiguro 257).

Even those who were thinking about the clones' situation and the treatment they receive prefer to think about it from a different perspective. They tend to convince themselves into thinking that the lives of their beloved ones matter more than the clones', who are not real humans. Their concern is "their own children, their spouses, their parents, their friends, did not die from cancer, motor neurone disease, heart disease" (258). Because of such developments, the support centres such as Hailsham and the Saunders Trust get has declined a great deal resulting in the failure of the

movement. In her article "Shadowy Objects in Test Tubes" Dona George mentions that "Through the novel, Ishiguro tries to re-create the consequences of unregulated experimentation by portraying an alternate world where children are bred on farms to produce healthy vital organs for the privileged human category. Thus, clones are regarded as machine-made products or factory products that are called shadowy objects in test tubes" (110). It is clear that the Morningdale incident serves as a confirmation of the state's authority to control life, so long as it stays beyond the sphere of public moral discomfort, rather than a rejection of cloning. It illustrates a fundamental aspect of Foucauldian biopolitics which states that the state's power is not limited to allowing life or causing death, but to organizing life according to political utility, while obscuring the ethical implications of such control.

The song "Never Let Me Go" is important for Kathy not only because she found it at Sales, and she is the only one who has hold of such an item. The picture of the singer on the cover of the album is indeed one of the reasons why she likes it but also the specific number three track titled "Never Let Me Go" makes her come up with a completely different version of what is stated and can be inferred from the lyrics. She tends to comprehend the lyrics in a different way other than what is meant by it. The singer in the song is actually addressing to her lover when she says baby, but Kathy thinks that she is talking about her baby which she is about to lose.

> Well the thing was, I didn't use to listen properly to the words; I just waited for that bit that went: 'Baby, baby, never let me go…' And what I imagined was a woman who's been told she couldn't have babies, who 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 is so happy, but also because she is so afraid something will happen, that the baby will get ill or be taken away from her. Even at the time, I realized this couldn't be right, that this interpretation didn't fit with the rest of the lyrics. But that was not an issue for me (Ishiguro 70).

It is revealed in the coming pages of the novel that just like all the clones, Kathy is not capable of having babies. As she was listening to the song, she was aware of this fact. She recalls by saying "of course, we all knew something I hadn't known back then, which was that none of us could have babies. It's just possible I'd somehow picked up the idea when I was younger without fully registering it, and that's why I heard what I did when I listened to that song" (72). As Michael Mack states in his book *How Literature Changes the Way We Think* "the significance of the song for her is that of a delusion that keeps her going. She thinks the song represents the miracle of birth

for someone who, similar to her, has been excluded from procreation. Miracles do not happen, at least not in *Never Let Me Go"* (50). This is in line with the idea that they are both told and not told about the reality behind their existence. The guardians during the lectures make it clear that there is no way for the students in the future to have babies.

Just like the women in *Brave New World*, clones cannot have babies. However, the reason behind is not quite similar to each other. In Aldous Huxley's novel, reproduction is industrialized as all babies are produced in tubes, with predetermined castes, conditioning, and engineered immunity to certain illnesses. In contrast, the sterility of Ishiguro's clones serves their designated purpose as organ donors. Despite not being specifically given as the reason for not being able to give birth, it seems logical to assume that the clones will prematurely die after a few organ donations and the child of such a clone has no place in society as he will be of no use for anyone.

While *Brave New World* employs sexuality as a tool for social cohesion and control as everyone belongs to everyone else, *Never Let Me Go* presents sexuality as a regulated space for emotional experimentation. Kathy explains that they have been taught to "respect our physical needs', how sex was 'a very beautiful gift' as long as both people really wanted it" (Ishiguro 93). Despite these differences, both novels demonstrate how biopower operates by severing reproduction from emotional intimacy and bodily autonomy. They are reminded not to do it randomly during the lectures in which they learned about sex.

> Miss Emily used to give a lot of the sex lectures herself, and I remember once, she brought in a life- size skeleton from the biology class to demonstrate how it was done…she turned away and began telling us how we had to be careful who we had sex with. Not just because of the diseases, but because, she said, 'sex affects emotions in ways you'd never expect'. We had to be extremely careful about having sex in the outside world, especially with people who weren't students, because out there sex meant all sorts of things. Out there people were even fighting and killing each other over who had sex with whom (82).

It is clear that the society depicted in *Never Let Me Go* does not accept having an affair like the ones in *Brave New World*. It might have different meanings and students are suggested to be careful about it. People outside Hailsham can have babies as a result of sex unlike the clones so it is highly important for them to understand what it means, rather than what it means to them.

Another fact they are told is that clones cannot choose to do whatever they want as a profession in their future lives. There are some students who aim to become or think about becoming film starts or supermarket workers (80). Miss Lucy is one of the guardians who is not happy about the fact that the students are raised in a way that they accept their faith without questioning much. She thinks that the students are actually told about some of the facts when they are much younger, at a time when it is not possible for them to comprehend the real meaning of what they are told.

> Your lives are set out for you. You'll become adults, then before you're old, before you're even middle-aged, you'll start to donate your vital organs. That's what each of you was created to do. You're not like the actors you watch on your videos, you're not even like me. You were brought into this world for a purpose, and your futures, all of them, have been decided. So you're not to talk that way any more. You'll be leaving Hailsham before long, and it's not so far off, the day you'll be preparing for your first donations. 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 (80).

Miss Lucy is a guardian who does not feel comfortable with the situation of the clones. She tries to make students aware of their situation. She eventually resigns because she cannot stand the way students are behaved in Hailsham. Miss Lucy's departure signifies the internal breakdown of the disciplinary regime at Hailsham. Her refusal to conform reflects Foucault's notion in *The History of Sexuality* that resistance is inherent to power relations: "Where there is power, there is resistance" (95). Miss Lucy is one of those who tries to resist the system but, in the end, quits the environment altogether as she sees that her attempts are not acceptable and fail eventually. Miss Lucy's failure to disrupt the biopolitical framework reflects how thoroughly normalized and institutionalized the system has become, so much so that even well-intentioned resistance becomes unsustainable.

Hailsham is a discipline-machine, a panopticon, according to Foucauldian theory, where clones are observed, manipulated, and trained to behave normally through the use of hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination. The clones essentially turn into docile organs working for the biomedical state which results in the docile body. Foucault defines these as bodies made more efficient and able to be subjected, used, transformed, and improved. The woods near Hailsham serve as a tool of internalized discipline. The students never attempt to go out of Hailsham and pass the woods and escape. This sort of discipline is achieved mainly through the myths created either by the students themselves or the guardians as "The guardians

always insisted these stories were non-sense. 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" (Ishiguro 50). The woods are feared by the students at Hailsham, and stories about them are filled with horror and taboo.

> There were all kinds of horrible stories about the woods. Once, not so long before we all got to Hailsham, a boy had had a big row with his friends and run off beyond the Hailsham boundaries. His body had been found two days later, up in those woods, tied to a tree with the hands and feet chopped off. Another rumour had it that a girl's ghost wandered through those trees. She'd been a Hailsham student until one day she'd climbed over a fence just to see what it was like outside. This was a long time before us, when the guardians were much stricter, cruel even, and when she tried to get back in, she wasn't allowed. She kept hanging around outside the fences, pleading to be let back in, but no one let her (50).

It is these kinds of stories mainly that keep the students away from the woods or even think about going there for any reason at all. This can be considered to be the success of biopolitical governance as the students have been so thoroughly normalized that the idea of escape doesn't even arise. They have somehow internalized the fact that it is not safe to go outside alone and escape from Hailsham.

The Cottages is the place where the students Kathy, Ruth and Tommy go after they leave Hailsham, which is through their adulthood around the time when they are in mid to late teens, usually when they are around sixteen. There are some other places like Cottages but in the end, Hailsham is no longer a house to those after a certain age because it is a kind of graduation for the students.

> Eight of us who left Hailsham that summer ended up at the Cottages. Others went to the White Mansion in the Welsh hills, or to Poplar Farm in Dorset. We didn't know then that all these places had only the most tenuous links with Hailsham. We arrived at the Cottages expecting a version of Hailsham for older students, and I suppose that was the way we continued to see them for some time. We certainly didn't think much about our lives beyond the Cottages, or about who ran them, or how they fitted into the larger world. None of us thought like that in those days (114).

As Dona George explains in her article "Shadowy Objects in Test Tubes", cottages is a place "where they enjoy relatively greater freedom in the absence of guardians. Yet the systematic internalization of the panopticon resulted in what Foucault called the disciplinary individual" (112). The system of places like Cottages is quite biopolitical. There is a sense of freedom, but it is just an illusion. Clones live in places that remain isolated from mainstream society despite being located outside

Hailsham's boundaries. "Cottages were the remains of a farm that had gone out of business years before. There was an old farmhouse, and around it, barns, outhouses, stables all converted for us to live in" (Ishiguro 114). They can socialize with those living there, who are also clones and they tend to learn behaviour from each other, especially from the veterans who had more time outside. As Kathy tells Ruth, who has picked up a way of slapping Tommy on the arm, a habit she has learned from her friends who themselves have acquired it from a television comedy: "It's not what people really do out there in normal life . . . I'm just talking about Chrissie and Rodney. It looks daft, the way you copy everything they do" (122). Students such as Chrissie and Rodney probably learned such behaviour from television, which was restricted heavily in Hailsham, because they have the freedom to watch it at the cottages.

In the Cottages, the Hailsham students at first find it difficult to find a purpose for living and the essay assignment given by the guardians back in Hailsham helps them find the meaning they are looking for in their lives. Even the guardians think that it is a kind of assignment that none of the students will do as they will probably never see each other again.

> Once we got to the Cottages, though, the essays took on a new importance. In our first days there, and for some of us a lot longer, it was like we were each clinging to our essay, this last task from Hailsham, like it was a farewell gift from the guardians. Over time, they would fade from our minds, but for a while those essays helped keep us afloat in our new surroundings (113).

Despite the fact that they are not really supposed to finish their essays because they will probably never see their guardians who assigned them with the task, they feel they need to and they think it is something they can hold onto while getting used to living in the Cottages. After a while, Kathy finds another purpose for her life, which is to become a carer herself.

> …more and more students were going off to be carers, and among our old Hailsham crowd, there was a growing feeling this was the natural course to follow. We still had our essays to finish, but it was well known we didn't really have to finish them if we chose to start our training. In our early days at the Cottages, the idea of not finishing our essays would have been unthinkable. But the more distant Hailsham grew, the less important the essays seemed. I had this idea at the time — and I was probably right — that if our sense of the essays being important was allowed to seep away, then so too would whatever bound us together as Hailsham students (194).

As Hailsham students, there is a tendency among them to become carers and Kathy, feels alone as Ruth is having an affair with Tommy with whom she is in love with. However, she never talked about her feelings, and she decides that it is a good

idea for her to apply. “It wasn’t long after that I made my decision, and once I’d made it, I never wavered. I just got up one morning and told Keffers I wanted to start my training to become a carer. It was surprisingly easy” (199). As a carer, Kathy goes to different hospitals to be there for the clones who go through their donations.

> You spend hour after hour, on your own, driving across the country, centre to centre, hospital to hospital, sleeping in overnights, no one to talk to about your worries, no one to have a laugh with. Just now and again you run into a student you know a carer or donor you recognise from the old days — but there’s never much time. You’re always in a rush, or else you’re too exhausted to have a proper conversation (203).

Although there are difficulties of being a carer and many others fail at being a good one, Kathy finds “it’s brought the best out of” (203) her. She becomes such a successful one that they even let her choose the ones she would like to be a carer for. “I’ll have done twelve years of this, and it’s only for the last six they’ve let me choose” (4). She seems to accept the circumstances of being a clone and even contributes to the system of organ harvesting, which will be the eventual end of herself as well, by becoming an important part of it. Kathy also takes delight in providing excellent care and in keeping their fellow clones relaxed and content. “My donors have always tended to do much better than expected. Their recovery times have been impressive, and hardly any of them have been classified as ‘agitated’, even before fourth donation” (3).

The facilities that take the clones’ organs from their bodies treat them with care and the facilities have recovery rooms and a caregiver for each donor. All of this is done to partly to raise their standard of living. No matter how well they are treated or whether they have a good carer or not, the result for all the donors is the same. “The donors will all donate, just the same, and then they’ll complete” (276).

At the end of the novel, after Tommy’s death following his fourth donation, Kathy accepts her fate to begin donating, which signifies the success of the system despite the characters’ brief attempts at resistance through the hope for a “deferral”. It is clear that there is no escape from the fate which requires the clones to donate their organs. The novel ends without offering any possibility of systemic change or rescue. Instead, medical advancements require the bodies of clones to become sacrificial in the name of progress. The ending demonstrates Foucault’s concept of biopower at its most successful, when control over life and death becomes so naturalized that the subjects themselves cannot imagine an alternative existence, and their compliance appears as a form of dignity rather than defeat.

As for the ethical dimension of the novel, Bruce Jennings makes the following comment in the article "Biopower and the Liberationist Romance":

> Ishiguro gives us a World that his moral gaze does not so much condemn as reveal to be deeply wounded and impaired. Concepts like student, guardian, giving, caring, service, possibility, completion, holding on, and letting go are all turned inside out, rendered corrupt by euphemism and double entendre. The recipients of body parts from the stockroom of the donor caste in this society gain enhanced health at the price of emaciated meaning. They may live longer thanks to their biopower, but they will not humanly prosper (19).

Jennings moves beyond the ethical questions around cloning to show that *Never Let Me Go* also challenges how we use and understand language. The point about "emaciated meaning" is especially relevant when the novel's use of euphemisms like calling death "completion" and referring to those who assist donors as "carers" are considered. These softened terms hide the harsh reality of exploitation. This manipulation of language is one of the most powerful tools of the biopolitical system in the novel. It turns suffering into care and loss into duty. As Jennings suggests, the control in Ishiguro's world doesn't stop at the body as it also shapes how the characters think and speak about their lives, making it nearly impossible for them to question or resist the system they are part of.

In conclusion, *Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro offers a terrifying depiction of biopolitical control that is both subtle and clever, closely resembling Michel Foucault's ideas about biopower and biopolitics. The story reveals how contemporary cultures can exercise power not only through violence or repression but also by the control, normalization, and monitoring of life itself through the controlled lives of the clones, Kathy, Tommy, Ruth, and others. The characters are carefully created, conditioned, and trained to accept their duties as organ donors without any resistance. Under the appearance of care, education, and emotional control, this normalization of oppression shows how biopower functions through internalized ideas as well as institutional structures like Hailsham.

Thus, the novel questions the ethical and moral impact of a culture that defends human exploitation in the name of social order, progress, and health. The clones' clearly submissive obedience illustrates the efficacy of biopolitical techniques that turn people into self-governing entities where freedom is reduced to a carefully managed delusion. Ishiguro does, however, also point to moments of resistance, emotional bonds, introspection, and a search for purpose, which go against the totalizing logic of

biopolitical dominance beneath this submission. *Never Let Me Go* challenges the fundamental tenets of humanity and autonomy by incorporating themes of identity, memory, and mortality into a story that is influenced by bio-governance. It forces readers to consider the morality of altering life and the repercussions of treating people like biological machines. By removing human life's autonomy and dignity in favour of institutional efficiency and control, the story effectively depicts the dystopian potential of biopower.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley and *Never Let Me Go* by Kazuo Ishiguro through the lens of Foucauldian theories of biopower and biopolitics provides insight into the way literature reflects and critiques the mechanisms of control in modern societies. The significance of this study can be observed through its examination of the dystopian fiction not only in terms of its depiction of possible future worlds but also the way it mirrors the real-life practices of subject formation, bodily regulation, and political authority. The time period for both novels witnessed significant changes not only in political governance and scientific innovation, but also in ethical debates regarding human life. In order to contribute to a deeper understanding of the operations of power, the strategies that are applied to govern life itself through surveillance, normalization, reproductive control, and the management of health and death are taken into consideration.

During the early 20th century, the time period *Brave New World* was written is called the interwar period. The World War I was over but the unrest and the possibility for another one continued. This period also addresses issues such as mass production, the standardization of human behaviour and the loss of individuality. Amongst some of the other developments in the 20th century were rapid technological advancements, the rise of totalitarian regimes, and the emergence of mass surveillance and population control. These developments raised concerns about the role of the state in managing individuals' lives, not only through laws and discipline but also by shaping their biology and social roles. On the other hand, *Never Let Me Go* was written at a time when biotechnology, cloning, organ transplantation and genetic engineering have become central issues. In the context of these works, it is possible to see the anticipations and reflections of the fears and the moral dilemmas that were in question at the time they were written in.

In the fictional worlds depicted in both novels, the characters are obedient to the rules and regulations of the system. The novels display societies in which biopower governs through normalization, surveillance, and institutional control. In *Brave New World*, the strategies aiming at regulating the lives of the citizens are mostly scientific. The individuals are not born naturally as they are artificially created in hatcheries, where biological engineering ensures that each person is physically and intellectually

suited to a specific caste. Every single member of each caste, from Alpha Pluses to Proletarian Epsilons, is biologically designed to fit well into their castes and fulfil their roles in the society. With this intervention they are exposed to while being engineered in the centres, their capacities are predetermined. After their birth, biopolitical strategies continue to shape the individuals' lives. The use of hypnopaedia guarantees that the ideological foundations of the Fordian state are internalized without resistance. In addition to these, through repeated mottos of the state such as "Ending is better than mending" and "Everyone belongs to everyone else", individuals are conditioned to accept their social function as natural and unchangeable. The goal is to create people who not only obey the system but also desire what the system has to offer for them, eliminating the potential for critical thought or rebellion. In this context, whenever any threat to the teachings of the state might arise, there is always soma to help them get on track.

The elimination traditional social institutions such as marriage, childbirth, and monogamy, coupled with the promotion of consumption, casual sex, and polygamy, serves as a powerful tool of state control in *Brave New World*. They live their lives as expected of them and play their roles in the society. There are no emotional attachments as they are even taught that death is not something to be feared as they will continue to be useful to the society when they are eventually cremated. Thanks to these biopolitical strategies, the World State ensures that its citizens remain emotionally detached, easily governable, and entirely devoted to the collective order.

Unlike the world depicted in *Brave New World*, the one in *Never Let Me Go* portrays a dystopian world where biopolitical control operates not through violence or totalitarian enforcement, but through subtle mechanisms of normalization and emotional manipulation. The clones are introduced with their destinies to become donors at an early age, which is similar to the use of hypnopaedia. They are not taught in their sleep but rather at a time when they fail to grasp the meaning of being an organ donor. They are conditioned at every possibility about this fact but never informed in detail. This helps them internalize their fates and consider what they are supposed to do when their time comes as a noble action and try to do their bests to be of best use for their originals. The boarding school called Hailsham is the isolated place where guardians encourage creativity, politeness, and health consciousness, not to free the students, but to turn them into docile bodies.

Aldous Huxley provides a detailed and systematic account of the creation of individuals outlining each stage of their development from fertilization in hatcheries to caste-based conditioning. This technical explanation reinforces the novel's emphasis on scientific control and state-engineered conformity. Ishiguro on the other hand introduces the clones without any specific information as to how the cloning actually works. The narrative focuses instead on the experiences of the clones, leaving science behind their creation ambiguous.

The environments depicted in both novels are under strict biopolitical control and isolated from the outside world. In *Brave New World*, there are savages living outside the boundaries of the World State, the place called Savage Reservation, which consists of unregulated human life. Their lifestyle is unbearable to those from the World State, and they tend to make use of soma whenever they visit that place. On the other hand, in *Never Let Me Go*, there are also isolated places designed specifically for clones such as Hailsham, The Cottages and Recovery Centres and Donation Centres. Within these limited spaces, clones lead obedient, structured lives, shaped by the institutions that define their existence and limit their agency.

According to Foucault, individual freedom in dystopian societies is largely illusional. Modern societies make use of power in a way that the desires and bodies of individuals are shaped so that they internalize control and accept it as normal. In *Brave New World*, the individuals love their subjugation and are "under the illusion that they are substantial, autonomous unities" (Prado 36). The director points out that "all conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny" (Huxley *Brave New World* 12). The citizens of the World State think they choose pleasure, but they fail to grasp that they do so because of their biopolitical engineering. In that case, a citizen in World State is similar to the prisoner in a panopticon who is under constant surveillance and, as Foucault explains in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* "He is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication" (226). Even though they do not live in an actual prison, the citizens internalize surveillance, the idea of being watched at all times, through conditioning and pleasure. Therefore, they tend to obey the rules and regulations of the system they are exposed to.

Similarly, in *Never Let Me Go*, there is no physical imprisonment for the clones, but they never attempt to escape. Their freedom is limited not by force but through the conditioning they are exposed to throughout their lives. Hailsham might seem to be operating as an institution promoting art, health and civility but its real purpose is to create docile bodies that are prepared for their ultimate goal of organ donation. The clones are made to believe that their inevitable role is to become organ donors, and they assume it is noble. This logic of sacrifice is maintained through their emotional lives, their understanding of love and care and, they never have the chance to see otherwise. The world outside is scary and unknown for them as they have very limited amount of information about it. Despite not being in a prison, the constant presence of the guardians in Hailsham, social norms they are exposed to and the myths about the woods and the deferrals help the clones internalize their destinies just like they are living in a panopticon.

The chosen novels are of two different historical contexts, but they share a common concern about how dystopian societies might regulate life itself through biopolitical means. One of the aims of the thesis was to analyse how the mechanisms and representations of biopower evolve over time by comparing classic early 20th century and 21st century dystopias which have a critical approach regarding the advancements in biotechnology. While *Brave New World* focuses on the anxieties about mass production, totalitarian control and industrial developments during the interwar period, *Never Let Me Go* addresses debates about cloning, biotechnology, and the ethics of scientific progress after the cloning of Dolly the sheep and the rise of health systems. Even though there is a considerable time gap between the novels, they both depict highly regulated and controlled societies in which individuals are reduced to docile bodies and taught to internalize their subjugation.

Brave New World was published in 1932, at a time when Foucault had not coined the words yet. However, the tools of biopolitical control were quite visible in real world practices. These tools include eugenics, population control and state-controlled programs which aim at producing the ideal citizens. It is possible to say that Huxley could foresee these developments and depicted a world where reproduction, health, death and even desire are controlled strictly in order to maintain stability. On the other hand, these tools regulating citizens are more difficult to be observed in *Never Let Me Go*. That is because biopolitics in the novel are subtle, hidden and emotional.

Instead of force, there is emotional manipulation and education together with the promotion of creativity, which serves as a tool for normalization. In this kind of society, the people have internalized the norms, and they regulate themselves because they do not know otherwise. They have never come across a life different from the one they have been introduced with. The only world they know is the one they have been taught about in Hailsham and beyond its boundaries, it is a mystery. By analysing the two novels which are written in different contexts, one of my aims was to demonstrate how biopolitical regimes adapt to the ideological and technological conditions of their time. Despite their many differences, they have one thing in common which is to govern life of individuals and populations by transforming them into manageable biological resources.

It is clear to see that *Brave New World* is a satire for a consumerist religion. The citizens in the World State are conditioned to replace their old clothes instead of mending them which enforces endless consumption as a duty of the citizens. They promote this idea and remind each other about the fact that once their clothes need mending, they need to get rid of them. In addition, many of the citizens, those belonging to upper castes, use helicopters for transportation, which is not a cheap way to do so, and they need to buy lots of equipment to play games as the director explains while giving the tour to the students.

> Imagine the folly of allowing people to play elaborate games which do nothing whatever to increase consumption. It's madness. Nowadays the Controllers won't approve of any new game unless it can be shown that it requires at least as much apparatus as the most complicated of existing games (Huxley *Brave New World* 25-26).

The society is an embodiment of industrial capitalism's ideals which are the glorification of production, consumption, and social stability over individual freedom or equity. On the other hand, in *Never Let Me Go*, the bodies of clones are themselves commodities whose value lies in their organs. Clones eventually become complete, just like any product when finished is tossed into trash. They are abandoned just like garbage after they have been used. The understanding of donations for young clones are described as when their time came "you'd be able just to unzip a bit of yourself, a kidney or something would slide out, and you'd hand it over. Their bodies in the novel are likened to bags which can be opened easily, which is the understanding of donations for the students at a young age.

All in all, *Brave New World* and *Never Let Me Go* explore how modern societies might aim to regulate life through biopolitical strategies. Even though they were written in different centuries, both novels offer possible visions of what happens when individuals are managed under biopolitical strategies to serve the needs of a collective system. They are not only dystopian warnings but also reflections of real-world anxieties about technological progress, medical ethics, and the limits of individual autonomy. Through this comparative analysis, it is evident that both novels can criticize and illuminate the evolving relationship between power and life, offering critical insight into how societies might justify control in the name of progress, stability, or care.

WORKS CITED

Agamben, Giorgio. *Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press, 1998.

Atwood, Margaret. "Kazuo Ishiguro's Creepy Clones." *Slate Magazine*, Slate 1 Apr. 2005, https://slate.com/culture/2005/04/kazuo-ishiguro-s-creepyclones.html. Accessed 15 Apr. 2025.

---. *The Handmaid's Tale*. Emblem, 2017.

Babaee, Ruzbeh, Wan Roselezam Wan Yahya, and Shivani Sivagurunathan. "Manifestation of Biopower in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World.*" *Advances in Natural and Applied Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 5, 2013, pp. 489–497

Baker, Robert S. *Brave New World: History, Science, and Dystopia*. Twayne Publishers, 1990.

Black, Shameem. "Ishiguro's Inhuman Aesthetics." *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 55, no. 4, Dec. 2009, pp. 785–807, https://doi.org/10.1353/mfs.0.1637.

Bloom, Harold, and Aldous Huxley. *Brave New World: (New Edition)*, Infobase Learning, 2010. ProQuest Ebook Central, https://www.proquest.com/legacydocview/EBC/669618?accountid=15393.

Bradshaw, David. Hidden Huxley: *Contempt and Compassion for the Masses*. Faber & Faber, 1995.

Booker, M. Keith. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Greenwood Press, 2019.

Bunnin, Nicholas, and Jiyuan Yu, editors. The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy. Blackwell, 2004.

Cayuela, Salvador. 'Governing Goods, Bodies and Minds: The Biopolitics of Spain during the Francoism (1939-1959)'. Foucault Studies, June 2019, pp. 21–41. DOI.org (Crossref), https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i26.5748.

Cuddon, J. A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Wiley-Blackwell, A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication, 2013.

De Boever, Arne. *Narrative Care: Biopolitics and the Novel*. Bloomsbury, 2014.

Deese, R. S. *We Are Amphibians: Julian and Aldous Huxley on the Future of Our Species*. University of California Press, 2015.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *Surveillance, Crime and Social Control October*, vol. 59, 1992, pp. 3–7. JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/778828. Accessed 19 May 2025.

Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2. ed., [Nachdr.], Univ. of Chicago Press, 20.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Second Vintage Books edition, Vintage Books, a division of Random House, Inc, 1995.

---. *Power / Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* 1972 - 1977. Edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books, 1981.

---. "The Birth of Social Medicine." *Essential Works of Foucault*, Penguin Books, New York, 2002, pp. 134–156.

---. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2012.

---, et al. *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

---, François Ewald, et al. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France*, 1975-76. Nachdr., Penguin, 2008.

---, and Gerald Moore. "The Meshes of Power." *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Hampshire, 2007, pp. 153–162.

---, Bernard E. Harcourt, et al. *Wrong-Doing, Truth-Telling: The Function of Avowal in Justice*. University of Chicago Press, 2014.

---, and Jeremy R. Carrette. *Religion and Culture*. Routledge, 1999.

"Freemartin." Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/freemartin. Accessed 9 Mar. 2025.

George, Dona. "'Shadowy Objects in Test Tubes: A biopolitical critique of Kazuo Ishiguro's never let me go." *Technoetic Arts*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1 Aug. 2023, pp. 107–115, https://doi.org/10.1386/tear_00101_1.

Griffin, Gabriele. "Science and the Cultural Imaginary: The Case of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* ." *Textual Practice*, vol. 23, no. 4, Aug. 2009, pp. 645–663, https://doi.org/10.1080/09502360903000570.

Groes, Sebastian. "The new seriousness: Kazuo Ishiguro in conversation with." *Kazuo Ishiguro*, 2011, pp. 247–264, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-34526-3_20.

Hacking, Ian. "Biopower and the Avalanche of Printed Numbers." *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, pp. 183–199.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Harvard Univ. Press, 2001.

Holzer, Angela C. "Science, sexuality, and the novels of Huxley and houellebecq." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1 June 2003, https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1189.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. Vintage, 2010.

---. *Brave New World Revisited*. RosettaBooks, 2010.

---. *Crome Yellow*. Barnes & Noble Books, 2004.

Jaggi, Maya. "Interview: Kazuo Ishiguro Talks to Maya Jaggi." *Wasafiri*, vol. 11, no. 22, Sept. 1995, pp. 20–24, https://doi.org/10.1080/02690059508589446.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*. Faber and Faber, 2021.

---. *When We Were Orphans*. Faber and Faber, 2021.

Jennings, Bruce. "Biopower and the liberationist romance." *Hastings Center Report*, vol. 40, no. 4, 2010, pp. 16–20, https://doi.org/10.1353/hcr.0.0284.

Jerng, Mark. "Giving form to life: Cloning and narrative expectations of the human." *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas*, vol. 6, no. 2, June 2008, pp. 369–393, https://doi.org/10.1353/pan.0.0014.

"Kazuo Ishiguro Discusses His Intention behind Writing the Novel, Never Let Me Go." YouTube, Film Independent,

www.youtube.com/watch?v=_jCB59pPG7k. (1:20-1:30) Accessed 10 Apr. 2025.

Kevles, Daniel J. *In the Name of Eugenics*. University of California Press, 1985.

Kowalski, Andrea. “How to Create Inhumanity: Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*.” *Verso: An Undergraduate Journal of Literary Criticism*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2013, pp. 16–24. Dalhousie University, https://ojs.library.dal.ca/verso/article/view/4473.

Lemke, Thomas. *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction*. New York University Press, 2011.

Mack, Michael. *How Literature Changes the Way We Think*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Martin, Rux, et al. “Truth, Power, Self: An Interview with Michel Foucault.” *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, edited by Luther H. Martin, University of Massachusetts Press, 1988, pp. 9–15.

Mendieta, Eduardo. “Biopolitics.” *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, 21 Apr. 2014, pp. 37–43, https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139022309.009.

Murray, Nicholas. *Aldous Huxley: A Biography*. St. Martin’s Press, 2013.

My Sister’s Keeper. Directed by Nick Cassavetes, performances by Abigail Breslin, Cameron Diaz, and Sofia Vassilieva, New Line Cinema, 2009.

Negri, Antonio, and Diana Garvin. “At the Origins of Biopolitics.” *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, pp. 152–170.

Piasentier, Marco. *On Biopolitics: An Inquiry into Nature and Language*. Routledge, 2022.

Prado, C. G. *Starting with Foucault: An Introduction to Genealogy*. Routledge, 2019.

Rabinow, Paul, editor. *The Foucault Reader, by Michel Foucault*, Vintage Books; Random House, 2010.

Rabinow, Paul, and Nikolas Rose. “Biopower today.” *BioSocieties*, vol. 1, no. 2, June 2006, pp. 195–217, https://doi.org/10.1017/s1745855206040014.

Reiff, Raychel Haugrud. *Aldous Huxley: Brave New World*. Marshall Cavendish Benchmark, 2010.

Revel, Judith. “Power.” *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2014, pp. 377–385.

Revel, Judith, and Christopher Penfield. “The Literary Birth of Biopolitics.” *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, pp. 103–120.

Rollins, Mark. “Caring is a Gift: Gift Exchange and Commodification in Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*.” *CEA Critic*, vol. 77, no. 3, Nov. 2015, pp. 350–356, https://doi.org/10.1353/cea.2015.0027.

Rose, Nicholas. *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*. Princeton University Press, 2007.

Rutherford, Paul, and Stephanie Rutherford. “The confusions and exuberances of Biopolitics.” *Geography Compass*, vol. 7, no. 6, June 2013, pp. 412–422, https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12046.

Scheel, Stephan. *Biopolitical Bordering: Enacting Populations as Intelligible Objects of Government.* European Journal of Social Theory, vol. 23, no. 4, Nov. 2020, pp. 571–90.

Theis, Mary Elizabeth. *Mothers and Masters in Contemporary Utopian and Dystopian Literature*. Peter Lang, 2009.

The Island. Directed by Michael Bay, performances by Ewan McGregor and Scarlett Johansson, DreamWorks Pictures, 2005.

“The Matrix.” Warner Home Video, 1999.

Vranicar, Matthew, “The Senselessness of the Extremes Presented in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*”. *The Valpo Core Reader*, 1983

Wang, Jing, et al. "The Biopolitical Turn, Marxism and the Radicalization of Social Theory". *Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2022, p. 38.

Wells, H. G. *Men like Gods*. Dover Publications, 2016.

Woiak, Joanne. “Designing a brave new world: Eugenics, politics, and fiction.” *The Public Historian*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1 Jan. 2007, pp. 105–129, https://doi.org/10.1525/tph.2007.29.3.105.

Wong, Cynthia F. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. Liverpool University Press on Behalf of Northcote House Publishers Ltd, 2019.

Wroe, Nicholas. “Living Memories.” *The Guardian*, 19 Feb. 2005, www.theguardian.com/books/2005/feb/19/fiction.kazuoishiguro. Accessed 15 Apr. 2025.

TURNITIN REPORT

Ömer BUDANIR_22316812006

ORİJİNALLİK RAPORU

%10	%8	%6	%4
BENZERLİK ENDEKSİ	İNTERNET KAYNAKLARI	YAYINLAR	ÖĞRENCİ ÖDEVLERİ

BİRİNCİL KAYNAKLAR

1	acikbilim.yok.gov.tr İnternet Kaynağı	%1
2	ebin.pub İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
3	vdoc.pub İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
4	ada.atilim.edu.tr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
5	5dok.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
6	dspace.kocaeli.edu.tr:8080 İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
7	dokumen.pub İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
8	www.termpaperwarehouse.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
9	repozitorij.unios.hr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
10	pt.scribd.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
11	"A Companion to Foucault", Wiley, 2013 Yayın	<%1
12	www.arch.ntua.gr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

13	etd.lib.metu.edu.tr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
14	archive.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
15	Submitted to Atilim University Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
16	www.aensiweb.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
17	silo.pub İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
18	docslib.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
19	pure.roehampton.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
20	www.readbag.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
21	mavmatrix.uta.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
22	dergipark.org.tr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
23	open-evidence.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
24	Elia Zureik, David Lyon, Yasmeen Abu-Laban. "Surveillance and Control in Israel/Palestine - Population, Territory and Power", Routledge, 2019 Yayın	<%1
25	docshare.tips İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

26	dspace.atilim.edu.tr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
27	www.coursehero.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
28	Nikolas Rose. "The Politics of Life Itself", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2007 Yayın	<%1
29	Submitted to Fresno City College Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
30	Submitted to Union College Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
31	Aspasia Stephanou. "Reading Vampire Gothic Through Blood", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2014 Yayın	<%1
32	Submitted to Hillsborough County Public Schools Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
33	earsiv.anadolu.edu.tr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
34	epdf.tips İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
35	James S. Duncan. "Resisting the Rule of Law in Nineteenth-Century Ceylon - Colonialism and the Negotiation of Bureaucratic Boundaries", Routledge, 2020 Yayın	<%1
36	www.manchesterhive.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
37	Mallik, Senjuti. "The COVID-19 Crisis: Contraction Risks and Treatment-Seeking	<%1

	Behavior in the Slum Communities of Kolkata, India", University of Kansas, 2024 Yayın	
38	redmondaplit.blogspot.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
39	Ben Golder. "Re-reading Foucault: On Law, Power and Rights", Routledge, 2012 Yayın	<%1
40	Penny A. Pasque. "Critical Qualitative Research and Social Justice - Key Concepts in Qualitative Methods", Routledge, 2025 Yayın	<%1
41	adi2010.pbworks.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
42	dspace.cuni.cz İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
43	kupdf.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
44	www.zlibrary.to İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
45	Clayton Pierce. "Education in the Age of Biocapitalism", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2013 Yayın	<%1
46	Submitted to The University of Manchester Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
47	www.ummto.dz İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
48	"Foucault in an Age of Terror", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2008 Yayın	<%1

49	Submitted to Aliso Niguel High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
50	Ersoy, Duygu. "Manipulation of History and Language in Three Dystopias.", Middle East Technical University (Turkey), 2024 Yayın	<%1
51	Mark Olssen. "Toward a Global Thin Community Nietzsche, Foucault, and the Cosmopolitan Commitment", Routledge, 2015 Yayın	<%1
52	Matteo Vagelli. "Reconsidering Historical Epistemology", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2024 Yayın	<%1
53	Nada Elnahla, Ruth McKay. " Workplace issues in the context of Aldous Huxley's : Mental health problems, cannabis and the division of labour ", Transnational Corporations Review, 2020 Yayın	<%1
54	Njiru, Rose Anne Njeri. "Nipe-Nikupe: A Multi-Level Perspective of Gender and HIV Prevention in Heterosexual Marriages in Kenya", University of Connecticut, 2024 Yayın	<%1
55	bib03.caspur.it İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
56	dspace.library.uu.nl İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
57	dspace.univ-guelma.dz İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
58	open.metu.edu.tr İnternet Kaynağı	

		<%1
59	Chepeka, Collin. "Biopolitics, Necropolitics and Geopolitics: A Critical Evaluation of Settler Colonial Fascism", Queen's University (Canada) Yayın	<%1
60	Submitted to The University of the South Pacific Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
61	Submitted to Universidad de Alcalá Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
62	www.researchgate.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
63	Bilge-Ülker, Deni. "Neoliberal Governmentality of Health in Turkey,a Case Study of Constitution of "Healthy Woman" as a Subject.", Middle East Technical University (Turkey), 2024 Yayın	<%1
64	J. A. Cuddon. "A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory", Wiley, 2012 Yayın	<%1
65	Kara, Emre. "An Analysis of Julian Barnes' England, England & Kazuo Ishiguro's Never Let me go in the Light of Jean Baudrillard's Simulacra and Simulation.", Middle East Technical University (Turkey), 2024 Yayın	<%1
66	Submitted to Palm Beach Gardens High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
	Submitted to Saint Thomas High School	

67	Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
68	go.gale.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
69	www.bartleby.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
70	Submitted to American Public University System Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
71	Madan Sarup. "Marxism / Structuralism / Education - Theoretical Developments in the Sociology of Education", Routledge, 2012 Yayın	<%1
72	Submitted to Poway Unified School District Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
73	Submitted to University of the Western Cape Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
74	Submitted to Woodside High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
75	Submitted to Batavia High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
76	Submitted to Burlington Township High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
77	Submitted to Napier University Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
78	Submitted to North Haven High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
79	Stephen Ingle. "Chapter 7 'No Masters and no Masters' Men'", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 1979	<%1

	Yayın	
80	uir.unisa.ac.za İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
81	www.thefreelibrary.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
82	Phil Shining, Jon Braddy. "Sexuality and Eroticism in a Post-pandemic World", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2023 Yayın	<%1
83	Submitted to University of Lancaster Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
84	emergencejournal.english.ucsb.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
85	repozitorij.unizd.hr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
86	Submitted to 7034 Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
87	Submitted to Boyertown Area High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
88	Lucia Hodgson, Allison Giffen. "The Biopolitics of Childhood in the Long American 19th Century", Routledge, 2025 Yayın	<%1
89	McClurg, Darren F.. "Visions of Catastrophe: Human Enhancement in Contemporary, Dystopian Speculative Fiction", Salve Regina University Yayın	<%1
90	S. Salih. "Representing Mixed Race in Jamaica and England from the Abolition Era to the Present", Routledge, 2019 Yayın	<%1

91	Scott Veitch, Emilios Christodoulidis, Marco Goldoni. "Jurisprudence - Themes and Concepts", Routledge, 2019 Yayın	<%1
92	Submitted to Universita degli Studi di Torino Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
93	cdr.lib.unc.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
94	development.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
95	johost.eu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
96	m.everything2.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
97	scholarcommons.sc.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
98	tind-customer-uchicago.s3.amazonaws.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
99	1library.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
100	Munif, Yass. "French postcolonial nationalism and Afro-French subjectivities", Proquest, 2012. Yayın	<%1
101	Peter Gratton. "A 'Retro-version' of Power: Agamben via Foucault on Sovereignty", Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy, 2006 Yayın	<%1
102	Submitted to Randolph Township School District	<%1

	Öğrenci Ödevi	
103	The Biopolitics of Development, 2013. Yayın	<%1
104	Submitted to Virginia Commonwealth University Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
105	edoc.site İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
106	etd.ohiolink.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
107	etheses.dur.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
108	file.ebook777.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
109	hdl.handle.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
110	ia600602.us.archive.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
111	juliansamiloff.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
112	livrepository.liverpool.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
113	mural.maynoothuniversity.ie İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
114	mzuir.inflibnet.ac.in İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
115	novelas.rodriguezalvarez.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
116	openaccess.hacettepe.edu.tr:8080 İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

117	opentextbc.ca İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
118	orca.cf.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
119	uwe-repository.worktribe.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
120	www.elliswashingtonreport.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
121	www.gapjournals.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
122	www.huxley.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
123	"The Palgrave Handbook of Cold War Literature", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020 Yayın	<%1
124	Alan Milchman, Alan Rosenberg. "Postmodernism and the Holocaust", Brill, 1998 Yayın	<%1
125	Alexandru Balasescu. "Chapter 2 Body Matters", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2025 Yayın	<%1
126	Submitted to Allan Hancock College Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
127	Bishnu Prasad Pokharel, Sultana Banu, Binod Sapkota. "Human Organs as Commodities: A Critical Study of Kazu Ishiguro's Never Let Me Go", Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2025 Yayın	<%1

128	Gustavs, Julie. "Working the Knowledge Game? : The Power of the Everyday in Managing Truth in Organisations", University of Technology Sydney (Australia), 2024 Yayın	<%1
129	Karen Raber, Holly Dugan. "The Routledge Handbook of Shakespeare and Animals", Routledge, 2020 Yayın	<%1
130	Submitted to Queen's University of Belfast Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
131	Shenila Khoja-Moolji. "Producing neoliberal citizens: critical reflections on human rights education in Pakistan", Gender and Education, 2014 Yayın	<%1
132	Submitted to St. Mary's University Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
133	Steffens, Karolyn. "Modernist Affirmation: Twentieth-Century Fiction and the Discourse of Trauma.", Proquest, 2014. Yayın	<%1
134	Submitted to University of Warwick Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
135	blogit.utu.fi İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
136	bora.uib.no İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
137	cdn.b-u.ac.in İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
138	constitutionalist.com.ua İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

139	english-studies.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
140	epdf.gms.sg İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
141	era.ed.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
142	instifdt.bg.ac.rs İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
143	literatureessaysamples.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
144	padovauniversitypress.it İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
145	rauli.cbs.dk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
146	repository.asu.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
147	rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
148	ruor.uottawa.ca İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
149	thenostomodernreview.substack.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
150	theses.gla.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
151	undoingreason.blogspot.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
152	van Overbeek, Fons. "Shaping Claims to Urban Land : An Ethnographic Guide to Governmentality in Bukavu's Hybrid Space.", Wageningen University and Research	<%1

Yayın

153	www.resenhacritica.com.br İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
154	Özdemir, Burcu. "Suicide and Modernity: Philosophical Suicide as a Potential Form of Resistance to the Primacy of Life in Modern Times.", Middle East Technical University (Turkey), 2024 Yayın	<%1
155	Gabriele Griffin. " Science and the cultural imaginary: the case of Kazuo Ishiguro's ", Textual Practice, 2009 Yayın	<%1
156	Mark Bould, Andrew M. Butler, Adam Roberts, Sherryl Vint. "The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction", Routledge, 2009 Yayın	<%1
157	Submitted to Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
158	R. S. Deese. "Introduction: “The Question of Questions for Mankind”", University of California Press, 2019 Yayın	<%1
159	Sarah Sharma. " TAXI CAB PUBLICS AND THE PRODUCTION OF AFTER 9/11 ", Cultural Studies, 2010 Yayın	<%1
160	Topal, Mahir Onat. ""It's the Meat Talking, Ignore It": The Question of Posthuman Embodiment in William Gibson's Neuromancer and Kazuo Ishiguro's Never Let	<%1

	Me Go", Middle East Technical University (Turkey), 2024 Yayın	
161	Submitted to University of Canterbury Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
162	scholarworks.bgsu.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
163	www.dur.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
164	Submitted to Bishop O'CONNELL High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
165	Jeremy W. Crampton, Stuart Elden. "Space, Knowledge and Power - Foucault and Geography", Routledge, 2016 Yayın	<%1
166	Sandro Mezzadra, Brett Neilson. "Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2013 Yayın	<%1
167	Sverre Raffnsøe, Marius Gudmand-Høyer, Morten S. Thaning. "Michel Foucault: A Research Companion", Springer Nature, 2016 Yayın	<%1
168	Valeria Tinkler-Villani, C.C. Barfoot. "Restoring the Mystery of the Rainbow (2 Vols.)", Brill, 2011 Yayın	<%1
169	docplayer.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
170	epdf.pub İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
	qspace.library.queensu.ca	

171	İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
172	Submitted to CSU, Bakersfield Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
173	Submitted to Diocesan Boys' School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
174	Submitted to The Rockhampton Grammar School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
175	Submitted to University of the Arts, London Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
176	Submitted to Zespol Szkol nr 6 w Plocku - Liceum Ogolnoksztalcace z Oddzialami Dwujezycznymi im. Wladyslawa Jagielly Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
177	Submitted to Byron-Bergen Central High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
178	Submitted to Divine Savior Holy Angels High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
179	Submitted to Gar-Field High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
180	Submitted to Grosse Pointe South High School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
181	Submitted to University College Falmouth Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
182	Submitted to University of Edinburgh Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1

183	Welty, Allison. "Rhetorical Imperialism.", Proquest, 2015. Yayın	<%1
184	Submitted to Windermere Preparatory School Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
185	ethesisarchive.library.tu.ac.th İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
186	odysseus-network.eu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

RESUME

Full Name: Ömer Budanır

Educational Status:

Degree	**Major**	**University**	**Year**
Undergraduate Degree	English Language and Literature	Süleyman Demirel University	2011
Master Degree			

Work Experience:

Workplace	**Position**	**Year**
Atılım University	English Instructor	2018 - present
Nesibe Aydın Schools	English Language Teacher	2017 - 2018
Kemerburgaz University	English Instructor	2011-2015

Foreign Languages: English (Proficiency), German (Basic)

Publications:

Date: