

2019

# Embracing Foreignness: Transplanting, Transnationalizing, and Translating the Stranger in Kazuo Ishiguro's Works

Suguru Ikeda

Connecticut College, sikeda2013hg@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.conncoll.edu/enghp>



Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ikeda, Suguru, "Embracing Foreignness: Transplanting, Trans-nationalizing, and Translating the Stranger in Kazuo Ishiguro's Works" (2019). *English Honors Papers*. 39.

<https://digitalcommons.conncoll.edu/enghp/39>

This Honors Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the English Department at Digital Commons @ Connecticut College. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Honors Papers by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Connecticut College. For more information, please contact [bpancier@conncoll.edu](mailto:bpancier@conncoll.edu).

The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the author.

Embracing Foreignness: Transplanting, Trans-nationalizing, and Translating the Stranger in

Kazuo Ishiguro's Works

An Honors Thesis presented by  
Suguru Ikeda  
to the Department of English  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for  
Honors in the Major Field

Connecticut College  
New London, Connecticut  
December 2018

### Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I wish to thank Professor Marie Ostby for her academic and emotional support throughout the thesis writing process. If she had not been my adviser, this whole project would not have existed. I also wish to thank Professor Jeff Strabone and Michael Chan for being readers to my long thesis. I am especially grateful to Professor Chan for helping me write the third chapter, and teaching me how to format Japanese sources and citations from scratch. I also wish to thank Professor Hubert Cook for teaching his class “Fugitive James Baldwin” in my last semester at the college, without which I could not have written my conclusion. Thank you also to Professor Sandy Grande, Nathalie Etoke, and Rae Gaubinger for offering spaces to work on and talk about my thesis when I was still trying to conceptualize the arc of my writing.

I wish to send special thanks to Professor Courtney Baker, who has shaped so much of the ways I think about social justice and literature. Her text, *Humane Insight: Looking at Images of African American Suffering and Death*, is essential, not just to this thesis but, to my whole academic life.

Finally, I wish to thank my life mentor, Russell Bowley, who taught me the beauty and joy of critically engaging with English literature, and introduced both of the novels by Kazuo Ishiguro that I engage with in this honors thesis.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Living as Foreigners.....4  
Chapter 1: A Community of Foreigners.....13  
Chapter 2: Toxic Foreignness.....57  
Chapter 3: A Foreign Hope.....91  
Conclusion: Subversive Foreignness.....132  
Works Cited.....141

Introduction: Living as Foreigners

While in the most savage human groups the foreigner was an enemy to be destroyed, he has become, within the scope of religious and ethical constructs, a different human being who, provided he espouses them, may be assimilated into the fraternities of the “wise,” the “just,” or the “native.”

—Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*

It is shocking that what Julia Kristeva wrote in 1991 speaks in the past tense about “the most savage human groups” (2), yet I cannot find a more adequate way to describe the attitudes of those behind the revolting acts currently taking place at the Mexico-U.S. border, which include family separation and tear-gassing. To be a foreigner in 2018 is to be a criminal, and this does not just apply to the Mexico-U.S. border explicitly, although this is one of the most inhumane sites of xenophobic violence, alongside the violence directed against Palestinians in Israeli-occupied territories. Technological “advancements” have indeed mitigated distance as a factor of foreignness. Chatting face-to-face with someone one may or may not know on the other side of the globe has become no remarkable feat thanks to the global communications network that makes possible the various social media applications. Airplanes transport living and non-living entities from one continent to another, connecting lands separated by vast bodies of water. Foreignness has nothing to do with distance anymore, as David Palumbo-Liu writes in his introduction to *The Deliverance of Others*:

Globalization has delivered to us far more distant spaces and peoples than ever before, with greater regularity and integration on multiple fronts—economic, political, social, cultural, ecological, epidemiological, and so on. “Otherness” is thus not only increasingly in contact with the “same,” but the points of contact and contagion with otherness are far more numerous. Therefore, the degree to which we are the same as or different from others is discernible only in very specific manners that demand to be carefully and critically scrutinized. I am thus interested in otherness as both a “thing,” manifested in various forms, and as a relation. (3)

While interactions over large distances have occurred throughout the course of human history through trade and immigration, globalization since the mid-twentieth century has accelerated

drastically with technological advancements. Indeed, as the Palumbo-Liu passage above suggests, globalization is the promise of delivering the foreign into the native world, both traveling across borders and spreading within the borders once delivered. Yet, foreigners, upon crossing a border, or finding the border has crossed them, often meet ill-founded xenophobic hatred directed at them and find themselves accused of crimes they have not committed. How can we talk about the deliverance of others in a world that has already prescribed the other's deliverance as harm and ills? How can we talk about otherness when the other is not even regarded as human, predetermining the unknown other as a threatening foreigner?

As such, I wish to problematize the word "otherness," which Palumbo-Liu uses to analyze relationships within globalization. Specifically, I take issue not so much with the word "otherness" itself, but rather with how he sets up its differentiation from "sameness." Through this problematization, I wish to point to the positionality of the self in Palumbo-Liu's claim, for the contrast between the "same" and "other" seems to presuppose we can analyze sameness and otherness from an abstract and objective perspective. In the model Palumbo-Liu offers, based on the conflict between otherness and sameness, the concepts of "sameness" and "otherness" precede the individual. One merely enters an already predefined relationship with the other regardless of one's peculiar position in relation to larger systems, such as nation or race. Rather, I believe one *constructs* and *reconstructs* this concept of sameness and otherness relative to one's own position at every moment, setting up a unique, self-perceived relationship of sameness and otherness each time. Thus, I use the words "foreign" and "native" to talk about this relationship between the self and others. "Foreign" can be used in various ways similar to "other," but in its direct contrast to "native" and "nation," "foreign" implies an inevitable embeddedness within political and social systems which affect the relationship of the self and other, inscribed with

power dynamics that the rhetoric of “other” and “same” may overlook. In short, I suggest that the rhetoric of “same” and “other” conceals the hegemonic force with which globalization operates, inscribed in an Occident-centered world. In contrast, the juxtaposition of “foreign” and “native” can reveal the power dynamic and the role the individual plays in realizing this dynamic.

Yet, the disadvantage of using “foreignness” instead of “otherness” lies in the immediate association of the former with nation-states, and thus, foreignness not as a radical “other” in general, but specifically in political terms in relation to countries and ethnicities. While I have chosen the term “foreign” precisely to evoke this association, I must also broaden the scope such that foreignness occurs not just in reference to international relations, but also interpersonal relationships within the same country and ethnicity; that is, foreignness on an intra-national scale. Hence, I will first analyze Kazuo Ishiguro’s 2005 novel *Never Let Me Go* in order to destabilize and radicalize the term “foreignness” through this novel which stays in England throughout, and never overtly mentions race or ethnicity. Then, I will move to his first novel, *A Pale View of Hills* (1982), in order to enter an analysis which deals more directly with the ideas of countries and ethnicities with the radicalized concept of foreignness from *Never Let Me Go* in mind. Finally, I will end by reading the two novels translated into Japanese alongside their English originals. In working through the transformations that occur in the process of translation in both of the novels, I will show how translation can expand the world of the novel, and reveal aspects that become visible only through translation into a specific language. However, this expansion can also be seen as a hegemonic invasion by the English language, as translation today almost always means first a translation from or into English. In the end, I will argue that the very fact that transformations and expansions occur through translation suggests that we can imagine a world not necessarily organized around the English language.

Two central words in my analysis, which are intricately linked, are “foreign”—which inherently also means a consideration of the “native”—and “world.” To define something or someone as being foreign situates the definer(s) in their native world, for “foreign” only means something relatively. It takes the world relatively native to the person in comparison to the world of the foreign other and expresses this relation in a way that is specific to that moment of its usage. In fact, as Eric Hayot observes, the parallel relativity of the term “world” connotes this ambivalence of foreignness:

Consider the first two major definitions of world in the Oxford English Dictionary: “human existence; a period of this”; “the earth or a region of it; the universe or a part of it.” The or in each half of the second definition does the work of the semicolon in the first, forcing world to pivot between a reference to any self-enclosing whole (what are, after all, periods, regions, or parts of wholes but wholes themselves?) and a material reference to the largest possible versions of such wholes (human time; the planet Earth; the universe). The ambivalence between world as a generic totality of any size and world as the most totality of all recapitulates the difficulties generated by the world of world-systems and the world of world literature. (Hayot 131-132, italics in original)

The word “alien”, of which the second major definition is “A person who does not belong to a particular family, community, country, etc.; a foreigner, a stranger, an outsider” (*Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “alien.”), conveys the connection between foreignness and world. Alien also refers to “[a]n (intelligent) being from another planet; an extraterrestrial” in addition to the foreigner, as in the previous definition. The definition of an alien therefore shifts according to the location of the non-alien world, and where the border is seen relative to this location. Furthermore, a key term in the definition of “foreign” is outside (*OED*, s.v. “foreign.”), inevitably leading us to infer an inside in contrast to this. Thus, when one claims foreignness in the other, this simultaneously sets up a whole world in that specific moment in time of the speech, which reflects the speaker’s subjective perception of where to draw the border.

While this ambivalence may seem to trivialize the notion of foreignness because of its

uncertainty, it only trivializes attempts to universalize and fix a definition of foreignness. For despite its ambivalence, at the moment foreignness is brought into focus, at least for that moment, a world is plotted in its relativity. As such, foreignness still possesses significance in the face of its ambivalence; in fact, I argue it is precisely this ambivalence which reveals the characteristics of the world and foreignness in the moment. Jean-Luc Nancy's concept of the being singular plural leads to this revelation:

Being cannot be anything but being-with one-another, circulating in the with and as the with of this singularly plural coexistence [...] Existence *is with*: otherwise nothing exists [...] From place to place, and from moment to moment, without any progression or linear path, bit by bit and case by case, essentially accidental, it is singular and plural in its very principle [...] From now on, *we, we others* are charged with this truth—it is more *ours* than ever—the truth of this paradoxical “first-person plural” which makes sense of the world as the spacing and intertwining of so many worlds (earths, skies, histories) that there is a taking place of meaning, or the crossing-through [*passages*] of presence. “We” says (and “we say”) the unique event whose uniqueness and unity consist in multiplicity. (*Being Singular Plural*, henceforth *Being* 3-5, italics in original)

He later adds: “The co-implication of existing [l'exister] is the sharing of the world. A world is not something external to existence; it is not an extrinsic addition to other existences; the world is the coexistence that puts these existences together” (ibid. 29). Because, as Nancy describes, “existence is with,” each time one invokes one's conception of the world in one's specific, local moment, this conceptualization of a specific world-view does not perform in negation of others' world-views, but rather exists with them, creating a totality which we also call a world (one can set this up with infinite layers). These worlds' co-existence with each other in terms of foreignness and nativeness conceptualizes divisions and unities, while always existing with each other on different scales. Thus, while being is always being-with, different modes predicate being-with, such as foreign and native, or human and non-human. Through these different modes, different rules and conceptions that constitute a certain world are exhibited and enacted, revealing the underlying premises of that world displayed in a specific mode of being-with. As

such, the term “foreignness” will signify the specific person or place which is foreign within the whole world which one’s perception of “foreign” and “native” sets up.

*Never Let Me Go* is a dystopian novel, set in an imaginary England that followed an alternate path after World War II which has made groundbreaking progress in the field of bio-technology instead of nuclear technology. In the novel’s world, advances in bio-technology have created a society where humans extend their lives through harvesting organs from clones, who are cultivated until they reach maturity after around twenty to thirty years. These clones are referred to as ‘students’ in the novel. My first chapter on this novel will focus on the lives of students in relation to the humans in the novel, and examine foreignness by seeing the students as beings made foreign from almost every aspect of their lives: from the human world, from humanity, and from their own bodies. Seeing the students as foreigners will allow me to expand the lens of foreignness, refiguring foreignness to not only be applicable on the national scale, but also on the interpersonal scale, much like how Palumbo-Liu uses the term “otherness,” but keeping the broader world-scale connotation in mind. Through Nancy’s *The Inoperative Community* and *Being Singular Plural*, with which Palumbo-Liu’s *The Deliverance of Others* is in dialogue in his chapter on *Never Let Me Go*, I will examine the structure of the students’ community, in relation to the human world. Incorporating Courtney Baker’s concept of the humane insight, I analyze how the technological relationship set up between the humans and the clone-students is toxic to healthy interpersonal relationships. The clones, specifically Kathy, Tommy, and Ruth, ultimately seem to be capable of finding “little pockets of happiness” (*Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro* henceforth *Conversations*, 202), even in the face of a world which makes even their own bodies foreign from them, through the time they spend with each

other, existing in an alternate space to the one the humans have constructed in the novel.

If the clone-students in *Never Let Me Go* exhibit the happiness that can be found even in the face of the most brutally depriving world, *A Pale View of Hills* suggests a failure to find this happiness in reality, visible through the contrasting endings. While Kathy, as a being designed to donate everything, still has found “something no one can take away” (*Never Let Me Go* henceforth NLMG, 281) in the form of her happy memories; Etsuko, the protagonist of *A Pale View of Hills* has surrendered hope: “in the end, Niki, there isn’t very much else” (henceforth PVoH, 180). While *A Pale View of Hills* is set in an early 1950s Japan and 1970s England which resembles reality, Etsuko’s narrative is bleaker than Kathy’s dystopian narrative in many aspects.

Carrying the connotations of foreignness explored in the previous chapter, I will be analyzing foreignness in relation to nationhood and culture as well in Chapter Two, along with the power dynamics inscribed in such political relations. Examining the relationship individual characters establish in relation to their community and to their nation, I argue that both foreignness and community arise out of such relationships. I read foreignness as one’s relationship to the unknown other in contrast to foreignness as a state in which one finds oneself, as Kristeva posits in *Strangers to Ourselves*, although her analyses of the relationship between the foreigner and the native person are pivotal to this chapter. Benedict Anderson’s concept of “imagined communities” is central to my analysis of foreignness as a relationship, as this locates the community as a personal construct based on one’s perception of the world. Since gender informs a large part of the particular relationship one has with the nation and the foreign, in examining the neocolonial occupation by the U.S. military in Japan during this period, much of the historical context I examine is based on Michiko Takeuchi’s analysis of the post-war period, which mainly focuses on the role “pan-pan girls,” “private prostitutes and streetwalkers” (78),

played during this time. This aligns with the novel's perspective, told from Etsuko's point of view, and her reminiscences of her doppelgänger-like figure Sachiko. I conclude that, unlike the clone-students who find happiness amongst each other, the only happiness Etsuko can locate is in her dreams of being elsewhere. She cannot find happiness in reality because she tries to locate happiness in an Orientalist world, which, as Edward Said describes, constantly maintains an unequal relationship that deems the Orient a Western possession, thus dehumanizing Etsuko and any foreign individuals.

In the last chapter, I analyze the translations of the two novels I focused on in the previous chapters and describe the expansive potentials of foreign interaction, specifically focusing on the transformative nature of the translation act. Looking at the text through two different linguistic and cultural lenses makes visible the hegemonic force of English to which a global author, like Ishiguro, may be contributing. Drawing from the ideas of Paul Ricoeur and Emily Apter, I will first examine the process of translation itself, from individual words moving to whole texts, and how changes almost inevitably occur in translation. I will also be borrowing Jacques Derrida's concept of *différance* to examine how this transformation through translation is an expansive transformation, wherein foreign elements enter the language into which the work is being translated, expanding the world into which the translated work is introduced irreversibly. This expansion of the world takes place not only within the literary field, but in the broader culture, as Rebecca L. Walkowitz suggests with her concept of *unimaginable largeness*, a phrase which she takes from Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*. However, the analyses Kojin Karatani, Minae Mizumura, and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o offer of literature in non-English and European nations reveal how this expansive translation acts as a hegemonic expansion of the Eurocentric empire. Mizumura even identifies the English language to be an imperial force which threatens

to devour all languages including other European ones. Mizumura and Ngũgĩ's theories hint at the reasons why Etsuko and Sachiko in *A Pale View of Hills* could not locate happiness, but the clones can. Ultimately, I argue that foreignness becomes the hopeful future Etsuko believes she sees in England only when that foreignness exists outside of the hegemonic empire, wherein inequality between the natives inside the empire and foreigners outside is fundamental. No matter how limited that foreign world may be, it is only in a world which embraces one another's humanity like the clones' world, that one can meet another, not with xenophobic hostility devoid of a creative possibility, but with gratitude for a deliverance that one can realize only through the embrace of a foreigner.

## Chapter 1: A Community of Foreigners

The reader of *Never Let Me Go* encounters the setting of the novel through the eyes and memories of Kathy, one of the clones created for their organs to be transplanted. Stylistically, Ishiguro seems to guide the readers to sympathize with the clones, as the readers do not learn immediately that the characters are clones. Despite our sympathies, however, the border between the humans and the clones remains firm within the novel. The clones are constantly dehumanized, segregated, and dismissed from sight and thought by the humans, as if to remind the clones that their existence is foreign to the world. In fact, as the reader learns more about the dynamics between the humans and clones within the novel, the foreignness of the clones is emphasized. Even their lives do not belong to them within a world where their organs belong to some other human, sustaining that human's life rather than the clone's.

Yet, although the clones do not fight back against this existential tyranny, they nonetheless seem to live their life rather happily. In an interview, Ishiguro mentions this aspect of the novel as the point he was trying to communicate: "the fact is, yes, we will all fade away and die, but people can find the energy to create little pockets of happiness and decency while we're here" in comparison to the reading of the novel as "a chilling warning about the way we're going with cloning and biotechnology" (*Conversations* 202). As such, Ishiguro suggests an ethical reading of the novel, rather a technological one. Indeed, it is in the human(e) relationships the clones have with each other, rather than the automated ones they have with humans, in which the clones seem to be happy.

In discussing *Never Let Me Go*, I will first follow the text in accordance with the three parts of the novel to analyze the dynamics of the clones' world. Framing each analysis in terms of setting, I read the clones as being placeless everywhere, even in the places where they are

living at the given moment. Then, I will focus specifically on Chapter Twenty-One and Twenty-Two, the section of the novel where the climate and history of the humans' world is revealed to both the reader and Kathy. This scene exhibits an absolute lack of care and the neglect of the clones' humanity by the humans in the novel. Having outlined the two main worlds, the clones' and humans', within the novel, I then locate the happiness which the clones find in their sad lives in the bonds which they form amongst themselves. Finally, I compare the reader's world to the novel's world, concluding that despite their limited lives, the clones form a community in the mode of love and affirmation, which we should strive for in contrast to the cold world of the humans, plagued by guilt and inhumanity that organ transplants worsen rather than cure.

David Palumbo-Liu's chapter on *Never Let Me Go* and Jean-Luc Nancy's philosophical concepts of ontology will be the main critical sources I use to read the novel. Michel Foucault's concept of Panopticism in *Discipline and Punish* will be a central work in identifying the humans' world in the novel and foreign policies in reality as an "automatize[d] and disindividualize[d] power" mechanism (*Discipline and Punish* 202). Throughout the chapter, as I have already done in the previous paragraphs, I will use the term "human" to differentiate between the clones and the non-clones within the novel. The term "people" will be used to refer to both the clones and humans, and also will be a term which gives insight into what it means to be human within the novel.

Another foundational text through which I will be reading *Never Let Me Go* is Courtney Baker's *Humane Insight: Looking at Images of African American Suffering and Death*. Although her text offers profound insights specifically on the role of representation of African American bodies in empowering the black community in the United States, her concept of humane insight is applicable to my readings of the novel:

This kind of looking, one in which the onlooker's ethics are addressed by the spectacle of others' embodied suffering, is what I am calling in this book *humane insight* ... It is an ethics-based look that imagines the body that is seen to merit the protections due to all human bodies. Humane insight describes a decision to identify the body being looked at as a human body, a gesture that is integral to the formation of our social interactions. It is a look that turns a benevolent eye, recognizes violations of human dignity, and bestows or articulates the desire for actual protection. (5)

While as Baker identifies, "the remarkable legacy of black pain and vulnerability" (5) especially demands humane insight, the concept has implications on human interaction beyond the specifics of the gaze upon blackness. In charging the onlooker with the responsibility of enacting an ethical relationship with others, humane insight locates humanity as a concept in the look of the onlooker rather than in others themselves. In other words, the ability, or inability, to recognize the humanity in others depends not on a notion that the other possesses a defined and universalized "humanity," but on the looker's ability to see humanity in others. This means the humanity of the other is never in question; if anything, it is the inhumanity of the onlooker which is exhibited in the inhuman gaze. In saying this, however, I do not wish to portray dehumanization as an individual's personal malice, for as Baker writes, "humanity is an ideological construct and, as such, neither its visual appearance nor its verbal testimony can confirm its presence in any absolute terms" (9). Ideology is systematic; the onlooker's inhumanity reflects the inhumanity of the system that conveniently defines "humanity."

As such, the concept of humanity becomes "less of a condition than it is an idea that signals to others how those identified as human beings ought to be treated" (9), which demands that our interaction with the other is founded upon care for the other's well-being. This, in turn, reflects the desire to utilize the non-human body in ways that violate ethics, for if humanity requires certain rights be respected, dehumanization arises precisely to violate such rights intentionally. There are similarities between this and the identification of the other as foreigner

relative to where one draws the line. The foreigner becomes excluded from the community in a certain way in relation to the rights which a native receives that the foreigner does not. The gaze which designate human and non-human, or native and foreigner, and fashion the other as exploitable, is what Baker's humane insight challenges. In *Never Let Me Go*, the inhuman gaze is directed by the humans in the novel to the clones in relation to their humanity, whereas the clones see themselves through the humane look, recognizing the humanity in each other. I will argue that the humane look is the source of happiness that the clones locate in their lives, in the face of the inhuman gaze of society and the harsh, brutal, and mechanical world that harvests their lives.

The novel starts where it ends: Kathy as a carer about to enter her donations stage. Most of the novel is Kathy's reminiscence of her past, through which we learn that the setting of the novel is an England that has diverged from reality post-World War II, defined by cloning technology. The logic of the world within the novel is to create a perpetual underclass, clones who are defined to be non-human, who the humans need not feel guilty in treating their lives inhumanely because they have been rendered non-human already. In this bleak world, we follow Kathy's life as a clone through her childhood, centered around her interactions with Tommy and Ruth, childhood friends who are also clones.

The first part of the novel occurs at Hailsham, never beyond its borders, the most fixed and central location that the reader and clones hear most about in the novel. In Hailsham, the clones live under constant surveillance of the guardians, and are gradually taught their roles as clones and their fate of donations. While they seem to be able to play within the borders freely, what they can and cannot do is strictly enforced by the guardians, and later the clones who

embody such values. Later at the Cottages, the institution some of the Hailsham students go to after Hailsham, Kathy still echoes the guardians in looking at Tommy's new artworks: "What I was looking at was so different from anything the guardians had taught us to do at Hailsham, I didn't know how to judge it" (185). The value system of the guardians is solely what Kathy bases her life upon, disciplining herself, and others, in this case Tommy's art, in accordance to those values. Kathy has internalized the guardians', and hence the humans', perspective of the world successfully. Already, the seeds of Foucault's Panoptic system are planted: "this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers" (*Discipline and Punish* 201). Hailsham, in one aspect, is the institution that makes the clones ready for the cold, inhumane acts they are about to face while internalizing the perspective of the humans who receive the benefits of the inhumane act such that the clones do not revolt against the system, but rather see it as a necessity to the wellbeing of society.

But as an individual institution, Hailsham means more than a system of surveillance to the clones, and is a fantastical place which every clone seems to dream of. Every character the reader encounters, or rather, Kathy reminisces about, seems to know of Hailsham. In fact, even in moments when Kathy talks to an imagined audience, she assumes the audience knows, perhaps not details such as the exchange in question, but at least the name and implications of Hailsham: "I've heard [resentment expressions of being from Hailsham] said enough, so I'm sure you've heard it plenty more" (4). For the non-Hailsham clones, Hailsham is a special institution with special privileges for its graduates, and thus, a place which they admired to have lived throughout their life. While the readers do not encounter any clones from the other institutions in

Part One, Miss Emily reveals to Kathy, Tommy, and readers later on that the Hailsham students should consider themselves lucky that they were able to be at Hailsham rather than the other institutions. One of the first clones the readers encounter other than Kathy also sees some splendor in Hailsham, as Kathy realizes his wish is to remember Hailsham “just like if it had been his own childhood” (5). This reveals that within the world of the clones, Hailsham is perhaps as foreign as the outside world is to the clones in its exceptional quality as an institution for the clones. It is a place to project dreams upon, a world so foreign that any fantastic projection nonetheless seems possible at Hailsham. In fact, as I will discuss in greater detail later in this chapter, this view of Hailsham as a foreign estate seems to give rise to certain myths about the rights only Hailsham students have such as deferrals, and thus, a method to momentarily go beyond the borders of the clone world. Hailsham performs much like a dream for the clones, as a utopia or gateway to life beyond the borders of the enclosed world, almost as one imagines that traveling abroad will have a profound effect on one’s life.

Yet, also like a dream, Hailsham is closed down, and seems to evaporate into thin air, for nobody, except for people like Madame or Miss Emily who facilitated Hailsham, seems to know where exactly it was. The clones speculate about what has become of Hailsham, “a hotel, a school, a ruin” (280), and Tommy and Ruth also present their ideas, although Ruth’s is only in a dream. In seeing a beached boat in the marshland, Tommy says “Maybe this is what Hailsham looks like now... [e]xcept there’s no boat, of course” (220-221), to which Ruth responds that “I was dreaming I was up in Room 14 [in Hailsham] ... and everything outside was flooded. Just like a giant lake” (221). The symbol of water persists throughout the novel, and here it exists as a physical boundary that denies access to the boat: “‘Pity we can’t go closer to the boat,’ [Tommy] said. ‘One day when it’s drier, maybe we could come back’” (223). In creating a parallel

between Hailsham and the boat, not only the boat but Hailsham too has become inaccessible due to this physical and imagined body of water. Yet the water also represents a place of tranquility and of last resort. Despite Ruth's image of a flooded Hailsham, she also mentions: "[b]ut there wasn't any sense of panic or anything like that. It was nice and tranquil, just like it is here. I knew I wasn't in any danger, that it was only like that because it had closed down" (221). Nonetheless, neither Kathy nor the reader ever return to Hailsham beyond graduation, and it remains forever in the realm of memories. Hailsham has become, in the minds of ex-Hailsham students, a place in and of memory, inaccessible in reality. Yet, it also seems to be this dream-like quality of Hailsham that enchants it with happiness, allowing for Hailsham and non-Hailsham students to dream freely in relation to the institution. It is not the physical institution of Hailsham itself which is magical, but rather, the students enchant Hailsham with magic upon retrospective reminiscence.

One of the key moments at Hailsham, for both the students and the reader, though in different ways, is when Miss Lucy, one of the guardians at Hailsham, reveals to the students what it means to be a clone, and to the readers that these students are clones existing solely for the purpose of donating their organs:

None of you will go to America, none of you will be film stars. And none of you will be working in supermarkets as I heard some of you planning the other day. Your lives are set out for you. You'll become adults, then before you're old, before you're even middle-aged, you'll start to donate your vital organs. That's what each of you was created to do. You're not like the actors you watch on your videos, you're not even like me. You were brought into this world for a purpose, and your futures, all of them, have been decided. (80)

The clones, at this point in their life, already know that they are clones, and thus, they react in a nonchalant way: "Well so what? We already knew all that" (81). For the clones, this revelation is nothing new, and perhaps one can say the same for the reader, who has encountered terms

such as “donor,” “carer,” and “donations” from the start of the novel used in an unfamiliar way and thus, anticipates that they will be explained at some point. In a metaphorical way as Palumbo-Liu employs the term to talk of xenophobia, Hailsham in the case of the clones and the readers seems to have functioned as a cyclosporin, a drug “used as an immunosuppressive drug to prevent the rejection of grafts and transplants” (*OED*, s.v. “cyclo-, comb. form.”), that suppresses a shock reaction to this revelation: “Certainly, it feels like I *always* knew about donations in some vague way, even as early as six or seven. 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). In this way, both the clones and the readers anticipate this absolute foreignness: the foreignness of the clones from the guardians, and the rest of humanity for the clones; and the foreignness of the novel’s world from the readers’ world. Palumbo-Liu describes this articulately: “cyclosporin becomes the chemical of tolerance, one which enables doctors to manage the immune system and selectively accommodate the foreign, or quell ‘xenophobia’” (99). The shock of the revelation is numbed by Hailsham guardians for the clones, and by Ishiguro for the readers.

However, we should not forget that the cyclosporin suppresses not natural disease symptoms, but reactions to the technological operations introduced to humanity by the evolution of biotechnology. The shock that needs to be suppressed in this case arises from the humane rejection of farming organs via clones. It is ethics, not foreignness itself, that is being suppressed by the chemicals in Palumbo-Liu’s metaphor. Xenophobia is not inherent to humanity. It arises from a specific interaction with the foreigner perceived as a threat to individuality and the nation to which the individual belongs, based on circulated myths about the foreigner. The cyclosporin affects not the condition of foreignness itself, but the perception one has of foreignness. Hence,

Hailsham achieves its effect as “immune suppression” precisely because the cloning system at large is a set of violent interactions with the foreign existences, the clones and the readers in sympathy with the clones.

The facility Kathy, as well as Tommy and Ruth, move onto next is the Cottages. Less supervised than Hailsham, where the guardians are with the clones constantly, the Cottages only have one supervisor: Keffers, who is not even always there. As a location, the Cottages do not seem to be an important part of the clones’ lives. In addition to this, compared to the years spent at Hailsham<sup>1</sup>, the clones can only remain at the Cottages for a maximum of two years (113). Yet the key transition between Part One at Hailsham and Part Two at the Cottages is the car, and thus, travel. For the first known time, the clones can access the world beyond the walls of the institutions in real life, not just through texts or occasional visits to Hailsham from the outside by workers. The parallel between the age at which humans and clones gain access to cars is not a coincidence. In Britain, where the novel takes place, the legal age at which one can start driving a car is seventeen.<sup>2</sup> For the clones too, this age is roughly when they have matured to a certain extent; the lack of the presence of guardians at the Cottages reveal this. Yet, what does maturity mean for the clones? One possible answer is that at this age, the clones have successfully understood and accepted the idea that they are clones, and thus non-human, as a fact. Although they talk about the idea of their ‘possibles,’ “the person [the clone] was modelled from” (137), this still does not trigger the clones to fight against the situation. As foreigners liable to deportation at any time, they must obey the laws the humans have set specifically for the

---

<sup>1</sup> There is no direct mention of when they enter Hailsham. There are no mentions of babies at Hailsham (obviously), and the youngest age Kathy recalls is 5 or 6. Since they graduate Hailsham at 16, at least 10 years are spent at Hailsham, and likely other similar institutions as well.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/driving-lessons-learning-to-drive>

foreigners as well as those which apply to the natives.

The clones, as foreigners to the human world, feel themselves under constant surveillance by the natives' inhumane gaze. Thus, a Panopticism specific to foreigners is realized:

The Panopticon is a machine for dissociating the see/being seen dyad: in the peripheric ring, one is totally seen, without ever seeing; in the central tower, one sees everything without ever being seen.

It is an important mechanism, for it automatizes and disindividualizes power [...] The Panopticon is a marvelous machine which, whatever use one may wish to put it to, produces homogeneous effects of power.

[...] He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection. (*Discipline and Punish* 201-203)

More susceptible to this mechanism than others because of their already vulnerable position as foreigners, the clones/foreigners must embody this machinery for survival. The clones are only able to talk about “dream futures” at the cottages “before all the talk of becoming carers, before the driving lessons” (140); the driver’s license costs them their dreams. Once outside, they must hide their foreignness, as Ruth says about a lady at a gallery who talks to them: “*Art* students, that’s what she thought we were. Do you think she’d have talked to us like that if she’d known what we really were” (164). Their foreignness must be hidden, for it will disrupt the natives’ lives. Bleakly and paradoxically, the realization that there is no escape (from fate) and the internalization of the hostility of the humans against the clones is the passport to stepping outside the border. Julia Kristeva writes of this as the paradox imposed upon foreigners: “If political regulations or legislation generally speaking define the manner in which we posit, modify, and eventually improve the status of foreigners, they also make up a vicious circle, for it is precisely with respect to laws that foreigners exist” (96). Created by law which makes them vulnerable, the clones/foreigners in the novel are most susceptible to the mechanism. Their freedom to travel within the borders is only granted upon accepting the internalized surveillance which requires

them to constantly make efforts to prove themselves fit for society in the face of the natives, or the humans in the case of the clones. The foreigner and clone cannot but imagine the other's inhumane gaze to be hostile and doubtful, trying to deport them under the Panoptic mechanism which disciplines society.

Having their passports now, Kathy, Ruth, and Tommy venture to out Norfolk with Rodney and Chrissie, after hearing about Ruth's possible being found, to see if this is true. This trip to Norfolk is the first moment in which readers see Kathy going beyond the borders of the institutional system. Norfolk, among the students at Hailsham, is "England's 'lost corner.'" This phrase arises from a class taught by Miss Emily, when she called Norfolk "a lost corner" because "it's not on the way to anywhere" so "[p]eople going north and south ... they bypass it altogether." However, Norfolk becomes the place "where all the lost property found in the country ended up" (65) for the clones, because the lost-and-found corner at Hailsham had this function. Kathy revisits this fantasy at the end of the novel, after both Tommy and Ruth have completed, which is the term used when a clone has died in the process of or after organ donations:

All along the fence, especially along the lower line of the wire, all sorts of rubbish had caught and tangled. It was like the debris you get on a seashore ... That was the only time, as I stood there, looking at that strange rubbish, feeling the wind coming across those empty fields, that I started to imagine just a little fantasy thing, because this was Norfolk after all, and it was only a couple of weeks since I'd lost him. I was thinking about the rubbish, the flapping plastic in the branches, the shore-line of old stuff caught along the fencing, and I half-closed my eyes and imagined this was the spot where everything I'd ever lost since my childhood had washed up, and I was now standing here in front of it, and if I waited long enough, a tiny figure would appear on the horizon across the field, and gradually get larger until I'd see it was Tommy, and he'd wave, maybe even call. (282)

Although presented elsewhere as a space of currents that separates people from places as well as each other, Norfolk's metaphorical waves collect all that has been lost. This fantasy becomes so

developed that Kathy imagines this metaphorical seashore at Norfolk as the place where she can even meet those dear to her who have already completed, thus providing a place of rest for Kathy who has lost so much through her life. But as the “lost corner,” Norfolk cannot be a destination nor a place to stay at for long. Kathy too, eventually “turn[s] back to the car, to drive off to wherever it was I was supposed to be” (282), disciplining herself as the foreign worker.

The path set for foreigners, and the clones by the humans do not allow for long detours; constantly fated and railed, Kathy is supposed to be somewhere in response to someone else’s plan. Kristeva writes of immigrant workers that “[t]he foreigner is the one who works ... you really have to be without anything and thus, basically, to come from somewhere else, to be attached to [work] to that extent [...] since [the foreigner] has nothing, since he is nothing, he can sacrifice everything. And sacrifice begins with work” (17-19). This description of the foreigner uncoincidentally resonates with the clones’ lives, working to care for other clones as a carer, and eventually facing the inevitable, ultimate self-sacrifice of their own bodies. In this light, donation is the clones’ job, and the only job they can have. The clone-foreigner truly has very little else, for the world within the novel does not allow her to possess anything other than what is needed for her work, developing and donating her organs: her body. But Norfolk, “not on the way to anywhere” (65), leads the foreigner astray in its existence as a ‘lost’ corner. The foreigner is given time, and in this ‘lost’ time, the foreigner finds something other than work. Lost from the gaze of the humans, it is in such detours the immigrant workers find their moment of peace where, either alone or with other foreigners, the Panoptic gaze loses sight of them momentarily.

The scene at Norfolk is also the moment the reader learns the details of the idea of possibles. While neither the reader nor the clones ever learn who exactly the clones are copied

from, for the clones, the idea of the possibles poses an alternate significance: “when you saw the person you were copied from, you’d get *some* insight into who you were deep down, and maybe too, you’d see something of what your life held in store” (137-138). Kathy claims that “most of us had first come across the idea of ‘possibles’ back at Hailsham” (136), and the clones were fascinated by the idea to varying degrees: “There were some who thought it stupid to be concerned about possibles at all. Our models were an irrelevance, a technical necessity for bringing us into the world, nothing more than that. It was up to each of us to make of our lives what we could” (138). Resembling something like fortune telling in the real world, the ‘possibles’ are a projection of the self into the future; however, as the ‘possible’ is the origin, it exists in the past. As such, the hope of “what your life held in store” is not a possibility for the clones, but rather like an avatar of the clone-self that role-plays being human. But it is an avatar that the clones do not have control over, for the ‘possibles’, in the end, exist independently from the clones. The avatars refuse to reflect anything back at the clones, maintaining their humanity in the face of the projection by the clones, yet the clones nonetheless try to find something there that will tell them about themselves. The foreigner dreams of integration, yet their internalized values of society make them discipline themselves to not let this get beyond a dream.

Furthermore, the only story Kathy reveals to the reader related to the idea of the ‘possibles’ revolves around Ruth’s possible, which only shatters hopes of the future further. At first, when they find Ruth’s possible working in an office in Norfolk, from a distance they all agree that, much to their surprise, the possible does resemble Ruth. Yet, upon following the possible, and getting a closer look at her face, they are all disillusioned. As they have come to Norfolk in search of Ruth’s possible, this disillusionment hits her hardest. Irritated, Ruth makes this bleak claim about the possibles:

We all know it. We're modelled from *trash*. Junkies, prostitutes, winos, tramps. Convicts, maybe, just so long as they aren't psychos. That's what we come from. We all know it... If you want to look for possibles, if you want to do it properly, then you look in the gutter. You look in rubbish bins. Look down the toilet, that's where you'll find where we all came from. (164)

This statement agrees with a scene that precedes the Norfolk trip, in which Kathy is reading porn magazines. Tommy sees Kathy doing this with a sad and slightly scared face, looking as if in search of something (133-134). While Kathy does not reveal her intentions to the reader, she later confirms that she has been looking at the porn in search of her possible (178-179) when Tommy asks her. As in the scene in which Miss Lucy reveals to the clones that the clones have no future but donations, the clones' relation to dreams and futures is plagued with disillusionment. Configured only in their mechanical function as sacrifices to the human world, the human world gives nothing back because in accepting their entry, the natives believe they have done the foreigners a favor already. The foreigners ask nothing more either, because they have internalized this perspective.

Another idea to which the reader is introduced during the Norfolk trip is the idea of deferrals. It seems to be an idea which non-Hailsham veterans, those who have spent at least one year at the Cottages, have fabricated about the special rights of Hailsham students:

We heard something else, something about Hailsham students [...] that 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, four years. It wasn't easy, but just sometimes they'd let you do it. So long as you could convince them. So long as you *qualified*.

[...]

'What they said,' Chrissie continued, 'was that if you were a boy and a girl and you were in love with each other, really, properly in love, and if you could show it, then the people who run Hailsham, they sorted it out for you. (150,151)

Later in the novel, this becomes a crucial idea as Kathy and Tommy meet with Madame and

Miss Emily to apply for this deferral, and the reader learns more about the bleak life of the clones within the novel's world alongside Kathy and Tommy. However, the demystification occurs later for the readers and clones, as in this scene nobody knows the truth.

However, responding to Chrissie, who is a non-Hailsham student, Ruth seems to affirm the myth of the deferrals: "Ruth sighed and said: 'Well, they told us a few things, obviously. But' – she gave a shrug – 'it's not something we know much about'" (152). Rodney inquires about more details, to which Ruth "look[s] to [Kathy] and Tommy for support" (152), and Tommy responds:

'To be honest, I don't know what you're all talking about. What rules are these?'  
[...]  
'I don't remember it,' he said flatly. And this time I could see – and Ruth could too – that he wasn't being slow. 'I don't remember anything like that at Hailsham.' (152)

While in terms of the plot, the purpose of this scene is to develop conflict between Ruth and Tommy, it also reveals the difference in ideologies within the clones' world. Ruth's implied affirmation in this scene confirms the hopeless hope that the clones fabricate to convince themselves that there is something in the future to advance towards in the face of their fate. Understanding that they cannot escape their donation, the deferrals represent a dream of postponing the moment they realize their fate, both as an understanding and as an actualization of their absolute lack of a future.

Of course, the clones will be woken from this dream once a Hailsham student rejects having heard of such a thing. Thus, "[i]t was always [non, ex-Hailsham] veterans talking among themselves [about deferrals]" (152) until this point. Ruth is chosen as the target Hailsham student on which to test the idea, as she seems to affirm various Hailsham myths:

[B]ecause Ruth was from Hailsham, somehow the whole notion came within the realms of the possible. That's how Chrissie saw it, and I suppose Ruth did say a few things every now and then to encourage the idea that, sure enough, in some mysterious way, a separate

set of rules applied to us Hailsham students. I never heard Ruth actually lie to veterans; it was more to do with not denying certain things, implying others. (143)

Thus, Chrissie brings the idea up explicitly to Ruth while the five clones are talking: “[Chrissie] looked around the table, then fixed her gaze on Ruth” (150). Of course, as the possibility of deferring applies only to Hailsham students, the possibility remains forever foreign to those like Chrissie and Rodney. But it leaves them with a hope to hang onto in the face of cruel reality precisely because of its foreignness in which the possibility is never affirmed or denied.

Kathy speculates that Ruth’s “not denying certain [myths]” about Hailsham and its graduates had a sacrificial element to it: “But it seems to me Ruth believed, at some level, she was doing all this on *behalf of us all* [...] She was struggling to become someone else, and maybe felt the pressure more than the rest of us because, as I say, she’d somehow taken on the responsibility for all of us” (128). Ruth, in this light, has been donating parts of her life to perform the role which the others projected upon her, not just the humans, but among the clones as well. She has, in this metaphorical way, started her donation process earlier than the other clones. As such, Ruth lives up to her name in both ways: as “[t]he quality of being compassionate; the feeling of sorrow for another; compassion, pity” for the clones; and “[m]ischief; calamity; ruin”<sup>3</sup> among Kathy, Ruth, and Tommy at several points in the novel. Yet, this role is different from the foreigner work assigned to them in the human world, because the motivation for Ruth within the clones’ community is love and care, whereas the work sees her and forces her to see herself as a machine of the system. It is thus not the sacrificial act of the foreigner itself that makes the world a harsh and cold place for them, but the way the sacrifice becomes configured by others in the world, that enacts the brutality.

On the other hand, Tommy refuses to donate his life any more than the world already

---

<sup>3</sup> *OED*, s.v. “ruth n.”

requires him to, although in the end, Ruth does not allow for such a ruthless intervention in her Ruthful affirmation. In rejecting the myth, Tommy is neither being cruel nor pessimistic, for he too attempts to apply for a deferral with Kathy. But he does not fabricate his life, refusing to “donate” his personal past at Hailsham for the sake of the other clones. Thus, he does not reject the idea of deferrals itself, but rather rejects having heard about it at Hailsham. In disagreeing with Ruth, his motivations are nonetheless love and care as well, caring for himself and other Hailsham students, re-claiming their own bodies for themselves. Hence, while the two may be in disagreement as to the exact method, both share the wish to alleviate the automatized power of the mechanical human world, and the conflict between them is redeemable in the end since they were always in fundamental agreement.

Shortly after this scene at Norfolk, Kathy decides to become a carer, the last stage of the clones’ lives before they start to donate their organs. The carers are clones who care for the other clones as they go through their donations. The time that one spends as a carer is not determined, although Kathy tells us early in the novel that being a carer for twelve years is long. This part of the novel does not have a firm setting like the other two sections, which reflects the clones’ state of existence at this stage of their lives: not staying in one location physically but rather constantly on the move, the carer clones become physically placeless, occupying a function rather than a place<sup>4</sup>. As they have fully matured, ready to be harvested, their life is no longer needed. They approach the completion of their job: carrying the organs safely to the recipients. The body no longer belongs anywhere, always on the move, its insides already claimed. The

---

<sup>4</sup> Although Kathy does mention living in a bedsit, she never gives any details of it beyond the fact that she has four desk-lamps (204), and readers do hear of a carer living in his flat (148), but never read about him directly. As the narrative focuses on her actions outside of her bedsit and residence, the space, though it may belong to Kathy, does not play the same role as Hailsham or the Cottages as a home.

foreigner, a job-function, dies with the completion of whatever task they were shaped to do.

Broadly speaking however, the final stage of the clones' lives takes place at the recovery centers. Yet, this creates a split within the clones' community as they enter the centers as either carer or donor. Having become othered and marginalized everywhere, even amongst themselves, this setting seems to sentence the clones to eternal exile from life itself, in both function and relation. The recovery centers are facilities that seem to resemble hospitals, although they are places of harvest rather than treatment. The treatment only occurs to prepare the clones for their next stage of donations, leading to an inevitable "completion" during which all the organs are harvested. Thus, although Kathy reunites with Ruth and Tommy in these recovery centers, it is also in such institutions that Ruth and Tommy complete, Ruth painfully and Tommy out of reach, for Kathy and Tommy agree to split as carer and donor before his completion. The novel's world reveals its last talon of malice to the clones in the end. 'Recovery' means both "[t]he regaining or restoration of one's health or a mental state" and "[t]he regaining or restoration to one's control or possession of a thing lost, stolen, or otherwise taken away, retrieval; the possibility of recovering such a thing" (*OED*, s.v. "recovery."), and yet the clones regain neither of these. Only the humans re-gain *their* organs from a foreign body that belonged to *them*, rather than the clones, from the start. As means for the humans to recover, the vitality of life has never belonged to the clones; they have lived only coincidentally. The clones represent an extreme case of immigrant workers. Made by law into foreigners in a system for the natives, immigrant workers are allowed entry into the country only because of what they can donate in working for the natives, just as the clones live only because life is the most efficient method of producing organs.

The final realization is that the foreigner cannot exist other than through their

contribution to society, for they were born only for the sake of the job. The life which the clone's body sustains is not the clone's, but the humans', who *regain* it eventually for *their* recovery.

Tommy's worry about the 'completion' reveals how the clones have internalized the foreignness of life:

How maybe, after the fourth donation, even if you've technically completed, you're still conscious in some sort of way; how then you find there are more donations, plenty of them, on the other side of that line; how there are no more recovery centres, no carers, no friends; how there's nothing to do except watch your remaining donations until they switch you off. (274)

Death cannot be conceived, because life cannot be conceived as belonging to the clones. But whom does the clone donate to in such a solitary world? The answer does not need to exist; the clones donate regardless of recipient because "to be" has become equated with "to donate" for them. Solely existent only through the work of donation, donation precedes life and death in the mechanism of society they have internalized. While death marks the boundary of life, and thus provides life with its meaning insofar that one can die, for the clones, death does not exist, and consequently neither does life, for it is the ability to die that proves the state of life. Having lived only coincidentally along with the organs belonging to some human, life and death, as well as their bodies, remain forever foreign to the clones. The foreigner does not exist outside of their donation of their labor to the native's world.

It is amidst these alienating moments at the recovery centers that the readers see the split between donors and carers, even among Kathy and Tommy (and Ruth). A scene at a boat in the marshes represents this divide: "I took long strides to the nearest dead tree trunk, where the soil was firmer, and held onto it for balance. Following my example, Tommy and Ruth made their way to another tree trunk, hollow and more emaciated than mine, a sort way behind to my left" (220). The tree trunks which they hold onto seem to resemble their bodily state: Kathy, a carer,

has all her organs and stands firmly; Tommy and Ruth, having started their donations already, are “hollow and more emaciated” because they lack certain organs. Then, readers hear a revealing dialogue between Kathy and Ruth:

‘How would you know [what a donor felt]?’ said Ruth. ‘How could you possibly know? You’re still a carer.’  
 ‘I get to see a lot as a carer. An awful lot.’  
 ‘She wouldn’t know, would she, Tommy? Not what it’s really like.’ (222)

Ruth rejects Kathy’s sympathy, a term Palumbo-Liu describes in his introduction: “We cannot be the other, but we can try to imagine what her or his situation would make *us* feel like” (8). In Palumbo-Liu’s terms, Ruth has rejected any sameness between her and Kathy, and carers and donors; they are different existences. Even Tommy, later on in the novel, seems to create this divide between donor and carer instinctively:

But what I couldn’t help noticing was how, more and more, Tommy tended to identify himself with the other donors at the centre.  
 [...] ‘Look, Kath, I’ll sort out my own things. If you were a donor, you’d see.’  
 [...] ‘Ruth would have understood. She was a donor, so she would have understood [...] Kath, sometimes you just don’t see it. You don’t see it because you’re not a donor.’ (271; 273; 276)

Although Tommy and Kathy come to terms after this conflict, and separate from each other in love, the overall disharmony between the donors and carers cannot be ignored. The direct source of the division is the physical difference, and the bodily experiences tied to the loss that creates it. As such, the carers are not divided from the donors forever, but rather temporarily although absolutely, as Tommy and Ruth both imply that only becoming a donor will allow Kathy to join them again. However, within the frame of the novel, Kathy never goes to the other side; she does not start her donation, but only implies she will start soon. One possible reading of this narrative framework is that once the clones enter the donation stage, the donors cease to be clones from

the perspective of other, non-donating clones, such as Kathy in her role as carer. This is perhaps because from donations onward, the body of the clones physically start to become foreign. In this grim perception, the sad attempt by Kathy to reclaim her body through the narrative structure shows her desperate, perhaps subconscious, attempt to reclaim her life before donations as her personal life by explicitly creating a divide between donor and carer. In this light, despite the heartbreaking separation between Kathy, Tommy, and Ruth due to this distinction, the separation between the carer and donor simultaneously reclaims individuality for the clones at the sacrifice of eternal bonds between the clones in terms of identity.

Let us return to Hailsham once more in this light: has Hailsham ever been home to the clones in the first place? While undoubtedly a home that Kathy always finds herself in, either physically or mentally in memory, it is not until much later that Kathy finds out what Hailsham really was in the wider world: “an example of how [humans] might move to a more humane and better way of doing things” (253). Of course, regardless of this truth, it nonetheless remains true that for Kathy, Hailsham was a place of comfort that meant more than just a stage in their life.

Hailsham thus remains the novel’s only home to which the clones can spiritually return: “all the students who’d grown up with me and were now spread across the country, carers and donors, all separated now but still somehow linked by the place we’d come from” (208). But this does not mean Hailsham has ever been a home for the clones—not home as in the physical house of dwelling, but rather home as “[a] refuge, a sanctuary; a place or region to which one naturally belongs or where one feels a tease” (*OED*, s.v. “home.”). Just as Kathy sees Hailsham relatively to her own experiences there, everyone sees their own version of Hailsham in accordance to their personal memory. Despite this, however, Hailsham was never the clones’ home regardless of

their perception of it as the root of their existence, because the clones' mode of existence is placeless and foreign. They do not belong anywhere naturally, as their existence is neither natural nor rooted. They exist for the other, and only for the human Other in coincidence. Since their essence is foreign and placeless, there can be no place that is home. Knowing this somewhere in the back of their minds, the clones happily inhabit a dream: "Maybe from as early as when you're five or six, there's been a whisper going at the back of your head, saying: 'One day, maybe not so long from now, you'll get to know how it feels.' So you're waiting, even if you don't quite know it, waiting for the moment when you realise that you really are different from [the humans]" (36). Hailsham can only be accessed by the clones in the dream-like state despite it being an essential part of the construction of a world for Kathy. And indeed, the notion of Hailsham as their root is nothing but a dream. Insofar as the foreigner is defined, legally and conceptually, as a foreigner within the borders, they are never truly 'home' in any physical place.

As such, Hailsham becomes the place upon which dreams are projected, but never realized. This is further revealed in Miss Emily talking about Miss Lucy, a former guardian at Hailsham when Kathy and Tommy were there:

[Lucy Wainright] thought you students had to be made more aware. More aware of what lay ahead of you, who you were, what you were for. She believed you should be given as full a picture as possible. That to do anything less would be somehow to cheat you.

[...]

Lucy Wainright was idealistic, nothing wrong with that. But she had no grasp of practicalities. You see, we were able to give you something, something which even now no one will ever take from you, and we were able to do that principally by *sheltering* you. Hailsham would not have been Hailsham if we hadn't. Very well, sometimes that meant we kept things from you, lied to you. Yes, in many ways we *fooled* you. I suppose you could even call it that. But we sheltered you during those years, and we gave you your childhoods. Lucy was well-meaning enough. But if she'd had her way, your happiness at Hailsham would have been shattered. Look at you both now! I'm so proud to see you both. You built your lives on what we gave you. You wouldn't be who you are today if we'd not protected you. (262-263)

Although ironically it is this confrontation between Kathy and Tommy, and Miss Emily and

Madame which shatters all hopes of the future, the dream of Hailsham was provided to “shelter” the clones from brutal reality. Thus, the two attitudes which Ruth and Tommy represent in talking about deferrals are shown to apply not just as a presentation of Hailsham to non, ex-Hailsham students, but to Hailsham students as well, but with one crucial difference. Whereas Ruth does not deny the hope of deferrals out of compassion of sharing the same fate, and Tommy denies having heard of deferrals out of the wish to not have to donate his personal past, at the least to other clones, Miss Emily and Miss Lucy come across condescendingly, as humans cultivating the clones. In a sense of selfish heroism, which I will discuss later, they argue about whether to maintain or pop the clones’ bubble in their role as supreme beings who know what is best for the foreign other, having created their very being through various mechanisms of society, such as law. Miss Emily and Miss Lucy, though they may be well intentioned, claim a controlling, eternal parenthood over the clones, benevolent prison wardens who nonetheless gaze at the clones inhumanely.

Because much of the novel depicts the clones’ world, the entirety of the human world remains unclear throughout most of the book. However, one of the few, crucial glimpses the reader sees of the world of humans in the novel arises when Kathy and Tommy go to apply for deferrals, in middle of a conversation, when Miss Emily answers Kathy’s question, “why people would want students treated so badly in the first place” (257):

From your perspective today, Kathy, your bemusement is perfectly reasonable. But you must try and see it historically. After the war, in the early fifties, when the great breakthroughs in science followed one after the other so rapidly, there wasn’t time to take stock, to ask the sensible questions. Suddenly there were all these new possibilities laid before us, all these ways to cure so many previously incurable conditions. This was what the world noticed the most, wanted the most [...] 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 [...] However uncomfortable people were about your existence, their overwhelming concern was that their own children, their spouses, their parents, their friends, did not die from cancer, motor neurone disease, heart disease. So for a long time you were kept in the shadows, and people did their best not to think about you. And if they did, they tried to convince themselves you weren't really like us. That you were less than human, so it didn't matter. (257, 258 italics in original).

Miss Emily's speech reveals not only the history of the clones, but also the attempt at constructing an impenetrable border by the humans against the clones. However, not only could humans see humanity in the clones; they had to "tr[y] to convince themselves [clones] weren't really like [humans]" or keep the clones out of sight not to recognize this. In fact, as Miss Emily claims, "there *were* arguments" about whether cloning technology should be kept intact after a certain period of time had passed since the invention of cloning technology. As such, Miss Emily's claim that "there was no way to reverse the process" is not actually true, for there was at least one point on which return could be conceived: ethics. What Miss Emily's speech also reveals is that cloning is an ethical problem that needs a solution: to stop cloning or silence ethics. Humans have to convince themselves that clones are non-human a priori. Otherwise, they would have to admit that the world they live in, where the foreign others become dehumanized to perform inhumane acts on them, is ethically flawed.

Miss Emily's speech about the Morningdale Scandal which follows the answer to Kathy's question reveals this point further. The Morningdale Scandal is the name of an incident where a scientist, James Morningdale, was caught trying to create super-humans:

[James Morningdale] carried on his work in a remote part of Scotland, where I suppose he thought he'd attract less attention. What he wanted was to offer people the possibility of having children with enhanced characteristics. Superior intelligence, superior athleticism, that sort of thing. Of course, there'd been others with similar ambitions, but this Morningdale fellow, he'd taken his research much further than anyone before him, far beyond legal boundaries. (258)

While Dr. Frankenstein did not intend to create a super-human but rather to reanimate the dead,

the reader is reminded of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* in this scene, as Victor Frankenstein's failure to create the female counterpart of the Creature also takes place in a remote part of Scotland. The imagined nature of both the creature in *Frankenstein* and the super-clones in *Never Let Me Go*, which are yet to be actualized, is hostility. The readers can easily see the mirror-function of such imaginations. The malice humans see in such 'threats' seems to reflect the desire of the dominating attitude toward the other, who is seen as either an enemy to exterminate or an entity to exploit, and becomes legally formed accordingly.

Nonetheless, in response to Morningdale's research, fear arose among humans that cloning technology possessed the ability to create super-humans, and institutions such as Hailsham had to be shut down. The fear of the foreign clones as super-human became a distinct threat to the concept of humanity, whereas the status quo that was and had to be in place within the world was that clones were objects, which would assure that clones were less-than-human and thus would be under human control. The ill treatment of the foreign being is an ethical problem; thus, an underclass is constructed to justify exploitation. The status quo is revealed to be an action taken, rather than an objective description. Thus, even the equally human clone puts the status quo and morals into question, as the recognition that the clones possess humanity would force humans to see their organs as belonging to other bodies, rather than their own, and render society unethical. Their inhumane acts would have to be acknowledged once the humanity of the foreigner become visible. To say that "[t]he world didn't want to be reminded" of the existence of the clones implies the exclusion of the clones from this "world" to which Miss Emily, who represents the view of humans in the novel's world in sum, here refers. In other words, humans do not see the clones as part of their world, and "to be reminded" of the existence of the clones, let alone having to "think about" them, is clearly a problem in itself, for that

possibility is what put a stop to the Hailsham project. This response is not unique to the novel. The threat of the foreigner, as revealed in the hostile antagonism of anti-immigration policy based on the dread of losing jobs, can be phrased in a similar way: as the act of excluding foreigners from one's "world" in which they are already configured as mere labor, rather than human beings. It is not the inhumane acts themselves which threaten to be revealed, but the fundamental dehumanization that allows for inhumane acts that seems to surface, threatening the conditions of the possibility required for the inhumane acts to occur.

The conclusion that the novel's world reaches is that clones do not need to be humanized at all: "It's one thing to create students, such as yourselves, for the donation programme. But a generation of created children who'd take [humans'] place in society? Children demonstrably *superior* to the rest of [humanity]? Oh no. That frightened people" (259, italics in original). Much as one consciously or subconsciously avoids thinking about where the meat in the supermarket came from, humans in the novel "preferred to believe these organs appeared from nowhere, or at most that they grew in a kind of vacuum" (257), especially if seeing reality meant having to see the clones as equal or superhuman, and think about clones co-existing with, let alone replacing, humans.

But [a suspicion of the foreigner surpassing the native] also provokes regressive and protectionist rage in [natives]: must we not stick together, remain among ourselves, expel the intruder, or at least, keep him in "his" place? The "master" then changes into a slave hounding his conqueror. For the foreigner perceived as an invader reveals a buried passion within those who are entrenched: the passion to kill the *other*, who had first been feared or despised, then promoted from the ranks of dregs to the status of powerful persecutor against whom a "we" solidifies in order to take revenge. (Kristeva 20)

The relationship between the clones and humans much resembles the foreigner and native dynamic Kristeva describes. Kristeva writes this in discussing the destabilization of the conscience of the native as a native, their native identity threatened in the face of the foreigner

with whom they feel an identification. The threat of the foreigner lies in their destabilization of nativeness, in the act of seeing the foreigner in themselves: “[e]very native feels himself to be more or less a ‘foreigner’ in his ‘own and proper’ place, and that metaphorical value of the ‘foreigner’ first leads the citizen to a feeling of discomfort as to his sexual, national, political, professional identity” (Kristeva 19). The threat of the foreigner is the recognition of their equally human quality. The clones, which perfectly resemble humans, forcefully put the humans’ own humanity into question upon deeming them “less than human” (*NLMG* 258). Humans find themselves asking: what makes me human, that can rule out the clones? Unable to find a satisfying answer, the inferiority of clones is thus forcefully assigned, or their existence is dismissed altogether: “So for a long time you were kept in the shadows, and people did their best not to think about you. And if they did, they tried to convince themselves you weren’t really like us. That you were less than human, so it didn’t matter” (258). “More importantly, we demonstrated to the world that if students were reared in humane, cultivated environments, it was possible for them to grow to be as sensitive and intelligent as any ordinary human being” (256): this was the project of Hailsham, and, perhaps ironically, it was Hailsham that realized the threat of the foreigner and thus destabilized the humanity of humans. The belief revealed here is that the ‘other’ can only be one of the two: an inferior, exploitable entity, or an enemy that must be dealt with, for otherwise the threat will be realized, putting at crisis the natives’ own humanity.

Furthermore, as Miss Emily notes, the Morningdale incident was not the only reason why institutions like Hailsham had to be shut down: “The world didn’t want to be reminded how the donation programme really worked. They didn’t want to think about you students, or about the conditions you were brought up in. In other words, my dears, they wanted you back in the shadows” (259). After all, the question for humans in the novel is not the treatment of the clones,

but how to harvest organs without thinking about the clones. The gaze is inhumane from the start. The difference in the use of the word “people” by Kathy and Miss Emily in the following passages exemplifies this attitude:

Kathy: “‘But what I don’t understand,’ [Kathy] said, ‘is why people would want students treated so badly in the first place’”; “Madame never liked us. She’s always been afraid of us, In the way people are afraid of spiders and things” (263).

Miss Emily: “And for a long time, people preferred to believe these organs appeared from nowhere” (257); “So for a long time you were kept in the shadows, and people did their best not to think about you. And if they did, they tried to convince themselves you weren’t really like us. That you were less than human, so it didn’t matter” (258).

While neither Kathy nor Miss Emily uses the word in an incorrect way, the population which the word refers to differ crucially, reflecting the speakers’ divergent definitions of “people”, and thus, their views on who is human. Nancy writes: “‘People’ clearly states that we are all precisely *people*, that is, distinctly persons, humans, all of a common ‘kind,’ but of a kind that has its existence only as numerous, dispersed, and indeterminate in its generality” (*Being* 7). In Kathy’s case, the use of “people” in the example above reflects her own perspective on the treatment of the clones, and her own reaction towards spiders, a sign of inclusion of clones in “people”. And how can she not include herself in “people”? For she experiences the world through her own perceptions. Her fear foregrounds recomposing Madame’s fear, which leads her to expect the shared incomprehensibility of the violence against the clones. In addition, her narrative, a reflection of how she sees herself, has lead the reader to see the clones as human. As such, Kathy’s use of “people” refers to both clones and humans, reflecting the humane insight she possesses.

Whereas Miss Emily’s usage of “people” refers to humans exclusively, not the clones—the clones obviously could not “believe these organs appeared from nowhere” since they came from their own bodies, nor could they keep their own existence in the shadows or perceive

themselves as less than human in existence.

[Miss Emily] paused, and Tommy and [Kathy] exchanged glances for the first time in ages. Then I asked:

‘Why did you have to prove a thing like that, Miss Emily? Did someone think we didn’t have souls?’ (255)

While knowing that they exist for their organs only, as in the passage above, Kathy and Tommy do not see that making them less than human. Naturally, like other humans, they have souls too. However, even humans like Miss Emily, who fights for more humane treatment of the clones, completely deny the humanity of the clones. Consequently, nothing in the novel’s world exists for the clones themselves, but rather for the humans to exploit the clones to the limit: Hailsham becomes a sentimental farm rather than a home, the ‘recovery’ center exists for the recovery of humans using clones, and the words ‘people’ and ‘human’ ultimately exclude clones as life which deserves respect by definition. In Miss Emily’s worldview, the treatment of the foreign other is measured ultimately in their utility for the natives, not in the face of their humanity.

The decision made by humanity in the novel’s world is to silence ethics and to keep the clones as inferior beings. In other words, the cloning project is revealed to be the making of a border between us and them, with a constant effort to maintain it as impenetrable in order to keep on fatally exploiting the non-human clones for the benefit of humanity. Following the opening and closing of Hailsham reveals this project in its entirety. According to Miss Emily’s explanation of history, it was after realizing “it was too late...to reverse the process” (257) of cloning that “our little movement came along” (258); the movement to “demonstrat[e] 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” (256). This was how institutions like Hailsham came to be: out of a desire to allow clones to live “good lives” that are “educated and cultured” (256), although nothing more than this. Then, with the realization of the

possibility of clones replacing or living like humans, which was hinted at by both institutions like Hailsham and the Morningdale Scandal, ethical treatment of the clones was taken out of the equation. In short, the opening and closing of Hailsham represents the shifting motivations of the humans in the novel, fluctuating between guilt (surrounding the ethical problems of cloning) and fear (of the threat the clones possess). Thus, even for the likes of Miss Emily and Madame, it was never about the clones, but the humans' feelings in relation to the clones. They have always gazed at the foreign existences inhumanely, and built the system upon the projected inhumanity.

Let us return to an earlier reference to the idea that Hailsham functions as a kind of cyclosporin, suppressing foreignness as a disease that needs to be dealt with somehow. While the effect of the cyclosporin seems to have functioned for the clones and readers in realizing the clones' bleak future, the cyclosporin in this light also has functioned for the humans in the novel as helping them deal with their guilt about silencing ethics. In other words, Hailsham suppresses the ethical question that problematizes dehumanizing the clones, and the rejection that comes from realizing that the transplanted organs in fact do not belong to humans in the novel, but to the clones. Foreignness becomes a disease, not because of something inherent to foreignness, but because it is pathologized by the inhuman gaze directed toward the foreigner. The technological, inhuman relationship that the humans in the novel establish causes a violent reaction that needs to be violently silenced, creating a situation where humans then use more technology, i.e. Hailsham and other institutions that work like cyclosporin, to live on a daily basis. The guilt never disappears, but can only ever be silenced and ignored. The technological relationship thus takes the humans further away from humanity, dehumanizing themselves rapidly such that they can no longer live in mere human bodies, but must constantly numb themselves, addicted to cyclosporin. As I mentioned earlier, cyclosporin quells not natural diseases, but natural human

reactions to something foreign entering the body. Xenophobia, the reaction to foreignness, occurs not because of a fundamental disagreement between natives and foreigners, but because the native treats the foreigner inhumanely.

Palumbo-Liu uses this metaphor of the cyclosporin to point out how the conception of individuality has been radically altered with the introduction of the medicine, such that the uniqueness of individuality comes into question, and thus writes:

Thanks to modern technologies of medicine, we have come the distance from unimpeachable individual specificity to wide-open interchangeability. And it should be clear by now that throughout these meditations on the distinct, unique, and nontransferable properties of individual bodies is a corollary ontological value pertaining to the notion of individual identity as something inherent, unchanging, and non-transferable. (100)

Organ transplant technology and cyclosporin have indeed made human bodies interchangeable, but this cannot be accepted as a new conception of ontology; it reveals the inhumane interactions of the world today. What cyclosporin makes available is the extraction of body parts from others, and appropriating it to fit another's body. Cyclosporin is an immune *suppression* drug, not a cure for a disease. It is a way of dealing with the humane rejection of seeing the self and other as interchangeable, a rejection of visualizing and conceptualizing one's body as belonging to somebody other than one's self. Palumbo-Liu argues that "advances in medical technology have created another kind of human community, one framed precisely by operationalization" (102), which he seems to describe but not criticize. Yet, this description misses the fundamental gaze which deems the other objectifiable. Although he acknowledges how in the case of *Never Let Me Go*, "the very possibility of delivering otherness delivers to the donor a death sentence, and to the receiver a morally contaminated, albeit extended, existence" (102), and calls the system "decidedly *unsocial* and *indecent* bioeconomics" (131-132), Hailsham as cyclosporin does not suppress this guilt arising from the violent system directly. Hailsham suppresses the rejection of

inequality and dehumanization, which gives rise to such a system founded upon extraction and inhumane acts from a legally inhuman body. In other words, while guilt arises from the “*unsocial* and *indecent* bioeconomics” which establishes this human community based on “operationalization” as Palumbo-Liu identifies, the initial conception of this community is the availability of an inhuman gaze, of seeing the other as less human than the self. The biotechnological relationship roots itself in the creation of a class system, and the clones are a group of people designed to become the perpetual underclass to mitigate the humane rejection of organ transplants. As such, Hailsham is only a part of the cyclosporin; cloning technology itself is the cyclosporin that allows the humans in the novel to suppress ethics in seeing other humans as objectifiable.

Thus, in its totality of the humans’ and clones’ worlds, a sad but curiously self-affirming world takes shape: “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” (267). Madame says this in reference to a moment back at Hailsham when she saw Kathy dancing to the song “Never Let Me Go” by Judy Bridgewater, hugging a pillow as an imaginary baby to her breast. The contrast in what Madame saw against Kathy’s imagination functions as a distinction between their individual world-views. Kathy imagines “a woman who’d been told she couldn’t have babies, who’d really, really wanted them all her life. Then there’s a sort of miracle and she has a baby, and she holds this baby very close to her and walks around singing: ‘Baby, never let me go...’ partly because she’s so happy, but also because she’s so afraid something will happen, that the baby will get ill or be taken away

from her” (70). Although Kathy says “there was no way I’d known [that she also could not have babies] properly back then”, Tommy infers that “[i]t’s just possible I’d somehow picked up the idea when I was younger without fully registering it” (72). Accepting this reasoning, the scene becomes indicative of possibility. As with their embrace of the idea of ‘possibles’, even in the face of their certain death, the clones project their life forward, living their life to the fullest of their abilities in their fate-bound state. Madame, on the other hand, sees in Kathy’s dance an advancing world framing a static person whose eyes are closed, refusing to perceive anything when faced with her ill fate. The figure of the girl who arises from the song and dance is thus given two similar yet differing personas: both are fated beyond their control, but one is progressive while the other is regressive in her future outlook.

The reader cannot forget, however, that this is a world which consciously puts effort into disregarding our narrator’s humanity, which the reader cannot help but see. In her interpretation of Kathy’s dance to the Bridgewater song, Madame seems to intentionally expand, even alienate, the significance of the dance from Kathy in that the particularity of Kathy’s clone-ness is not directly referenced:

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. That is what I saw. It wasn’t really you, what you were doing, I know that. But I saw you and it broke my heart.

[...]

She looked now to Tommy, then back at me. ‘Poor creatures.’ (267).

Seeing Kathy dancing, Madame instantly ejects Kathy-as-individual out of the picture, substituting ‘a little girl’ who could be any little girl. Then, breaking out of her reminiscence and facing the clones in front her, she does not see them as humans but as “‘poor creatures.’” While readers can read dehumanization into Kathy’s imagined significance of the dance as well, Kathy, when she imagines this situation initially, is not as knowledgeable of the reality of her future

(that she cannot have babies) as is Madame. “Even at the time, I realised this couldn’t be right, that this interpretation didn’t fit with the rest of the lyrics. But that wasn’t an issue with me. The song was about what *I said*” (70, italics added): Kathy role-plays a woman she imagines, an avatar of herself, perhaps like a possible. Kathy does not eject herself from the picture because she does not see herself; she sees the avatar she has created. Kathy injects herself into a foreign avatar, whether out of subconscious sympathy or out of coincidence, but Madame replaces Kathy with the anonymous figure of a ““little girl,””—that is, a nobody—and in so doing, she refuses to see the burden placed on the clones specifically. In short, this difference exemplifies the irresponsibility humans within the novel display towards the lives of others, for the performance of the perpetrators pitying the victims, even if the pity brings them to tears, is nothing but irresponsible, and at best, sentimental towards alien existences that ultimately do not matter to their lives.

The battle fought by people like Madame was not a fight for the clones, but against their own guilt as they grappled with how to inhumanely treat the clones. Never a challenge to the perpetrator-victim power dynamic, Madame’s pity is a violence through different means. Expanding what she sees in Kathy’s dance to the broader context of the world in general flattens the particular violence of the circumstance against the particular individual(s): that in the “old kind world”, the clones did not exist, and in the “harsh, cruel world” the clones exist as commodities. The two worlds envisioned by Madame reflect Nancy’s perception of the world: “The co-implication of existing [*l’exister*] is the sharing of the world. A world is not something external to existence; it is not an extrinsic addition to other existences; the world is the coexistence that puts these existences together” (*Being* 29). The world thus acts upon the clones in the mode of dehumanization as a consensus of coexisting humans. In addition to observing the

clones living their life to the fullest, the reader also sees the humans' absolute neglect of the clones' existence. Human operation, in such a world, fundamentally requires an underclass that they can exploit free of guilt. Indeed, as Madame says, the world is harsh and cruel, but this does not describe the foreigner's world; it reflects the inhumanity of the humans.

In response to an interview question about readers' reactions to his novel, Ishiguro poses two semi-overlapping readings of the text:

“This is a very sad novel, but there was something also quite affirming in it, because the characters are so decent. But, it's terribly sad.” That response is probably closest to what I was trying to get at. You know, the fact is, yes, we will all fade away and die, but people can find the energy to create little pockets of happiness and decency while we're here. I'm probably less excited when people come and say, “Oh this is a chilling warning about the way we're going with cloning and biotechnology.” That's fine, I'm perfectly open to people reading it that way, but if that's all they've got out of it, then I feel that the inner heart of the book has been missed. (*Conversations*, 202)

In looking at the textual world through the lens of foreignness or layers of different worlds, reading *Never Let Me Go* as a text of scientific warning seems to place us awfully close to Miss Emily, as our worry in that reading becomes a worry not about the ill treatment within the novel, but about the frightening future ahead of us by which the reader him/herself may be directly affected. In other words, the purely scientific reading of the text re-victimizes the clones within the novel by rejecting their desperate attempt to live their lives to the fullest within their given life span.

Yet where can the readers find “little pockets of happiness” in the novel which is, to say the least, “very sad”? While Ishiguro's imagined reader finds it in the decency of the characters, and I agree one can find this in the novel, one can also find affirmation of life in the world constructed from the singular-plural being as a clone. In other words, the pocket of happiness exists in the way the clones affirm each other's existence within their world. For despite the multiple conflicts between Ruth and Kathy within the novel, and the fact that Ruth prevents

Tommy and Kathy from being in a romantic relationship until the end of the novel and Tommy's life, neither Kathy nor Tommy displays hatred towards Ruth. And the affirming relationship between Kathy and Tommy exists without question. Thus, despite the fact that the novel's world deprives the clones of almost every aspect of life, including life itself, and makes those aspects foreign to the clones, the relationships which they construct with each other in their coincidental life is the one thing of which they cannot be deprived. While the clones may be foreign from everywhere, placeless and alone, the foreigner's home can be founded in these relationships. Hailsham, in the minds of Kathy, Tommy, and Ruth, is dream-like because the significance of Hailsham lies in the intangible aspects of it. The magic of Hailsham lies not in its physical institution or geography, but in the relationships the clones formed there. Thus, Hailsham may be a dream but the happiness is not; the relationship of the community exists, even if intangibly *like* a dream. Thus, Kathy is "not really interested in seeing it, whatever way it is now" (280). They may still be foreigners, but within themselves they can regard each other with humane insight and create a space of happiness that treats each other as human, rather than as sacrifices for the operation of the societal machine.

As such, like the reader, the clones cannot help but see humanity in each other; hence, even though they know they are clones, they cannot stop themselves from talking about "what it would feel like if we became actors" (79) and imagine possibilities such as the possibles or of deferrals in the face of reality. The clones, in seeing each other's humanity, are the only ones who affirm each other as complete beings, for even the people like Miss Emily do not see the clones as fully human: "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" (256, italics added for emphasis).

'I keep thinking about this river somewhere, with the water moving really fast. And these two people in the water, trying to hold onto each other, holding on as hard as they can, but in the end it's just too much. The current's too strong. They've got to let go, drift apart. That's how I think it is with us. It's a shame, Kath, because we've loved each other all our lives. But in the end, we can't stay together forever.' (277)

This speech by Tommy, which resembles the earlier quotation by Madame spoken when she sees Kathy dancing at Hailsham in which she sees "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" (267), sadly encapsulates the clones' affirmation of each other which Madame does not. Unlike Madame who sees a girl holding on to the world alone, Tommy sees two people holding each other. While they speak these lines in different situations and contexts, one can say the same of Kathy's image of a woman holding a baby close to her. In both Tommy and Kathy's vision, they are not in solitude but with another. As Tommy describes, despite everything moving past rapidly and forcefully outside of their control, eventually separating the two from each other, the clones nonetheless share the moments they have had together. Despite that "[t]hey've got to let go", "[they've] loved each other all [their] lives" (277) undeniably: despite the violent current, Kathy and Tommy managed to realize their love for each other. So, while the world within the novel might not love them, they can love each other, and there lies the happiness which the reader cannot neglect to see. Even if their lives were a mere coincidence, their love for each other has nonetheless existed. For the reader, this pocket of happiness which readers can locate becomes our tool to criticize and break off from the radically technological relationship that has been constructed between us and the other, where the other is regarded with inhumane gaze that sees them in the work they do for us, rather than as a fully authentic individual.

Returning to John Freeman's interview with Ishiguro in which Freeman describes the

novel as “imagin[ing] a world in which genetic cloning—not nuclear technology—turns out to be the defining science of the twentieth century” (196), the premise presupposed in this useful description is a techno-central perspective. Technology, as I have mentioned earlier, has come to define relations to the foreign in both reality and the novel. To go back to recent world history, the Cold War era was the historical period in which relations to the foreign other became technologically defined: the U.S. or the Soviet Union; capitalism or communism; ally or enemy. While the choice was between two political systems, the binary conflict was possible only because both sides possessed nuclear arms. For in the era of nuclear technology, there was no chance of winning against a country with nuclear arms if the nation did not possess it themselves. Such a relationship came back into prominent view with North Korea’s public announcement that it possessed nuclear weapons in 2005<sup>5</sup>, the year of the publication of *Never Let Me Go*, the rise of North Korea as a intercontinental nuclear arms wielder, and Russia’s declaration that it had successful invented a new missile (that can carry nuclear warheads)<sup>6</sup> in 2018. Symbolic significance precedes the humanity of the other; the foreign other can only be seen in terms of the role they play in regard to the nation’s laws. Thus, foreigners are either enemies existing outside the borders, or immigrants that have internalized the dehumanization and harsh self-discipline within the borders.

Of course, nuclear technology is not the only technology that defines our relationship to the foreign other today, as organ transplantation and the creation of organs to transplant from stem cells are also a reality in our world. Palumbo-Liu describes organ transplantation as “the most unflinching instance of the delivery of a part of another’s body into our own” (97) where “cyclosporin becomes the chemical of tolerance, one which enables doctors to manage the

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/feb/10/northkorea>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/03/01/putin-new-russia-missile-nuclear.html>

immune system and selectively accommodate the foreign, or quell ‘xenophobia’” (99). With the rise of such medical technology, our relation to the foreign other becomes fundamentally altered. For example, while one may not consider whether their friend’s organs are compatible with their own on a daily basis, this nonetheless becomes a defining relation to the other: is my friend compatible with me as a replacement for my failed organs? This perception of the other-as-my-future-organ, despite how little one wishes this comes to be the case, has become a possibility in the future ever since the advent of organ transplantation.

Palumbo-Liu analyzes the operation of the organ transplant articulately in relation to Nancy’s ontology, that “Being is not the Other, but the origin is the punctual and discrete spacing *between us*, as *between us and the rest of the world*, as *between all beings*” (*Being* 19):

On the one hand, one could say that the instance of the transplant negates the positive assertions we find throughout Nancy’s writing on being and otherness, that it points us to a new historical moment wherein bodies are inscribed and fused (for the sake of their very survival) within a community of science, technology, and the particular values that operationalize the heart in their service. On the other hand, it is possible to argue that this opening up to receive the other, and the subsequent re-relation of singularities, the radical upsetting of a sense of separateness, exemplify instead the perfect realization of Nancy’s ontology, that the technologically affected “fusion” actually only reverses the self-other relation and accentuates their mutual identity within the interstitial space of indeterminate ownership of the heart. (Palumbo-Liu 107)

In the eyes of Nancy, Being is singular/plural, and this cannot be separated from each other in that Being is necessarily both at the same time, existing with, even in, each other rather than individuals collectively. However, as Palumbo-Liu explains, the technological advancement in the field of medical sciences have radically altered our relation to the other, for either way one’s relation to the other cannot stay the same as pre-organ transplantation. And undeniably so since, as Palumbo-Liu writes, “where does one stop, and the other begin?” (108), when “the very condition on which the donor ‘gave’ his heart was the condition of his death” (108). In thinking about ontology in terms of *Being Singular Plural*, this physical fusion is either denied by the

breaking of the divide between the singular among the plural, or made extreme in the sense that the other exists, both physically and ontologically, within the utmost proximity as singular and plural simultaneously. In other words, the other either becomes a technological, medical symbol, as in the case of the heart (or whatever organ is to be transplanted), or it becomes as proximate as possible in physicality, through the fusion of one and the other in one body. While Palumbo-Liu sees the latter as an affirmation of Nancy's ontology, I believe both of the possibilities which Palumbo-Liu outlines negate Nancy's ontology precisely because in either case, our relation to the other has become technological in its operation. The former objectifies, and the latter is a Frankensteinian creation of a chimera in which the distance between the self and other as two singularities within the singular/plural dynamic has become eradicated.

In other words—and this is the warning I see in *Never Let Me Go*—the essentially technological relation of I and you lacks the “pocket of happiness” that is created, as with Kathy, Tommy, and Ruth, in that space between I and you. I agree with Nancy in his perspective on ontology that:

ontology must support both the sphere of “nature” and sphere of “history,” as well as both the “human” and the “nonhuman”; it must be an ontology for the world, for everyone—and if I can be so bold, it has to be an ontology for each and every one and for the world “as a totality,” and nothing short of the whole world, since this is all there is (but, in this way, there is *all*). (*Being*, 53-54)

Insofar as ontology should be “for the world ‘as a totality’” rather than a chimeric “one” which fuses all and everything, the ultimatum of the physical fusion between the self and other, the space between self and other needs to be in this collective. As such the technological intervention which eradicates this space puts happiness in crisis, as a physical technological invention or a system which sees its members only as parts of the larger mechanism.

Can we then find a way to save lives—for organ transplantations do save lives—while

maintaining this pocket of happiness? Or should life not be extended beyond its limits at the cost of the other? Does creating organs without a living body to harvest them from, such as from stem cells, solve this issue? Nancy writes:

Community is revealed in the death of others; hence it is always revealed to others. Community is what takes place through others and for others. It is not a space of the *egos*—subjects and substances that are at bottom immortal—but of the *I*'s who are always *others* (or else are nothing). If community is revealed in the death of others it is because death itself is the true community of *I*'s that are not *egos*. It is not a communion that fuses the *egos* into an *Ego* or a higher *We*. It is the community of *others*. The genuine community of mortal beings, or death as community, establishes their impossible communion. Community therefore occupies a singular place: it assumes the impossibility of its own immanence, the impossibility of community... A community is the presentation to its members of their mortal truth (which amounts to saying that there is no community of immortal beings: one can imagine either a society or a communion of immortal beings, but not a community). It is the presentation of the finitude and the irredeemable excess that make up finite being: its death, but also its birth, and only the community can present me my birth, and along with it the impossibility of my reliving it, as well as the impossibility of my crossing over into my death. (*The Inoperative Community* henceforth *Community*, 15)

We live through the death of others, and the death of the self. While I do not wish to glorify death as it can often be violent and unjust, I disagree with the drive towards immortality in that it negates life. A person should be able to live their full life, but a full life means a start and end defined. Healthy and unharmed, yes, but infinity cannot be full. I believe our relationship with the other becomes ever so meaningful in the face of death, and a full life can be without the technological redefinition of our relationship with the other.

In revisiting the concept of deferrals, and the difference between Ruth and Tommy, readers can see the importance of death in the creation of a community. Both Ruth's and Tommy's attitude towards affirming and rejecting the myth of deferrals arises from their reaction to the forced sacrifice of their lives, which is their fate. Despite all the conflicts Ruth causes among the three of them, both Kathy and Tommy acknowledge her Ruthful-ness: "as Tommy said, she wanted the best for us at the end, and though she said that day in the car I'd never

forgive her ... I've got no anger left for her now" (279). Although perhaps mistaken upon reflection, the self-sacrifice of Ruth nonetheless lays the foundation for Kathy and Tommy's relationship. For while it was Ruth who then kept them apart, it was also Ruth who wished Kathy to be Tommy's carer and provided the address to Madame's house. In the face of her fate, Ruth chooses to sacrifice herself for the community, and especially for her two friends.

Tommy's refusal to donate any further represents the other side of life, the desire to live. Realized in the face of his inevitable death in seeing the other clones' fates, Tommy is the one to attempt a deferral with Kathy. While the deferral is not realized, the attempt seems to offer Tommy and Kathy the chance to say everything they have held in their hearts to each other. As Nancy writes, "community is revealed in the death of others [and] ... takes place through others and for others" (*Community* 15): the love between the two, a closely-knit community, is realized in this resistance to the death of the others, and eventually the self. This love between the two finds itself upon Ruth's life, and regarding Ruth's sacrifice with humane insight allows Tommy and Kathy to see it as an act of love rather than a mechanical act, differentiated from sacrifice within the humans' world. Both relationships of care for the other and the self, embodied by Ruth and Tommy, sprout from the realization of death.

Returning finally to a closer analysis of the use of "people" by Kathy in reference to both clones and humans in the novel exhibits another aspect of how the clones see themselves. "People" clearly states that we are all precisely *people*, that is, distinctly persons, humans, all of a common 'kind,' but of a kind that has its existence only as numerous, dispersed, and indeterminate in its generality" (*Being* 7): Kathy's reference to the clone community as, at least, a part of 'people' reflects her humane insight into the diversity within the clone community, a non-uniformity that is yet tied with a commonality. Despite the humans' attempts to seal away

the clones in the shadows as uniform, medical objects, Kathy's narrative resists this on every level: "I'd spoken to Madame, but I could sense Tommy shifting next to me, and was aware of the texture of his clothes, of everything about him" (266). While talking to Madame about having seen Kathy dancing to Bridgewater's "Never Let Me Go," Kathy touches Tommy. The touch reminds the reader both of the clones' plurality (Kathy is *with* Tommy) and of Kathy's singularity (she can touch Tommy as another being).

As Nancy writes in regards of touch:

The touch of meaning brings into play [*engager*] its own singularity, its distinction, and brings into play the plurality of the "each time" of every touch of meaning, "mine" as well as all the others, each one of which is "mine" *in turn*, according to the singular turn of its affirmation. (*Being* 6)

While Tommy does hear about the scene in which Madame cries while seeing Kathy dancing, he is quiet during the conversation between Kathy and Madame, but stands together with her. The clones have their own stories to tell, which they share with one another. "All this time, I never told a single soul" (280): Tommy says this to Kathy before they part as donor and carer, recounting an imagination of "splashing through water" when he scored a goal in a football game back at Hailsham as he ran back to his team. The souls have their own narratives, standing in singularity while existing in plurality. "Did someone think we didn't have souls?" (255) Kathy rightly asks this, for they touch each other: they feel each other, as independent, foreign souls existing together with one another in a community. In their community that is deemed 'foreign' and 'non-human,' comprised of beings made foreign from everything but themselves, they find themselves in their togetherness.

I was talking to one of my donors a few days ago who was complaining about how memories, even your most precious ones, fade surprisingly quickly. But I don't go along with that. The memories I value most, I don't see them ever fading. I lost Ruth, then I lost Tommy, but I won't lose my memories of them.  
[...]

[T]he chances are I won't ever come across [Hailsham] now, and on reflection, I'm glad that's the way it'll be. It's like my memories of Tommy and of Ruth. Once I'm able to have a quieter life, in whichever centre they send me to, I'll have Hailsham with me, safely in my head, and that'll be something no one can take away. (280-281)

Who is Kathy narrating everything to? Maybe it is the reader, but one never learns the answer.

But someone is listening to her; someone has inherited the memory. And the memories live on in the form of the text. Accuracy is not the question here but, rather, experience. The memory is the experience of the person, necessarily reflecting themselves in relation to the “the world ‘as a totality,’ and nothing short of the whole world, since this is all there is (but, in this way, there is *all*)” (*Being*, 54). *Never Let Me Go*, a title to which readers see points of reference multiple times throughout the novel, echoes a call for recognition from those placed in the margins and oblivion: exiles made foreign from “history” and from life. Asking, through their pain, to never let the pain they have suffered go unseen and unheard in the violent current of history, to never let go becomes a responsibility for the reader. To never let go necessarily invokes at least two people, who hang on to each other in plea. As Palumbo-Liu suggests, there are multiple ways of being with one another. But this being together is a happiness which everyone has the right to access, and the clones, who have every possible thing donated out of them, provide the reader with the ultimate proof of this right.

## Chapter 2: Toxic Foreignness

In identifying his progression as a writer from his past works to *Never Let Me Go*,

Ishiguro describes a conversation between himself and a reader in the late 1990s in his Nobel

Lecture:

I was speaking before an audience in Tokyo, and a questioner from the floor asked, as is common, what I might work on next. More specifically, the questioner pointed out that my books had often concerned individuals who'd lived through times of great social and political upheaval, and who then looked back over their lives and struggled to come to terms with their darker, more shameful memories. Would my future books, she asked, continue to cover a similar territory?

I found myself giving a quite unprepared answer. Yes, I said, I'd often written about such individuals struggling between forgetting and remembering. But in the future, what I really wished to do was to write a story about how a nation or a community faced these same questions. Does a nation remember and forget in the same way as an individual does? (11)

In my reading of *Never Let Me Go*, I have focused on the ethical relationships that Ishiguro's characters form between themselves. In this chapter I will move in reverse order chronologically, returning to his first published novel from 1982, *A Pale View of Hills*. I will use this novel to examine exactly this question Ishiguro asks more than ten years after the publication of the novel: "Does a nation remember and forget in the same way as an individual does?" for despite the characterization of the novel as "concern[ing] individuals," I argue that the novel does in fact deal with the relationship between a nation and an individual explicitly. Through questioning the construction of a nation, and challenging the notion of nationhood, I will look at how the concept of the "nation" is a concept which rises out of the relationship an individual has with their social context. Thus, I will conceptualize nativeness, and foreignness in direct relation to nativeness, as a personal construct rather than something which one can examine on its own in contrast to individuals, as the conversation above suggests.

As I did in my previous chapter, I will analyze the novel in relation to each of its settings,

specifically England in the 1970s, and Japan in the 1950s. Roughly following the structure of the novel, I will start in England, focusing on the character of Niki, move to Japan, and finally return to Niki and England. As with the start of the novel, Niki will be the entryway into analyzing how foreignness operates in *A Pale View of Hills* since she embodies the foreign(er) as an emigrant and a traveler, but also the exotic object. Furthermore, Niki is haunted by the ghost of Keiko, her half-sister, much like Etsuko, their mother and the protagonist. Both Etsuko and Niki are burdened with a guilt that arises from each of their unique relationship to Keiko. However, not all characters are affected by Keiko's ghost, specifically Niki's father and the English newspaper, which represents the wider British society. Their relationship to Japan and Keiko is best described by Edward Said's concept of Orientalism, where Niki's father and the English society possess what Said calls "flexible *positional* superiority" (7), describing how the West constantly figures itself in a superior position in relation to the Orient.

These relationships resonate with the U.S. military occupation in post-war Japan, the historical context of the scenes of the novel which take place in Japan, in Etsuko's memories. In the work of scholars such as Michiko Takeuchi's "'Pan-Pan Girls' Performing and Resisting Neocolonialism(s) in the Pacific Theater: U.S. Military Prostitution in Occupied Japan, 1945-1952" and Yoshikuni Igarashi's "Bodies of Memory," we can read this occupation operating neocolonially, as a product of the cooperation between U.S. military personnel and the Japanese government. The agreement between the U.S. and Japan was possible not only because their interests matched, but because Japan had been an imperialist country pre-war modelled after Western imperialism. The perception of Japan as a pure, isolationist country is a myth; Japan has been a heterogenous construct, influenced by foreign cultures especially since the 1880s onward. Such a mythical image can be seen in Etsuko's nationalist father-in-law Ogata-San's perception

of Japanese identity, revealing to us how the concept of national identity is a personal belief projected upon one's community. Since foreignness stands in direct relation to national identity, foreignness, too, can be seen as a personal configuration of the world one inhabits. This reveals how foreignness describes the relation one has to the unknown rather than a state in which one finds oneself. I will again be drawing on Julia Kristeva, and also refer to Jacques Derrida to further destabilize the notion of the nation and foreignness. This destabilization means that one can see foreignness as one wishes: both as a threat, as Ogata-San does, and as an alternative opportunity in one's life, like the narrator Etsuko and her doppelgänger friend Sachiko. Yet, as a projection, this latter relationship to the foreign behaves like a dream, becoming disenchanted once one reaches the foreign land itself. Thus, at the end of the novel, Etsuko finds herself occupying a similar social role of the housewife as the one she thought she had escaped in leaving Japan: she becomes configured as a cog in her male partner's life.

Niki is the first name and word which we read in *A Pale View of Hills*, and her character represents many of the central themes the book deals with. As the child born between Etsuko, our protagonist, and her second husband, an Englishman, Niki is a biracial child. After Niki has been introduced, we immediately learn that her sister, Keiko, a daughter born between Etsuko and her first husband Jiro, a Japanese man, has committed suicide, which prompts Niki to visit Etsuko. Niki's visit triggers Etsuko's memories of when she was still in Japan and pregnant with Keiko. These recollections revolve around either her memories of Sachiko, a woman who Etsuko claims to have known, or Ogata-San, her father-in-law whom she had known before she actually married Jiro. She switches between her memories of the past and the present in Britain with Niki in her narrative, and Etsuko seems to lead the readers to read her narrative doubtfully,

contradicting herself sometimes or telling us directly: “Memory, I realize, can be an unreliable thing; often it is heavily coloured by the circumstances in which one remembers, and no doubt this applies to certain of the recollections I have gathered here” (156). Gradually, we start to see that perhaps her stories of Sachiko are stories about Etsuko indirectly, and meditations upon her relationship with Keiko. Niki seems to be the catalyst for this reflection, just like how she starts the novel for us, because “in truth, my two daughters had much in common, much more than my husband would ever admit” (94).

Sachiko had a daughter named Mariko, and although we never meet Mariko’s father, we learn that Sachiko had an American lover who had promised to take her back to the U.S. with him, although it seems obvious he had no real intentions of doing so. Etsuko’s narration of her stories with Sachiko appear to the reader as if Etsuko is telling stories about herself in relation to Keiko through the characters of Sachiko and Mariko, leading us to doubt at times if the two really existed, or are just fictional identities Etsuko fabricates. We even see this doubling between Etsuko and Sachiko in the first few pages of Etsuko’s narration of the past, when she is talking about the neighbor’s reactions to Sachiko:

I heard two women talking at the tram stop, about the woman who had moved into the derelict house by the river. One was explaining to her companion how she had spoken to the woman that morning and had received a clear snub. Her companion agreed the newcomer seemed unfriendly — proud probably. [...]

*It was never my intention to appear unfriendly, but it was probably true that I made no special effort to seem otherwise.* For at that point in my life, I was still wishing to be left alone.

It was with interest then that I listened to those women talking of Sachiko. (12-13, italics added)

Etsuko’s narration in this scene flows from her talking about the neighbors’ discussion about Sachiko to a defense of her own attitude, and immediately back to Sachiko, creating a doubling effect between Sachiko and Etsuko, such that Etsuko defends her own attitude when it is Sachiko

who is being gossiped about. The doubling between Etsuko and Sachiko, which Etsuko herself seems to acknowledge in this scene, invites the reader from here on to read the stories about Sachiko as if they were also stories about Etsuko as well. As the story develops further, eventually coming to the part where Sachiko is preparing to leave to Kobe, a port city in Japan, the mixing of Sachiko and Etsuko, and Mariko and Keiko become clearer, to the extent where, in talking to Mariko about Sachiko and Mariko leaving, Etsuko says “‘In any case,’ I went on, ‘if you don’t like it over there, *we* can always come back’” (173, italics added), sounding as if Etsuko is the one going. That Etsuko sees “[her] own shadow, cast by the lantern, thrown across the wooden slates of the bridge” before she converses with Mariko/Keiko, and how Ishiguro refers to the person Etsuko is talking to in this scene as “the little girl” and “the child” (172-173), not specifically Mariko or Keiko, adds to the merging of Sachiko’s story with Mariko’s, and Etsuko’s story with Keiko’s. While there are some details which are specific to Sachiko or to Etsuko that make them seem like different characters, such as the difference between their destinations overseas, the parallels between them are hard to not see, and Sachiko seems to be a cipher for Etsuko to examine her past without facing up to it directly, only looking at the shadow of her choices.

The first paragraph, which describes how the name Niki was given to her second daughter almost functions like an introduction paragraph to an academic work, signposting the themes which will be discussed, but vague enough so the reader reading the novel for the first time does not understand completely what the book will be about:

Niki, the name we finally gave my younger daughter, is not an abbreviation; it was a compromise I reached with her father. For paradoxically it was he who wanted to give her a Japanese name, and I — perhaps out of some selfish desire not to be reminded of the past — insisted on an English one. He finally agreed to Niki, thinking it had some vague echo of the East about it. (9)

We soon learn that Etsuko, the protagonist, and Niki are conversing in England, and the past of which Etsuko does not wish to be reminded is of her life in post-war Nagasaki, Japan around 1953, when the Korean War was still going on and there was U.S. occupation in Japan.

Born between an English father and Japanese mother, Niki embodies the three modes of foreignness: the emigrant, the traveler, and the exotic object, depending on who sees her. Niki perceives herself as an emigrant, which is visible in her view of Etsuko's departure from Japan as an escape from wasting her life away (89-90). She views Etsuko's choice to leave Jiro and move to England, the choice of which Niki is a product, affirmatively, indirectly affirming her status as an *émigré*. This view is also reflected in the eyes of her friend who writes poems, for Niki provides a gateway to Etsuko's experience of immigration from Japan. Somewhat overlapping with her self-perception as emigrant, in many ways, the Japanese essence in Niki never disappears in the eyes of the English people, but in a different way from her poet friend. Niki is mistaken for Keiko by Mrs Waters: "[...] Why, hello, Keiko' — [Mrs. Waters] touched Niki's sleeve — 'I didn't realize it was you'" (50). Of course, Mrs Waters is the kind of person who "would refer to works by Chopin and Tchaikovsky alike as 'charming melodies' (50), so it may not be surprising that she does not care about whether the person whom she is referring to is Niki or Keiko. Nonetheless, this passage affirms how the Japanese-ness in Niki cannot be unseen, rendering her foreign from England. But this foreignness Niki represents is one which has already been translated into English, such that she can be more easily perceived than Japan itself, for she is biracial: half-foreign, half-native. Thus, she embodies the object of exoticism in the eyes of the English people, brought close for them. This exists in complete opposition to how Etsuko perceives Niki. Etsuko tells us that Niki's knowledge of Japan arises from "some sort of picture from what her father had told her" (90), and refers to Niki's father as being the kind of

person who “despite all the impressive articles he wrote about Japan, my husband never understood the ways of our culture” (90). Etsuko sees Niki as not being Japanese in essence, never having been there herself and having heard stories about Japan from a skewed, English perspective. As such, Etsuko perceives Niki to be similar to the foreign traveler to Japan, much like her father.

The conflicting configurations by Niki, the English people, and Etsuko figures Niki as foreign from every angle. She sees herself indirectly as an emigrant (as a product of immigration), and thus a foreigner who has become part of England. English people see her as a foreigner also, not as a part of them although she is half-British, but rather as an exotic object translated. Finally, Etsuko sees Niki as foreign from Japan, and solely English. Perceived to be foreign from both the place where she has immigrated, and the place from which she has emigrated, Niki belongs nowhere, thus embodying “foreignness.”

However, the triple foreignness Niki embodies appears to directly go against Etsuko’s wish “not to be reminded of the past”, as Niki becomes seen as recognizably Japanese in the British world Etsuko inhabits. Niki also shares this view to a certain extent, as she configures herself as a product of immigration, recognizing her Japanese-ness as, at least biologically, a significant part of her identity. While such views may seem to conflict with Etsuko’s vision of Niki as supposedly “English”, Etsuko seems to be able to avoid having to acknowledge this aspect of Niki, at least directly. In talking about Niki later in the novel, Etsuko mentions how “[a]nd yet, one had become a happy, confident young woman – I have every hope for Niki’s future – while the other, after becoming increasingly miserable, took her own life” (94). Etsuko mentions this where she does not necessarily need to, for she is talking about how Niki resembles Keiko unlike how Niki’s father perceived Niki and Keiko to be “complete opposites”

(94). Niki's future is not the topic of the paragraph, and the insertion breaks the rhythm and juxtaposing effect of the whole sentence. As such, Etsuko seems to almost be forced to talk about Niki in relation to her future, as if she cannot tolerate talking about Niki in the past tense, "had become," and inserts the present tense before she can return to talking about the past. This affirms how Niki does, in fact, carry the past which Etsuko neglects to see by constantly associating Niki with futurity.

Of course, Etsuko cannot fully escape from the past which Niki embodies, since this introduction of Niki is also haunted by another character, Keiko, who is first evoked by the description, "younger daughter." Immediately after Niki's introduction, we learn that Niki had a sister named Keiko, and that she had committed suicide. Although we never read about her when she was alive but only when she is still inside Etsuko or after her death, Keiko's specter haunts the novel. For example, in this first paragraph which is about Niki, the description puts Niki in intentional contrast to Keiko, for "Keiko, unlike Niki, was pure Japanese" (10). Keiko, unlike Etsuko's perception of Niki, would constantly be reminding Etsuko of the past which she wishes "not to be reminded of," were she still alive. The doubling between Etsuko and Sachiko, and Keiko and Mariko, further develop this phantasmagoric aspect of Keiko's character. She always seems to be present in the novel without a single physical appearance, never able to be grasped completely though because she is only ever a phantom. We never learn about her directly, but only through the traces Etsuko leaves. The contrasting depiction between Keiko and Niki happens later in the novel as well:

This rather aggressive regard for privacy reminds me very much of her sister. For in truth, my two daughters had much in common, much more than my husband would ever admit. As far as he was concerned, they were complete opposites; furthermore, it became his view that Keiko was a difficult person by nature and there was little we could do for her. In fact, although he never claimed it outright, he would imply that Keiko had inherited her personality from her father. I did little to contradict this, for it was the easy

explanation, that Jiro was to blame, not us. Of course, my husband never knew Keiko in her early years; if he had, he may well have recognized how similar the two girls were during their respective early stages. Both had fierce tempers, both were possessive; if they became upset, they would not like other children forget their anger quickly, but would remain moody for the most of the day. And yet, one had become a happy, confident young woman – I have every hope for Niki’s future – while the other, after becoming increasingly miserable, took her own life. I do not find it as easy as my husband did to put the blame on Nature, or else on Jiro. (94)

The doubling, as Etsuko describes, is not only in Mariko and Keiko, but in Niki and Keiko as well. Both of these doublings seem to accuse Etsuko of her mistreatment of Keiko, and towards the end of the novel, Etsuko does locate this blame on herself, admitting: “you see, Niki, I knew all along. I knew all along she wouldn’t be happy over here. But I decided to bring her just the same” (176). She cannot, like her English husband, put the blame on the Japanese’s difficult nature, because she comes from that culture as well. The similarity between Keiko and Niki seems to prove to Etsuko that in fact, ethnicity has nothing to do with it. The similarity between the two Etsuko sees, and the difference in where life leads each daughter, suggests a future for which Keiko had a chance as much as Niki, but had been thwarted by Etsuko herself.

Yet, this guilt also lies in contrast to Etsuko’s thoughts that “[m]y motives for leaving Japan were justifiable, and I know I always kept Keiko’s interests very much at heart” (91). Indeed, at the time, during her life with Jiro as an obedient and silent housewife, Etsuko does not seem to have much else in her life except to be that housewife-machine had she stayed in Japan. Sachiko claims of the hopes she has of the future in the U.S. in much the same manner, for herself: “my father told me if I learnt my English well enough, I could easily become a business girl” (110). Sachiko later adds how the U.S. will be better for her but also her daughter, Mariko:

Mariko will be happier there. America is a far better place for a young girl to grow up. Out there, she could do all kinds of things with her life. She could become a business girl. Or she could study painting at college and become an artist. All these things are much easier in America, Etsuko. Japan is no place for a girl. What can she look forward to here? (170)

While in Etsuko's case, she goes to England, Sachiko sees not the U.S. itself as hope, but rather the English language as a gateway to possible futures, as we can observe through her dialogue with her father. In contrast, Japan becomes an obstacle to her freedom, for it was Sachiko's "very strict and very patriotic" Japanese husband who forbade her studying English (110). We can observe a relationship similar to this between Etsuko and Jiro, where Jiro sees it as only natural that Etsuko serves Jiro:

"What are you up to? I haven't got all morning, you know." He pushed his teacup forward.

I seated myself again, put his used dishes away to one side, and poured him some tea. He sipped it rapidly, glancing over the front page of the newspaper. (133)

And on the night of the same day which Jiro had a big day at work:

He greeted his father cheerfully – his show of temper the previous night apparently quite forgotten – before disappearing to take his bath.

[...]

"Congratulations," I said, smiling at my husband. "I'm so glad."

Jiro looked up, as if noticing me for the first time.

"Why are you standing there like that?" he asked. "I wouldn't mind some tea, you know." He put down his towel and began combing his hair. (153, 154)

Jiro does not even see Etsuko, let alone consider her to be someone with whom he can share his happiness. By contrast, he "greet[s] his father cheerfully" despite the fact that he had a fight with him the previous night. In Jiro's eyes, Etsuko exists to serve him tea, and manage his domestic life without a single appreciation needed. In short, Jiro treats her as an object he uses to live his life smoothly. As such, both Sachiko and Etsuko are treated as not needing an autonomy in the household in Japan, which we see both of them wanting to escape. While in the end, Etsuko seems to have given up, stating "But in the end, Niki, there isn't very much else" to "getting married and having a load of kids" (180) having reached England, Etsuko, like Sachiko, dreamed of possibilities in learning English and going overseas. In the face of the future she saw for

herself and the future to which Keiko was similarly headed, captive in the role of the housewife, Etsuko chose escape for the both of them at the time. Coinciding with the guilt about her neglect of Keiko is the feeling that Etsuko did imagine a better life for Keiko as well as for herself in going to England. Although actually reaching the other side disillusioned Etsuko of her hopes, England shone with hope while it remained a foreign destination. In other words, the enchantment lay not in the foreign land itself, but in its foreign *relationship* to Etsuko. England, the land itself, may have failed to provide Etsuko and Keiko with the success and opportunities it seemed to have promised them, but the foreignness of the country provided a motivation which was strong enough to make Etsuko decide to move out of Japan.

Niki is haunted by Keiko's ghost, too, but differently from the way Etsuko is. As the one who had "become a happy, confident young woman" against her sister who "after becoming increasingly miserable, took her own life", Niki reflects on the difference with which her father treated the two, mentioning how "I suppose Dad should have looked after her a bit more, shouldn't he? He ignored her most of the time. It wasn't fair really" (175) immediately before Etsuko admits her guilt. In this light, her claim that "I just remember her as someone who used to make me miserable. That's what I remember about her" (10) which she mentions in the beginning of the novel becomes charged with the recognition that her father treated Niki and Keiko differently. In many ways, despite the fact that Niki seems to have been treated well by her father, she is also the victim of his mistreatment of Keiko, bearing the weight of a guilt foreign to her but burdening her nonetheless as the other against whom Keiko was seen. Thus, despite how Niki says "[Keiko] was never a part of our lives — not mine or Dad's anyway" (52), she cannot pretend this to be the case, which is represented through her inability to rest in her own room because of its position across from Keiko's bedroom: "It's that other room. Her room.

It gives me an odd feeling, that room being right opposite” (53). Precisely because of its opposition, of the stark contrast between Niki and Keiko despite being the daughter of the same mother and a part of the family to the extent that Etsuko identifies many similarities between the two, that is beyond her control, Niki is haunted by Keiko’s presence, burdened with a guilt that is foreign to her.

This idea of the foreignness of guilt itself is conveyed by of the last images in the novel: “[Niki] was dressed in the same tight-fitting clothes she had arrived in, and her suitcase made her drag her step a little” (183). At the beginning of the novel, Etsuko identifies Niki’s reason for visiting as “a sense of mission [...] to reassure me I was not responsible for Keiko’s death” (10-11). That she comes and goes in the “same tight-fitting clothes” reflects Etsuko’s understanding of Niki’s mission to be for Etsuko’s sake, showing how little Niki has changed over the days she has visited Etsuko. As such, Niki, in visiting Etsuko, responds to not only her own guilt in relation to Keiko but also to Etsuko’s guilt towards Keiko’s death, a guilt that is foreign to her.

On the other hand, the suitcase represents a different kind of foreign guilt, which burdens Niki, and makes her “drag her step a little.” The suitcase is the container for what she carries with her as she moves from one location to another. As such, it represents a fragment of her life that she has carried over from wherever it is she came. In short, it symbolizes a past that she carries out of her former location. To return to the scene where Mrs Waters mistakes her for Keiko, the past which Niki seems to carry around with her as a burden can be read as her Japanese-ness and her relationship to Keiko, which are deeply connected. In the eyes of the British people, Niki is as Japanese as Keiko is, and yet the difference is that whereas “Keiko [...] was pure Japanese” and Niki is not, which makes Niki already translated and thus, integrated into the English world. However, Etsuko wishes not to see Niki’s Japanese-ness, and Niki, “an

affectionate child” as Etsuko describes, leaves Etsuko, taking away that reminder of the past packed in a suitcase. This way in which Niki cares for Etsuko is seen in their conversation:

“What do you say to people, Mother?” Niki asked. “What do you say when they ask where I am?”  
 [...]
 “[...] Really, Niki, I had no idea you were so concerned about what people thought of you.”  
 “I’m not.” (180)

What Niki cares about in asking “What do you say to people” is how those people see Etsuko, not herself. As the child always compared to Keiko, Niki is burdened with a hope of the future by Etsuko, by the unequal treatment between the two by her father, and by the gaze which admires the exotic, foreign land. The fact that Niki’s future was unattainable by Keiko or Etsuko only burdens Niki more. Configured in accordance with the ways the others wish to see Niki, a part of Niki seems to always remain foreign to herself. Thus, Niki comes and goes, burdened with the same suitcase with the same things inside: her guilt which she possesses in its foreignness from her own identity.

Unlike Etsuko and Niki, who are burdened with guilt in relation to Keiko, Niki’s father and the newspaper are able to flatten her phantom to an ethnic type, and a foreign object unrelated to their lives. In the case of the newspaper, the report equates suicide with being Japanese: “Keiko, unlike Niki, was pure Japanese, and more than one newspaper was quick to pick up on this fact. The English are fond of their idea that our race has an instinct for suicide, as if further explanations are unnecessary; for that was all they reported, that she was Japanese and that she had hung herself in her room” (10). The fact that a Japanese person committed suicide is neither interesting nor new, for suicide is a Japanese symptom. The newspaper here mimics a report on a confirmation, as if rumors of a disease have been scientifically confirmed to be true. Keiko becomes a result of a scientific experiment, a sample case that affirms the myths. Except

whereas scientific experiments are usually tested several times, one sample is enough in this case to judge about the Japanese object as a whole, and the circulation of the newspaper confirms and fortifies an exotic myth.

The myths surrounding the exotic Japanese object can also be observed in Niki's father's seemingly paradoxical attitude towards Keiko as well. While "it was he who wanted to give [Niki] a Japanese name", it was also he who "ignored [Keiko] most of the time" (175). Niki's father's admiration of Japan, which is not necessarily ungrounded in truth as he had written impressive articles about Japan (90), does not lead him to love Keiko curiously despite his desire for a Japanese-named daughter. Etsuko defends him, noting how "[h]e wasn't her real father, after all" (175), and this is the crux of his attitude towards Japan which displays an Orientalist attitude. Niki's father had decided that "Keiko was a difficult person by nature and there was little we could do for her. In fact, although he never claimed it outright, he would imply that Keiko had inherited her personality from her father" (94), Jiro, Etsuko's first husband. Niki's father desires to possess a Japanese essence, as we can observe through his insistence on a Japanese name, but not one which he does not have control over. To him, Jiro is a male rival not only to his possession of Etsuko, but also to the Japan he has built inside his own head with exotic myths. As Etsuko writes: "For, in truth, despite all the impressive articles he wrote about Japan, my husband never understood the ways of our culture, even less a man like Jiro [...] [Jiro] was never the oafish man my husband considered him to be" (90). Jiro does not fit into Niki's father's image of Japan, and is cut off from his admiration of the Japanese myths.

Keiko belongs to this categorization, for Niki's father cannot tame her as she is "difficult by nature" like her father. Niki's father desires not a Japanese daughter, but his Japanese daughter formed by his own hands. Said defines an aspect of Orientalism as "a way of coming to

terms with the Orient that is based on the Orient's special place in European Western experience" and "a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" (1, 3), which captures the character of Niki's father perfectly. What he desired was not an actual Japanese daughter, or to learn about Japan. He wanted Japan to reflect his perception of Japan, and a daughter related to him by blood and under his control such that he possessed a fragment of Japan legally and physically. Niki's father objectifies Keiko, but in a different way from the newspapers. In his eyes, she is an outlier to the myths of Japan he has created, and he denies Keiko's entry into his life in order to protect himself and his creation. Niki's father, as well as the newspaper, seems to show Orientalism as indeed a Western creation, wherein they freely speak of the foreign other and appropriate them in ways they seem fit without any guilt. However, this guilt they ignore does not simply disappear, and others bear it in their place. In the case of this novel, Etsuko and Niki are the ones who bear the guilt in place of Niki's father and the English society, represented by the newspaper. Etsuko feels guilty for having brought Keiko to England, and although she did so in hopes of providing Keiko a better life, England has failed them both. Nonetheless, Etsuko perceives herself as having failed Keiko. In the case of Niki, constantly being compared to Keiko and Japan, she feels guilty for the ill treatment Keiko received, especially at the hands of Niki's father. Thus, she bears the guilt she inherited by blood from her father, and carries it with her. While Niki's father and the English culture has extracted all it wished to from Japan through Etsuko and Keiko, the punishment of this colonial act is afflicted upon Etsuko and Niki. Bearing Japan inside them while also being a part of this Western sphere, they are burdened with the guilt as a result of this colonial violence having been enacted upon Keiko through Niki's father.

Colonial violence can also be seen in the historical setting of the parts of the novel which

take place in Japan: the early 1950s when there was still U.S. occupation in Japan. Etsuko does not offer an exact time of her recollections, but we do know that at the time Etsuko was with Sachiko, “[t]he worst days were over by then. American soldiers were as numerous as ever—for there was fighting in Korea—but in Nagasaki, after what had gone before, those were days of calm and relief. The world had a feeling of change about it” (11). This conflicts with real history as the “peace memorial” (137) in Nagasaki was not completed until 1955,<sup>7</sup> three years after the war in Korea had officially ended. While this conflict makes it difficult to point to when exactly the stories in Japan take place, the U.S. military presence was still prominent in the 1950s regardless of the exact year. This confusion perhaps reflects how Etsuko states “[m]emory, I realize, can be an unreliable thing” (156), but also how Ishiguro says in an interview:

[W]hen I reached the age of perhaps twenty-three or twenty-four I realized that this Japan, which was very precious to me, actually existed only in my own imagination [...] And so I think one of the real reasons why I turned to writing novels was because I wished to re-create this Japan—put together all these memories, and all these imaginary ideas I had about this landscape which I called Japan [...] I very much wanted to put down onto paper this particular idea of Japan that I had in my own mind, and in a way I didn’t really care if my fictional world didn’t correspond to a historical reality.  
(*Conversations* 53)

As was the case with *Never Let Me Go*, in this light, *A Pale View of Hills* too can be seen as happening in a uniquely novel-world. The world points not necessarily to “a material reference to the largest possible versions of such wholes (human time; the planet Earth; the universe)” but “a reference to any self-enclosing whole (what are, after all, periods, regions, or parts of wholes but wholes themselves?)” (Hayot 131-132), thus, the novel’s world that shares some aspects with reality is free to branch off to express an aspect of the world unique to the novel. In the case of *A Pale View of Hills*, the novel’s world is born in relation to historical reality, which allows the novel to reference reality in both modes of affirmation and differentiation. As such, the conflict

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.city.nagasaki.lg.jp/heiwa/3030000/3030100/p005151.html>

between historical reality and the novel's world function as not a lack of relation to reality but a significant reconfiguration of the novel's world in relation to reality. The comparison of the novel's setting to historical reality, despite the novel's inconsistency with reality, is significant in that it brings to light the worldview of particular characters, such as Ogata-San, and his conceptualization of ideas such as "native" and "foreign."

Nonetheless, although the U.S. military occupation was rationalized through the stated objective to democratize and civilize the Japanese through introducing "American democracy and capitalism," the U.S. military presence performed neocolonially in two main respects: politics and sexual exploitation, which were deeply connected to each other, as scholars such as Takeuchi point out. These two aspects of neocolonial invasion play a large role in Etsuko's reminiscence of her days in Japan when Ogata-San, her father-in-law at the time, had come to visit her and Jiro. On the political side, as Ogata-San comments multiple times, the major import of the U.S. occupation was the idea of democracy: "Discipline, loyalty, such things held Japan together once [...] People were bound by a sense of duty. Towards one's family, towards superiors, towards the country. But now instead there's all this talk of democracy" (65). Ogata-San used to be a teacher, and identified with Japanese nationalism before the War. The changes that were occurring in Japan post-war towards the direction of "democracy" and Westernization disappoints him, as he views this transition not as an advancement from pre-war ethics and politics, but a harmful invasion:

Take what happened in my profession for instance. Here was a system we'd nurtured and cherished for years. The Americans came and stripped it, tore it down without a thought. They decided our schools would be like American schools, the children should learn what American children learn. And the Japanese welcomed it all. Welcomed it with a lot of talk about democracy [...] Many fine things were destroyed in our schools. (66)

Putting aside for the moment whether the system which had been "nurtured and cherished"

provided “fine things” for the people, this process which Ogata-San outlines is a neocolonial invasion, as he believes. Takeuchi writes, describing the relationship between Japan and the U.S.: “Japan was a concubine, a symbol of American male power and privilege” (96-97), and created a state where Japan relied on the U.S. for it to have any power in East Asia. This dependency relationship between Japan and the United States can be seen in the treaties: “the 1951 Security Treaty granted large latitude to the U.S. military in Japan, while there was no specific U.S. responsibility to defend Japan against an attack by a third party” (Igarashi 133), and further, “Article I [...] gave the United States the right to intervene in Japan’s domestic disturbances, and Article II [...] prohibited Japan from granting bases to other countries without prior U.S. consultation (ibid.). Furthermore, and I will elaborate on this topic further later, Japanese women were “given” to U.S. military men as prostitutes by the Japanese government, whom Takeuchi refers to as “pan-pan girls”: “private prostitutes and streetwalkers” (78), an act which shows subjugation to the masculinity of neocolonial U.S. occupation. As such, Ogata-San’s characterization of the Americanization of Japan as a threat to Japanese identity is not, in itself, mistaken.

However, an inspection of the larger context in which this neocolonial relationship operated reveals two of Ogata-San’s illusions: the dream of pre-war Japan as purely Japanese, and the vision of the future which would follow Americanization. In other words, pre-war Japan was not as purely Japanese as Ogata-San may perceive it, and post-war Japan is not as purely American as he sees it either. Reminiscing about the past before Japan lost the war, he mentions how “[t]here was a spirit in Japan once” (66). While the central ideology of Japan may seem to have changed significantly—although this too becomes questionable, as we will see later—this past Japan Ogata-San romanticizes was not free of foreign influences either. Ronald Robinson, in

his work “Non-European Foundations of European Imperialism: Sketch for a Theory of Collaboration,” observes:

By 1914 these Japanese collaborators had achieved what otherwise only white colonists seemed able to achieve. They succeeded in translating the forces of western expansion into terms of indigenous politics. By adapting European style techniques and institutions, they managed to control them so that they strengthened, instead of destroying, Japanese government, and worked not for [European] imperialism but for Japan. (127)

Robinson’s observation reveals that the age to which Ogata-San refers has already been founded, not on a Japanese ideology, but rather a localized Western ideology of imperialism and colonization. Indeed, in 1914 as Robinson describes, Japan did have an enormous Eastern Empire, with parts of China (Manchuria), Taiwan, and Korea as well as former German colonies in China and the Pacific which it won in World War I under its control. In fact, even before 1914, Japan had already started trading with Portugal in the mid-1500s, and had ended its isolationist policy in 1854 with the signing of the “unfavorable Treaty of Peace and Amity with the United States [...] leading to the opening of Japanese ports to the rest of the world” (Hotta xvii-xix). Thus, neither Westernization nor Americanization is a new phenomenon in Japan. Pre-World War II Japan has been significantly influenced by Western ideologies. While Ogata-San laments “[t]heir ways may be fine for Americans, but in Japan things are different, very different” (65), in fact, Western ways had been fine for Japan for a long time, and their ways have been incorporated into the system successfully in creating the Japanese identity he perceives. As such, the “spirit in Japan [that] bound us all together” that Ogata-San talks about is a localized Western spirit, a blend between Japan and the West, much like post-war Japan which is a mix of Japan and the U.S. The native identity, as individuals and a nation, that Ogata-San feels is penetrated by the foreign power, the U.S., was actually already a heterogenous construct of native Japan and the foreign West. Perceptions of the border between the foreign and native

are not as clearly and objectively drawn as we may imagine them to be.

Furthermore, the real future for which Japan is headed also complicates the sense of crisis Ogata-San feels, as the mainstream ideology within the government becomes not communism, as Ogata-San worries, but a “return to the pre-1945 militarist legacy” (Igarashi 133). Of course, this return happens in the late 1950s, after Japan had, in formal terms, regained its sovereignty<sup>8</sup> and Kishi, the “*yōkai* of the Shōwa era”<sup>9</sup> and an embodiment of the wartime Japan, became Prime Minister of Japan, which happened in 1957 (ibid. 136). Since these happen after the memories Etsuko tells of Ogata-San, he is not to be blamed in this case for feeling threatened. Nonetheless, this turn of tides is significant to Ogata-San’s perception of nationhood because it shows that the Americanization that Ogata-San worries about is not necessarily the cause for threat against the Japanese Empire and the concept of the nation, as pre-war Japan had almost returned while still being under U.S. occupation. This was because Americanization did not essentially contradict pre-war Japan ideologies, for “fundamental nature of the two countries’ relations” was that “Japan gained concessions only through actively recognizing and internalizing U.S. strategic interests in East Asia” (ibid. 134), and yet “the Kishi administration was about to revive the pre-1945 legacies in postwar Japanese politics with the assistance of ‘U.S. imperialism.’” (ibid. 135). While this agreement between U.S. interests and Kishi’s revival of pre-1945 legacies was in the face of the rise of the Soviet Union, as Igarashi has previously identified in these observations (133), the conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States predates the 1950s, suggesting that the agreement between the Kishi administration and the U.S. government had pre-existed as well. Thus, despite Ogata-San’s belief that “[t]he Americans, they never

---

<sup>8</sup> U.S. military bases are still in Japan and the U.S. has a huge influence on the Japanese government to date.

<sup>9</sup> “*yōkai* are the monstrous pre-modern creatures that survived in the liminal space of modern Japan, defying scientific explanations” (Igarashi 136).

understood the way things were in Japan [...] [t]heir ways in may be fine for Americans, but in Japan things are different, very different” (65) is not completely true, as Japanese nationhood before the War was already heavily influenced by Western ideologies and is much in agreement with post-war U.S. ideas, at least in political terms.

The sexual exploitation of women during the U.S. military occupation further complicates Ogata-San’s perception of the occupation, not only because it draws out the agreements and similarities between the U.S. military and Japanese men, but also because the so-called “pan-pan girls” took advantage of their relationships to the GIs. As I will later discuss, like Etsuko and Sachiko, they often saw the relationships they had as a chance for them to challenge the status quo. By having relationships with GIs, even though the relationship may have been one of prostitution, the pan-pan girls, “private prostitutes and streetwalkers” (Takeuchi 78), were able to attain resources and materials that were scarce for the Japanese people in the post-war period, and thus raise their quality of life above much of the Japanese population at the time.

The occupation altered the lives of the Japanese women the most. As Takeuchi writes: “controlling the sexuality of [Japanese women, many in their teens to mid-twenties and impoverished by the war,] was crucial to the establishment and maintenance of U.S. hegemony over Japan” (79). Takeuchi further describes how “[w]ell before the end of the Second World War, some Americans had expectations about Japanese women acting like ‘Madame Butterfly’: passive, obedient, and self-sacrificing geisha who knew how to treat men”, and “[y]oung GIs—arriving as conquerors, able to buy conquered women, and feeling that they were taking control of other human beings—experienced a tremendous sense of power” (89). This prostitution service, or what Takeuchi refers to as the “pan-pan girl business” (89), was not forcefully created by the U.S. occupation government only, but with the cooperation of the Japanese government

trying to mitigate sexual assaults on non-prostitute women. These women employed as pan-pan girls were “young women who had lost families, homes, or jobs as a result of total war” (ibid. 82). Furthermore, these were mostly women who came from lower-class backgrounds as well, since the U.S. had strategically bombed the lower-class sectors (ibid. 82). Thus, from the Japanese perspective, “[l]ower-class women were to serve GIs for the sake of the nation, and at the same time, upper- and middle-class women were to preserve their chastity [...] so that they properly belonged to Japanese men” (95). In addition to the merit the Japanese government gained, this passage indicates how women nonetheless belonged to men, the only difference being whether the men were American or Japanese. Since their autonomy did not socially exist in any case, the Japanese government willfully surrendered “their” women to the U.S. military men. Furthermore, a large amount of money was spent on this prostitution business, “between \$90 million and \$140 million” (ibid. 89), which benefitted the Japanese government economically. This is why Takeuchi calls the pan-pan girl business “[t]he system of bilateral exploitation of the sexuality of Japanese women” (89): both sides merited off of the bodies of lower-class Japanese women in this business.

Interestingly, the GIs’ expectations of the Japanese women to be “Madame Butterfly” is reconfirmed in the novel by the Japanese men, Jiro and Ogata-San. We have already seen Jiro’s attitudes toward Etsuko, expecting her to serve him silently and obediently, not showing individuality at least in the presence of their patriarchal masters. Thus, Etsuko is condemned for congratulating Jiro upon his success, since she has not served him the tea he wants yet (154). Ogata-San, unlike Jiro seems to be on better terms with Etsuko, talking about how she can teach him how to make an omelette (32-33) and conversing often with Etsuko. However, in speaking of women, or rather of wives specifically, Ogata-San seems to be much on the same page as Jiro,

commenting “[a] wife these days feels no sense of loyalty towards the household. She just does what she pleases, votes for a different party if the whim takes her. That’s so typical of the way things have gone in Japan. All in the name of democracy people abandon obligations” (65) upon hearing about how one of Jiro’s colleague’s wife voted for a different party from him (62-63). In this claim, Ogata-San seems to exclude certain populations from his reference to people, most obviously the young women such as the pan-pan girls sacrificed to protect the chastity of the wives Ogata-San talks of here. This is further reflected in his later argument about how the Americans have ruined Japan:

There was a spirit in Japan once, it bound *us* all together. Just imagine what it must be like being a young *boy* today. He’s taught no values at school — except perhaps that he should selfishly demand whatever he wants out of life. He goes home and finds his parents fighting because his mother refuses to vote *for his father’s party*. What a state of affairs. (66-67, italics added)

The movement from “us” to “young boy” in school in the next sentence naturalizes the exclusion of women from the academic environment, as well as the fundamental assumption that the women will be naturally bound by the same spirit as men in claiming an “us” while focusing on the young boy. His repeated emphasis on how a woman is at fault for believing something different from the patriarchal master further affirms the naturalized misogyny, not to mention how this example he offers seems to ignore the life of a woman before her marriage completely. In this light, his previous comment about how “[a] wife these days feels no sense of loyalty towards the household [...] All in the name of democracy people abandon obligations,” which like the shift from “us” to “young boy” but in the opposite direction shifts from “wife” to “people”, may also be seen to completely ignore the unmarried woman. As such, in both Ogata-San and Jiro, the expectation of Japanese women to be “‘Madame Butterfly’: passive, obedient, and self-sacrificing geisha who knew how to treat men” is affirmed in their misogyny as well,

despite how Ogata-San believes “[t]he Americans came and stripped [a system we’d nurtured and cherished for years], tore it down without a thought” (66).

Yet, the pan-pan girls, perceived to be “Madame Butterfly”, were aware of their expectations, and often “played and performed the myth of Japanese femininity to attract GIs for the sake of financial gain as well as social status” (Takeuchi 91). Although this aspect does not make the pan-pan girl business justified in any way, imagining the pan-pan girls as without autonomy in this dynamic aligns one with the GIs and Japanese men exploiting the girls. Since World War II was a total warfare, and the country was impoverished by the end, the business provided the lower-class women with access to materials they may never have had otherwise. In other words, although it involved a tremendous physical sacrifice on the part of the women, the pan-pan girl business, and more broadly, the neocolonial occupation which disrupted the pre-existing social hierarchy, was a chance for some to take advantage of. Sachiko, in her relation to her American boyfriend Frank, can be seen in a similar light. In the last scene which we see Sachiko in Etsuko’s memories, Sachiko acknowledges how: “I realize we may never see America [...] And even if we did, I know how difficult things will be” (170). This shows the strength of Sachiko’s hopes in her relation to the U.S., especially since she has the option of moving in with her uncle and cousin, Yasuko-San, which will secure her and Mariko a certain standard of life, not to mention how Mariko will be able to keep her kittens. Sachiko decides to take her chances and go with Frank as she does not see anything in going to live with her uncle. Thus, while acknowledging the risk of going to Kobe with Frank:

“But what of it?” said Sachiko. “What difference does it make? Why shouldn’t I go to Kobe? After all, Etsuko, what do I have to lose? There’s nothing for me at my uncle’s house. Just a few empty rooms, that’s all. I could sit there in a room and grow old. Other than that there’ll be nothing. Just empty rooms, that’s all. You know that yourself, Etsuko.” (170)

Her father calls the house without Sachiko “a tomb” (161). While her cousin and uncle may see Sachiko’s return as a way to change the house from being a tomb, in the passage above, Sachiko seems to imply that the house will remain nothing but “empty rooms” whether or not she is there, for nothing happens there but decay for her. In the eyes of Sachiko, it is the unknown foreign land and people in its otherness she knows through stories she has heard from her father and Frank, that signifies for her a possibility she does not see in staying in Japan. Thus, Sachiko, and women like her, have their unique relationship with foreignness because of their social position. For people like Ogata-San, who have a certain position in society, the foreign is perceived as a personal crisis of their own position. Sachiko, having lost her husband in War, finds herself in a similar position as the pan-pan girls and Etsuko, who also leaves after Sachiko, and sees nothing in protecting the status she has in her native land. Neither Sachiko, nor Etsuko, nor the pan-pan girls share the same idea of nationhood with people like Ogata-San, because their sense of nationhood has been obliterated by the war, and thus, have nothing to lose. If, as Ogata-San says, national identity is that “spirit in Japan once, [which] bound us all together” (66), the destruction of war and the foreign penetration in post-war Japan, accepted by the Japanese government, has shattered such an national identity, and created a space for new relationships to form.

Therefore, in both the political and sexual neocolonial invasion of the United States under the code “democracy,” although the invasion was neocolonial and violent, it did not, as Ogata-San may believe, threaten the Japanese system in place pre-World War II. Instead, the neocolonial invasion represented an addition of U.S. men to the top of the social hierarchy with much of the pre-existing system intact, for as in the case of Kishi even the actors who ran the country may not have changed. Thus, the crisis Ogata-San feels due to the U.S. occupation of Japan is not a threat against Japan’s national identity, which as we have seen, was defined as a

heterogeneous mixture of Japanese and Western ideologies, but a threat against his own personal beliefs. While we may often associate foreignness with a whole place or group of people against another, Ogata-San's case reveals foreignness as one's perception of the foreign in relation to their imagined community. This is reflected in his confrontation with Shigeo Matsuda, who wrote an article in a journal called "*The New Education Digest*" supporting communism and criticizing people like Ogata-San who believed in pre-war Japanese ideologies. Ogata-San first questions Shigeo, asking "do you believe a word of what you wrote?" (146), then mocks Shigeo for having written it "with a pen in one hand and his books about communism in the other" (60). Yet, when Shigeo answers vaguely how "[m]any things have changed now. And things are changing still. We live in a different age from those days when ... when you were an influential figure" (146), Ogata-San replies "Have *I* ever done something to offend you?" (147, italics added), revealing how Ogata-San has taken Shigeo's criticism personally. When Shigeo then states clearly that "I believed in everything I wrote in that article and still do. In your day, children in Japan were taught terrible things [...] And that's why the country was plunged into the most evil disaster in her entire history" (147), Ogata-San replies "We may have lost the war [...] but that's no reason to ape the ways of the enemy [...] You have no idea, Shigeo, how hard we worked, men like myself, men like Dr Endo, whom you also insulted in your article" (147), seeming to further reveal that more than the ideas Shigeo promoted, Ogata-San is shocked by the personal criticism. While he locates the crisis on the national level, the crisis is in fact more personal than he may wish to acknowledge. Foreignness puts into doubt one's personal relationship to the world, not the world itself.

Yet, although Ogata-San is a character in Ishiguro's fictional world, which can be seen, as the author himself admits, to break off from historical reality, Ogata-San is a type who did

exist in post-war Japan, as are the government officials, who gave the lower-class Japanese women to the GIs and kept the upper- and middle-class women for themselves as their possessions (Takeuchi 95). However, in depicting this nationalism as a personal belief Ogata-San possesses, Ishiguro pushes us towards realizing not that one's nationalism is wrong or ill-founded. Rather, the reader is made to realize that the concept of nation is something personal, for despite the personal aspects of the crisis Ogata-San feels, Ogata-San himself believes that nationhood is a shared notion. That is why he mixes the personal with the general in his conversation, shifting from talking about himself to a collective "we" as we saw in his conversation with Shigeo. The nation, in other words, can be seen as a personal belief in a synchronized collective identity. And since the "foreign" exists in direct relation to nativeness, foreignness too can be seen as a personal belief of those who do not belong to one's perception of a community. This bears a resonance with Benedict Anderson's concept of "imagined communities": "*imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion [...] it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (6, 8). It is important to note that Anderson stresses how the mode of the imagined community is of "'imagining' and 'creation'", not "'fabrication' and 'falsity'" (6), and this does not conflict with the earlier characterization of the nation as a personal construct. Nationhood is only ever shared among the imagined members coincidentally and partially, when an individual's imagination happens to affirm someone else's. As an imagined community, the idea of nationhood remains personal. Thus, the nationalist always exists in isolation and solitude no matter how much unity they may perceive, and nationalism can be seen

as a personal statement of belief rather than an ideology to be shared.

Yet, this solitude is not a denial of the possibility of connections between people but rather an affirmation of interpersonal relationships, for communication exists between two distinct beings. Communication happens only because the other's thoughts cannot be known. Jean-Luc Nancy writes in his preface to *The Inoperative Community*: "The community that becomes *a single* thing (body, mind, fatherland, Leader...) necessarily loses the *in* of being-*in*-common. Or, it loses the *with* or the *together* that defines it. It yields its being-together to a being *of* togetherness[.]" although the truth of the community lies in its "being-the-one-with-the-other" (xxxix). In other words, one realizes the community only when one realizes the fundamental disconnect and the inability to identify with the other completely; in short, that the other is unknowable. Thus, returning to David Palumbo-Liu's reading of *Never Let Me Go* through Nancy, a crisis occurs with the heart transplant, when the other enters my body and becomes one, trespassing that distance of the "with" necessary to realizing a community.

However, in the case of the imagined community, a conceptual transplant is all that is required for that imagination to be shattered. In Ogata-San's case, the transplant is his confrontation of Shigeo, where Ogata-San faces Shigeo's foreignness. The imagined community is shattered in this scene because Ogata-San still believes Shigeo to be a part of the community. Hence, he still says "We may have lost the war [...] but that's no reason to ape the ways of the enemy" (147), referring to a shared 'we' and 'enemy' between themselves. It is this being together of Ogata-San and Shigeo co-existing with the rejection of Ogata-San's imagined community that shocks him greatly, but also makes Ogata-San smile:

Ogata-San watched [Shigeo] disappear down the hill. He continued to stand there for several more moments, not speaking. Then when he turned to me, there was a smile around his eyes.

"How confident young men are," he said. "I suppose I was much the same once. Very

sure of my opinions.” (148)

By identifying Shigeo with himself, and then calling Shigeo’s perspectives “opinions”, Ogata-San seems to implicitly acknowledge that his nationhood too, is a personal opinion. Thus, later in the same day, when he gives a toast to Jiro’s success having decided to leave for home, and says “Here’s to your future, Jiro” (156), the act of retreat can be seen not only from Jiro’s house, but also from the younger generations’ future. This scene can be seen, in other words, as Ogata-San’s realization of the community as many individuals coming together, and since he will die before the younger ones, he sees that he should not attempt to form the future of the community of which he will soon no longer be an active part.

Perhaps rather accidentally, this is the moment then when Ogata-San actually moves against the Americanization of Japan, since Shigeo is a communist. The U.S., after all, aimed to “[make] American democracy and capitalism appear more attractive than communism, in order to gain and expand in overseas markets” (Takeuchi 95) through the occupation of Japan. While Ogata-San sees both communism and democratization as things which the Americans brought into the U.S., as we can observe through his criticism of Shigeo of “ap[ing] the ways of the enemy” (147), in fact as Takeuchi points out, communism was exactly what Americanization was fighting against. Japan achieved this through returning to pre-1945 Japanese ideologies, as I mentioned earlier. As such, in this Cold War historical context, despite Ogata-San’s realization of the variety of “opinions” about the future of the nation that exists in the peoples, the diversity reveals itself as perhaps merely representative of two economic systems: capitalism and communism. In other words, borrowing from Franco Moretti’s metaphors of the ‘tree’: “the passage from unity to diversity” and ‘wave’: “uniformity engulfing an initial diversity” (166) as modes in which world literature circulates, the seeming diversification in Japan that Ogata-San

observes is in fact merely two waves colliding and try to engulf each other. It is this ultimate engulfing of Japan as a nation—in short, its becoming merely a part of the U.S. or Soviet Union—that threatens Ogata-San’s realized sense of the community as a “being-together”, rather than “being *of* togetherness” (*Community* xxxix). We can observe then, in Ogata-San’s finally realized imagined community, something similar to the relations Kathy realizes in *Never Let Me Go*. Even in the face of the wave that engulfs the nation and makes it foreign, U.S. capitalism or Soviet communism, we can still find each other as individuals fighting for what they believe to be the future of their imagined community.

This destabilized nativeness seems to put into question the “clear definition of foreignness” that is Kristeva’s premise in *Strangers to Ourselves*: “With the establishment of nation-states we come to the only modern, acceptable, and clear definition of foreignness: the foreigner is the one who does not belong to the state in which we are, the one who does not have the same nationality” (96). Kristeva uses this definition in the legal and political terms of the nation-state and the foreign, which is why she claims this is a “clear definition” that also exhibits a power dynamic: “[t]he group to which the foreigner does not belong has to be a social group structured about a given kind of political power” (*ibid.*). Yet, even this “nation-state” has political and legal significance that seem to clearly indicate what that nation-state is, and Derrida’s concept of “différance” allows us to deconstruct such notions. The political and legal fields, despite the validity with which we credit them, are merely sign-systems, which, like language, “[refers] to another and to other concepts, by the systematic play of differences” (Derrida 285). They are both thus defined, like foreignness, by what they are not. We thus encounter a cyclical motion, where, even if we define foreignness and nativeness in political and legal terms, we nonetheless encounter the problem of indefinability, where one defines the other

and vice-versa, unable to conceive of one without invoking the other. However, this cyclical motion does not follow the same exact route in every revolution. As Derrida writes, “each element that is said to be ‘present,’ appearing on the stage of presence, is related to something other than itself but retains the mark of a past element and already lets itself be hollowed out by the mark of its relation to a future element” (287). The cycle is never what it was, for, as a “systematic play of differences” it is already different from what it was and will be different from what it is at the present, moving in a spiraling motion. In other words, with the concept of the nation-state changing every moment, as well as being unique to each individual within the nation-state as we saw in post-war Japan, foreignness can neither be constrained to a definition, which in turn cyclically destabilizes nationhood. Foreignness and nativeness are intricately intertwined within a system, constantly changing, so the fact that Ogata-San sees foreignness as a threat but Sachiko sees it as opportunity is, conceptually, not surprising.

However, contrary to their perception of their state, both Sachiko and Etsuko in their respective scenes of flight seem to neglect the wish of the children, Mariko and Etsuko, to visualize their futures in relation to the foreign land. Although they both claim at points that “[m]y daughter’s welfare is of the utmost importance to me, Etsuko” (44) and “I know I always kept Keiko’s interests very much at heart” (91), they cannot keep this mask on for long. Eventually, they both admit their neglectful attitude towards their respective daughters: “Do you think I imagine for one moment that I’m a good mother to [Mariko]?” (171) and “I knew all along [Keiko] wouldn’t be happy over here” (176). The conflicting attitudes reflect the societal roles which Sachiko and Etsuko have to perform in this chaotic reformulation of Japan as both mothers. They are both responsible for the child’s welfare above themselves, and are individual women wishing to live happily and autonomously. This societal role haunts both of them

strongly, as we can observe in their justifications and confessions throughout the book, sometimes through Sachiko in Etsuko's case. However, in examining the origin of this conflict, especially as women struggling for autonomy, the origin can be seen as their respective encounters with the foreign male. In the case of Sachiko, before the War, when she was still a child, her father's foreign connections gave her access to English, and she "used to dream [she]'d go to America one day" (109). But her husband, upon their marriage, forbade her from continuing her studies in English, and Sachiko does not disagree with this, in a mode of resignation: "I didn't protest when he forbade me to study English. After all, there seemed little point any more" (110). In the case of Etsuko's relationship to Jiro, as we have observed, she performs the obedient housewife mechanism, not allowing her emotions to surface in front of the patriarch. Thus, although it makes Sachiko and Etsuko torn between being a mother, and an individual woman, the foreign intrusion into Japan and their personal lives provide Etsuko and Sachiko with an opportunity to re-visualize their futures, partially freed from the social constructs to which they seemed so bound in their familial relationships with their Japanese husbands. It is the entrance of the unknown, the foreign, into their lives which seems to liberate Sachiko and Etsuko despite the neocolonial characteristic of the U.S. occupation. The mystery of the foreign life lets them dream of being freed from their destined housewife role, and starting life anew somewhere other than where they are now.

Yet, this dream of foreignness does not last long: Frank, we learn, has been unfaithful to Sachiko, having cheated on her once in Tokyo before they came to Nagasaki, and is caught cheating again in Nagasaki before he asks her to move to Kobe with him so that he can take her to the U.S., leading us to doubt whether Sachiko ever makes it over the border. Etsuko, on the other hand, laments in retrospect "But in the end, Niki, there isn't very much else [to life other

than getting married and having a load of kids]” (180) having reached England. In contrast, Ogata-San will soon find that the U.S. occupation will actually revive the pre-1945 spirits, creating a Japan that he longs for at this time of the novel. While we do not learn what happens to Sachiko after we hear that she is moving to Kobe, she suggests herself the doubt of Frank’s accountability to keeping his promises: “I realize we may never see America” (170). The foreign provided a dream for Etsuko and Sachiko, perhaps only when they were in Japan, before the foreign land had become a reality. Thus, while Etsuko, on her initial arrival, sees her new neighborhood as “how so truly like England everything looked” (182), she has learned eventually that, as Niki points out to her, “this was not the real countryside, just a residential version to cater for the wealthy people who lived here” (47). Foreignness has been disenchanted upon arrival; Etsuko realizes that geographical location was never the problem in her life. The same problems persist in England just as they did in Japan.

While one way to see this disillusionment is to see how similar power dynamics exist on a global scale, we can also see this as a suggestion of how foreignness is not a condition, as perhaps Kristeva in her political and legal definition sees it, but a relationship to the unknown. The foreign enacts its magic in being that relation which suggests alternate possibilities that exist outside of what one perceives to be native. In other words, for Sachiko, the U.S. is seen as possibility because it allows her to dream of becoming something which she cannot imagine herself becoming in Japan, and the same is true for Etsuko with England. Ogata-San is scared because the existence of alternate possibilities of life would prove that the one lifestyle he conceived of as absolutely correct could have been wrong. The unknowability of foreignness, simply by virtue of its being outside of oneself, allows one to project any dream and not have it rejected immediately, whether this dream is an aspirational fantasy or a dreadful nightmare. But

because this dream, in the case of *A Pale View of Hills*, is founded upon a neocolonial relationship, the effect of the violence is realized upon reaching the disenchanting, foreign land. Insofar as this relationship to foreignness happens in a real-world context, the historically violent relations poison newly formed relationships, and create debt which the perpetrators of the historical violence push onto the victims to pay. In the form of the specter of Keiko, the ghost of neocolonial violence haunts Etsuko and Niki, somewhat unjustly, but accordingly to the real-life context of the Occident-centered world system. To return to Said once more, the relationship between the West and Japan was Orientalist: “a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (3). Etsuko is ultimately inscribed in a power system which “puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand” (ibid. 7), and it is only in the dream of being elsewhere that Etsuko becomes liberated.

### Chapter 3: A Foreign Hope

As a worldwide-acclaimed author, Ishiguro's works have been translated into multiple languages and circulated globally. Having followed Ishiguro's work in reverse chronological order, I have gone in the opposite direction of his thematic movement from his earlier works to *Never Let Me Go*: "What if I stopped worrying about my characters and worried instead about my relationships?" (*My Twentieth Century Evening – and Other Small Breakthroughs*, 12). In my first chapter, I reexamined the concept of foreignness based on human relations rather than in technical or political terms in *Never Let Me Go*. Then I moved on to examine the characters of *A Pale View of Hills*, which Ishiguro identifies as having written about "often concerned individuals who'd lived through times of great social and political upheaval, and who then looked back over their lives and struggled to come to terms with their darker, more shameful memories" (ibid. 11), through the lens of foreignness in terms of human relationships as established in the first chapter. In my last chapter, I will focus on Ishiguro's works in translation, and the transformations the novels go through in this process.

In performing a comparative reading of *A Pale View of Hills* and *Never Let Me Go* each in its English original and Japanese translation, the purpose is not to critique the adequacy of the translation, but rather to observe the different ripples each version causes. For while the translated text is supposed to be the same text just in another language, translation inevitably transforms the text to varying degrees. As such, the translated text will create different receptions and reactions, which arise from the translation itself and the interaction caused by the original and translation. Rebecca L. Walkowitz quotes J. M. Coetzee about the work in translation, "as an author I am powerless to say, The words are written; I cannot control the associations they awaken" (220). As Walkowitz clarifies, "the readers [Coetzee] is thinking about are translators

and those who read the translated works” (220). No matter how faithfully the translator translates the original text, because translation is the traversing of different world systems of varying scales, the work in translation will necessarily invoke different associations.

In the translation from English to Japanese, we can observe the new associations evoked in the translator’s use of loan-words and katakana (a set of Japanese characters used to express foreign words), *furigana* (a phonetic guide added to Japanese texts), and word choice by the translator which adds to the novel an element which did not exist in the original. Thus, the observations in this chapter will arise not from reading just the translation but the translation in comparison to the original. Hence, while I will identify points in the texts where the original and translation appear to differ, my focus will not be on the difference itself, but on the analysis of how that difference in translation creates a different novel-world for the reader. Finally, I wish to argue that translation has immense positive potential for a literary work, of expansion through transformation that can only occur through the translation process. However, the other side of the same coin is the hegemonic force translation can have, spreading and perpetuating the English centered empire on a global scale, a force that needs to be observed not just through English, but also through the eyes of non-English recipient cultures. Drawing on arguments put forward by Minae Mizumura and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o, I will argue that the positive potential of translation can be realized, in choosing to become a foreigner in the face of this hegemony. As such, in quoting Mizumura’s text in this chapter and the conclusion, I have chosen to quote the original, Japanese text before the English translation in accordance with how I perceive her project’s encouragement to choose Japanese in the face of English.

In translating a text into Japanese, the translator uses three types of alphabets—hiragana, katakana, and kanji—in their transliteration. Hiragana is the most basic alphabet, consisting of

fifty-one characters which represent all the sounds in the language, and kanji are the Chinese-based, logographic characters in the Japanese language. The Gakken Dictionary of Kanji (*Gakken Kan-Wa daijiten*), for example, has eleven thousand character entries, and although not all of these are of common usage, around two to three thousand of these are used daily. All the kanji characters have one or more meanings on their own, but often they are also combined to mean one word. For example, the characters “日” and “本” mean “sun” and “book” in Japanese commonly, but combined mean Japan (日本). Not all the words we speak in Japanese have corresponding kanji, but all the kanji can be read using the sounds of hiragana, and so what is written in kanji can be written out in hiragana as well. When using a kanji which is hard to read because readers may not be familiar with it, the writer would add what is called *furigana* as a phonetic guide. Returning to the example of 日本, although not a hard word to read, with the *furigana* it would look like this: 〈<sup>にほん</sup>日本〉 (above the kanji is written にほん, read “nihon”).

*Furigana* can be also used by the writer intentionally to attribute a non-traditional reading to a kanji or set of kanji. An example of this from *A Pale View of Hills*, which I will discuss later in detail, is when Mrs. Waters calls Etsuko: “シェリントンガム<sup>さん</sup>夫人! (*Sheringham-san!*)” (49), where the kanji with the *furigana* over it, “夫人” is usually read “fujin”, meaning “wife of,” but the translator, Takeshi Onodera has us read it as “-san,” the most common honorific in Japanese. The use of kanji is often to distinguish between two homophones of the same reading. For example, the word for “to let go” and “speak” both are “*hanasu*” in Japanese, but written in kanji would be written “離す” (to let go) and “話す” (speak), having different characters to designate between which pronunciation of “*hanasu*” one means without having to guess from context. But kanji also

makes reading easier, as unlike English, the Japanese language does not put spaces between each word. As such, when written out all in hiragana, it becomes difficult to read the text, so writers of Japanese would write in kanji whenever possible, except when they are making writerly choices to not write in kanji. These two character-sets comprise a large part of Japanese texts.

The third set of characters, katakana, in pronunciation are exactly the same as hiragana, with fifty-one characters that all correspond to the individual hiragana characters. However, they are used mainly to express loan words from foreign languages, although some words in katakana are formed in Japanese by combining loan words in an order or set non-existent in the original language.<sup>10</sup> According to Mark Rebeck, (mainly English) loanwords in Japanese expressed in katakana have three functions: “Firstly, when an equivalent native word does not exist, a loanword may become necessary to fill a ‘lexical gap’ (Takashi 1990: 330). Secondly, loanwords may substitute for native equivalents to achieve some kind of special effect. In addition, they may be employed as euphemism in certain cases” (54). As such, katakana signals a foreignness kept intentionally unintegrated, for in each of these three functions Rebeck outlines, it nonetheless remains that it functions in such ways precisely because of its alien existence in the Japanese language. This foreignness of katakana appears in the physical shape of katakana as well, for katakana uses simple and straight lines in composition, compared to the curved hiragana and complex kanji. Thus, T. Heitani describes this alien nature of katakana in Japanese as “allow[ing] everything in, but in fact get[ting] by without anything entering” (Rebeck quoting Heitani 54), both in the physical appearance and also function. One can read the function of katakana as a form of cultural resistance, borrowing from but not being assimilated into foreign cultures.

---

<sup>10</sup> “アフレコ (*afureco*)” is one example of such a word, where the words “after” and “recording” are combined and truncated to form one word, which means dubbing.

The availability of katakana sheds light on another interesting aspect of translation and loan words, which is that when a text is translated, the world changes, for like a loan word in katakana, translation fills a lexical, or rather cultural gap (Rebuck 54). And like katakana, translation does not fill a gap, but rather creates a new space for new discourse to occur. In other words, translation expands the world into which the translation is introduced, and this expansion is a process which cannot be undone. Jacques Derrida's concept of *différance*, "the movement by which language, or any code, any system of reference in general, becomes 'historically' constituted as a fabric of differences" (286), describes articulately the expansive process that translation performs. As Derrida notes later, this historical movement not only moves backward in time, but also forward: "Différance is what makes the movement of signification possible only if each element that is said to be 'present' ... is related to something other than itself but retains the mark of a past element and already lets itself be hollowed out by the mark of its relation to a future element" (287). And this historical movement only ever expands, for no matter how the present element is "hollowed out by the mark of its relation to a future element", it does not disappear altogether. Language is, as Derrida notes, "a fabric of differences"; every future relation reconfigures the whole history, forever expanding its horizon:

In order for it to be, an interval must separate it from what it is not; but the interval that constitutes it in the present must also, and by the same token, divide the present in itself, thus dividing, along with the present, everything that can be conceived on its basis, that is, every being – in particular, for our metaphysical language, the substance or subject. Constituting itself, dynamically dividing itself, this interval is what could be called *spacing*; time's becoming-spatial or space's becoming-temporal (*temporalizing*). And it is this constitution of the present as a "primordial" and irreducibly nonsimple, and, therefore, in the strict sense nonprimordial, synthesis of traces, retentions, and protentions ... that I propose to call protowriting, prototrace, or *différance*. (287)

This process only accelerates when we consider the act of translation, in which at least a fragment of a whole system of references enters another system of references. As Derrida writes

later about translating Hegel, “[t]he translation would be, as it always should be, the transformation of one language by another” (288). This transformation is also an expansion, for the past becomes that which language was and now is not, but only in relation to the language which it has now become, inscribed into that fabric of differences.

The translated work is not a perfect copy of the original work in another language. When a text is translated, it is also transformed, as the Oxford English Dictionary suggests, defining the term as both “[t]o turn from one language into another; ‘to change into another language retaining the sense’ (Johnson); to render; also, to express in other words, to paraphrase” (*OED*, s.v. “translate”) and “[t]o change in form, appearance or substance; to transmute; to transform” (*ibid.*). This is not surprising, as Emily Apter writes in her preface of *The Translation Zone* titled “Twenty Theses on Translation” that “Nothing is translatable” and “Everything is translatable” (xi-xii), two poles regarding translation which accurately capture the position of translation. In offering this paradoxical expansion of the act of translation, Apter does not ask us to choose; rather, she exhibits the impossibility of reducing translatability to a binary statement. Translation both succeeds and fails in its process of becoming one language from another, existing on a balance of what Paul Ricoeur calls “linguistic hospitality”: “where the pleasure of dwelling in the other’s language is balanced by the pleasure of receiving the foreign word at home, in one’s welcoming house” (10). The fundamental aim of translation is to welcome the foreign culture into the local culture. While the dream of a perfect translation may be something unattainable, as theorists agree, translators make efforts to be as faithful as possible to the author’s original text. In striving for perfection while acknowledging the inevitable imperfection, the translator welcomes the foreign culture into another.

Imported intentionally and selectively, translation rewrites the foreign text into the native culture, as Lawrence Venuti writes in *Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, because “the task of translation is to make a foreign text intelligible in domestic terms” (81). In addition, as Venuti notes further, “a translator can choose to redirect the ethnocentric movement of translation so as to decenter the domestic terms that a translation project must inescapably utilize” (82). Translation alters the text and the culture into which it is imported, and both of these change depend on the situation of the “welcoming house” (Ricoeur 10) into which the text becomes translated. As such, the work of translation can be seen to possess an agency of its own, through which it forms associations with the native culture that did not necessarily exist in the original language.

Yet, equally important is that insofar as a translation exists only after publication of the original work, even as it raises seemingly new associations through the process of translation, the work of translation exists in constant conversation with the original work. In other words, the agency with which translation and the translator act in their native culture is always on behalf of the original work, and the reactions to the translation/translator return eventually to the original text. While translation does create a domesticated version of the original text, as Venuti writes, it never becomes a completely different text. Thus, throughout this chapter, I will envision the transformative character of translation to be expansion, rather than creation. No matter what the new idea realized through translation may be, or whether Ishiguro originally envisioned that new idea or not, like a piece of literary criticism about a given novel, the work of translation always exists in relation to the original work, never wholly independent of it. While translators may alter the text according to their interpretation to varying degrees, consciously and unconsciously, the reception feeds back not into the translation in isolation, but into the whole world of the novel

that has been expanded by the translation process, perhaps beyond the author's control. As such, in analyzing how the translations of *Never Let Me Go* and *A Pale View of Hills* change in the hands of their respective translators, Onodera and Masao Tsuchiya, I will read these translations not as independent pieces of work, but rather in terms of the changes they bring to the respective novels, each expanding the whole world of the novel in its totality in a certain way, moving from individual words to phrases to overall structure of the text.<sup>11</sup>

Even at the most basic level, that of the single word, translation proves itself a difficult task as there exist entities which are only present in one language and no other. The simplest example is food, for what one eats in a country depends on what one can get in the region, although this is changing as export and import technology advances. As such, language specific words appear even at the stage of ingredients. Once cooking starts, and ingredients are mixed with cooking techniques, translation often proves to be truly a difficult task; as such, names of dishes are often imported along with the dish itself. Sushi, matcha, and tiramisu are some examples of this. While one can find definitions of these words in the Oxford English Dictionary, the entries, through the etymology, definition, or both, reveal themselves to be imported as they were named in another language.

Of course, the alternate option to importing the name along with the dish is to find an adequate term for it in the language into which it is translated. One instance of this can be seen in *A Pale View of Hills*: Mrs Fujiwara's noodle shop. The noodle shop which Mrs Fujiwara runs in this scene is translated by Onodera as an udon shop (うどん屋) (23), although it could equally be

---

<sup>11</sup> I refer to *Tōi Yamanami no Hikari* (2001), Onodera's newest translation of *A Pale View of Hills*, when I refer to the translation of the novel in this chapter, unless specified otherwise.

a soba shop or ramen shop, because the direct translation of noodle shop (麵屋) into Japanese would be too vague. Onodera's translation offers a cultural specificity that would exist in reality, which Ishiguro's vague description does not offer. While noodle does mean "[a] string- or ribbonlike piece of pasta or similar flour paste (sometimes containing egg)" (*OED*, s.v. "noodle n.2.") which would fit what an udon is, the term is also used to reference other types of noodles, such as spaghetti and soba, another Japanese noodle. Consequentially, unless they possess knowledge of the types of noodles that are accessible in Japan (which, if one knows multiple types the phrase "noodle shop" would be vague), readers of the original may not have the exact image of the kind of dish Mrs Fujiwara serves in her shop. The vagueness of Mrs Fujiwara's noodle shop arises as a consequence of Ishiguro finding an adequate compromise in the process of rendering a Japanese cultural context in an English text. As in the cases of sushi and matcha, or the noodle shop and udon-shop, culture-specific words certainly pose a difficulty for the translator and works in translation, and Onodera here has chosen to add cultural specificity in translating Ishiguro's vague translation of Japanese culture into English.

Yet, the translation of the foreign term into the Japanese equivalent, as in the case of Onodera's choice to translate noodle as udon, does not always re-work the text successfully, leading to an unnecessary loss of a textual effect that Ishiguro intentionally wrote into the novel. One of the transformations which Onodera performs in the translation is to change the game of chess (56) which Ogata-San and Jiro plays to the game of shogi (77), a Japanese game that is similar to chess, although with slightly different elements and rules. The biggest difference between the two games is their pieces. While chess pieces resemble the roles they represent, such as a horse for a knight and a crowned piece for the king, shogi pieces are flat, pentagon-shaped wooden pieces in different sizes, with a kanji character on both sides of each piece which shows

its role in the game. Thus, while in observing a game of chess we see pieces standing upright, the board appears almost flat in a game of shogi. While, as Onodera translates, shogi is the traditional Japanese game and fits the character of Ogata-san, a traditional Japanese man resistant to foreign culture, this change in games forces Onodera to change an important description later in the novel, when Jiro attempts to knock over the chess pieces. While the description of Jiro's action until he turns to the game board is translated word-for-word, except for the aforementioned difference in the game they are playing, Ishiguro describes the chessmen as "still upright on their squares" (131). Onodera translates this as "the pieces still aligned on their squares" (*imada ni kichin to narandeiru koma*, 185) because the shogi pieces, as previously mentioned, are not tall pieces like those of chess, and thus cannot be standing upright when they lay flat on the surface.

The consequence is not just a slightly less vivid description. One of the things which angers Jiro in this scene is when Ogata-San calls Jiro a defeatist as Jiro easily admits defeat and tries to abandon the game. Ogata-San's attitudes toward the younger generation is also exhibited in his conversation with Shigeo Matsuda:

"We may have lost the war," Ogata-San interrupted, "but that's no reason to ape the ways of the enemy. We lost the war because we didn't have enough guns and tanks, not because our people were cowardly, not because our society was shallow [...] We cared deeply for the country and worked hard to ensure the correct values were preserved and handed on." (147)

He says this in response to Shigeo, who says: "In your day, children in Japan were taught terrible things [...] And that's why the country was plunged into the most evil disaster in her entire history" (147). Denying that he could have been mistaken, Ogata-San perceives the entry of American forces and changing ideologies in Japan as shameful and ill for the country. Even his reactions to Jiro and Shigeo's disapproval of him are almost identical: "A faint smile had

appeared around his eyes.” (131); “when [Ogata-San] turned to me, there was a smile around his eyes” (148). The parallel in the reactions is retained by the translation as well: “*memoto niwa kasukana emi ga ukandeiru*” (185) and “*watashi o mita memoto niwa bishō ga ukandeita*” (210), where both “*kasukana emi*” and “*bishō*” point to the faint smile that appears (*ukandeiru/ita*) around Ogata-San’s eyes (*memoto*). Despite both Jiro and Shigeo’s attempts to deny Ogata-San, he is not upset by them, “standing upright” physically as well as ideologically in both versions. These parallels link Jiro and Shigeo in their anger towards the upright Ogata-San and his pieces, recreating the dynamics in two scenes, one after the other. However, the parallel between the “upright” Ogata-San and the similarly upright chessmen is lost in this transformative translation with the change to shogi, distorting the opposition Ishiguro sets up between people like Ogata-San on the one hand, and Jiro and Shigeo’s generation on the other. Onodera’s translation in this scene may have gained cultural specificity, but loses the parallel between Jiro and Shigeo’s anger against Ogata-San’s stubbornness, weakening the intergenerational conflict that is highlighted in the original work.

This example of shogi and chess shows that despite the culture-specific elements which the novel employs in telling its story, the novel depicts the novel’s world, not necessarily reality. Thus, the reader and translator must keep in mind that when reading *A Pale View of Hills* they are inhabiting neither Japan or England in reality, even if the setting is not in an alternate England as in *Never Let Me Go*, but Ishiguro’s Japan and England within the novel’s world unique to this text. As Ishiguro says in an interview, “I very much wanted to put down onto paper this particular idea of Japan that I had in my own mind, and in a way I didn’t really care if my fictional world didn’t correspond to a historical reality” (*Conversations*, 53). To be faithful to the original work in translating may sometimes mean, as in this case, not to be faithful to cultural

and historical realities within the fictional world. In this scene, the translation thwarts the characterizations and conflicts that depict the post-war Japan Ishiguro wished to re-create in the novel for the sake of a cultural specificity that is not as problematic as the previous example of “udon”, especially since chess is accessible in Japan, and thus replaces rather than adds a detail. To return to Venuti, “a translator can choose to redirect the ethnocentric movement of translation so as to decenter the domestic terms that a translation project must inescapably utilize” (82). However, the decentering Onodera performs in this translation of chess to shogi does not undo a Westernization of Japan. In fact, Onodera’s translation does not necessarily bring the novel closer to the reality of Japan, and can even be seen to be creating an exoticized version of Japan with this isolationist image, despite the international influences throughout Japanese history that I described in my previous chapter.

A difference in the wording of the novel is visible in the translation of the “Peace Park” (137) in Nagasaki that Ogata-San and Etsuko visits. The peace park in Nagasaki which they go to exists in reality, and is called *Heiwa Kōen* (Peace Park) (194), even though Etsuko is unsure “whether this was the official name” (137). According to the official homepage of Nagasaki, the statue to which Ishiguro and Onodera refer is called the *Heiwa Kinenhi*, which translates to the “peace memorial.” Yet, while Ishiguro calls the statue the “peace memorial” (137) in English, Onodera re-translates this to *genbaku kinenhi* (194), which translates to “atomic memorial,” rather than adopting the official name. Although Ishiguro and Onodera are referring to the same statue with the same symbolic meanings attached to it, there is a clear difference between the perspectives which underlie each title of the statue. While calling the statue a peace memorial—even though the statue points to the atomic bomb—performs as a euphemism which avoids directly referencing the tragedy of the atomic bomb, calling it *genbaku kinenhi* invokes the

traumatic tragedy directly. Thus, while calling it a “peace memorial” seems to indicate a wish for peace in the future, the title “genbaku kinenhi” that Onodera attributes to it is a specific reminder of the atomic bomb and its atrocities. The change in translation of a single word creates a change in the whole perspective of how Etsuko, and through Etsuko’s narration the reader, views history. As the person in control of “receiving the foreign word at home, in one’s welcoming house” (Ricoeur 10), the translator cannot be overlooked in the role they play in the publication of a book in another language, especially in this case for Onodera makes a political claim, directly interrogating the nuclear bomb rather than wish for abstract peace, through his translation of Etsuko. Onodera has edited the translation of this book twice, each time the novel was republished by a different publisher (Translator’s Afterword 263).<sup>12</sup> As he mentions how “it was with his fifth publication, *When We were Orphans*, that the world of Kazuo Ishiguro seemed to become truly visible” (ibid. my trans, 263), and had edited his 1994 translation of *A Pale View of Hills* upon having read *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* and “gaining a further understanding of Ishiguro’s essence” (*Onnatachi no Tōi Natsu* (1994), my trans 266), Onodera’s second translation (*Tōi Yamanami no Hikari* (2001)) was informed by the works Ishiguro wrote after *Pale View of Hills*, something that would be impossible for the original work to be unless Ishiguro rewrote the novel. We can almost read Onodera’s translation as his scholarly interpretation of *A Pale View of Hills* in this light.

In the case of *Never Let Me Go*, the word choices of translation affect how we perceive the mindset of the students like Kathy. One of the games which Kathy plays at Hailsham is to daydream when she finds herself alone:

When I found myself alone, I’d stop and look for a view – out of a window, say, or through a doorway into a room – any view so long as there were no people in it. I did this

---

<sup>12</sup> The first publication was from *Chikuma Shobou* (1984), the second from *Chikuma Bunko*, a label of Chikuma Shobou (1994), and this publication from *Hayakawa Shoubou* (2001).

so that I could, for a few seconds at least, create the illusion the place wasn't crawling with students, but that instead Hailsham was this quiet, tranquil house where I lived with five or six others. (88).

One of the significant details of this game is that Kathy does not just daydream, but finds a view without anyone else in it in order to do so. She is creating this illusion, therefore, not completely inside her head but based on a physical situation in which she finds herself. In this description, Kathy thus has not altered her physical location. Hailsham is still Hailsham, situated where it is, and she looks at the view which Hailsham in reality provides for her. The change she does dream of is for Hailsham to no longer be a school from which one has to graduate and move on, but a house in which she lives. Thus, the daydream is not of a dream of altering the current state Kathy finds herself in, but rather to maintain the world she inhabits at the moment, stretching this temporal stage in her life longer. The daydream arrests the flow of time, unchanging the changing world.

In translation, this dream of unchange can no longer be found:

What I wanted to do was, even for a moment, imagine I was in a different world (*betsu sekai*). This isn't Hailsham overflowing with students, but rather a quiet and tranquil house somewhere (*dokoka no yakata*), where only five or six others were living with me. (my trans, 140)

Instead of imagining a lack of change, Kathy imagines an escape from the reality in which she finds herself. The dream thus becomes a fantasy of escape, where she is in a different world with the people she is closest to. Explicitly stating "a house somewhere" Hailsham has also become relocated in this fantasy of escape. The act of creating an illusion does not have the largeness with which the term "world" is associated. The illusion is a mask of reality; fantasizing a different world is a recreation of reality, even if only a dream. One might even take it so far to say that in Tsuchiya's translation, Kathy seems to fantasize of escaping from the world which deems her a clone, and instead living an alternate life.

Another instance where a word choice alters the worldview of *Never Let Me Go* is with the notion of possibles: “The basic idea behind the possibles theory was simple [...] Since each of us was copied at some point from a normal person, there must be, for each of us, somewhere out there, a model getting on with his or her life” (137). While the possibles are models of the clones, although it is said that perhaps one would “get *some* insight into who you were deep down” (138) in meeting one’s possible, a physical connection is not perceived. The possibles are, at most, mirrors which show yourself for who you really are. Yet, Tsuchiya uses an interesting metaphor to describe the relation between the clones and possibles:

The basic idea behind the possibles theory was simple [...] Since each of us was copied at some point from a normal person, there must be, for each of us, somewhere out there, say a model, or a “parent” (*oya*), getting on with his or her life. (my trans, 213)

While most of the original text is intact, the model from which the clones are copied is attributed the metaphor of being a parent in the translated version. The clones suddenly have, at least metaphorically, parents, which is an idea Ishiguro does not even mention in the original, for reproduction among the clones is strictly prohibited. The notion of blood-related “family” is something revolutionary in *Never Let Me Go*, and the world of clones in their radical isolation. While perhaps in looking at the individual words themselves the words seem to convey a similar sort of meaning, the translated single word can have an expansive effect on the world of the text.

Ricoeur notes as such in his book: “it is texts, not sentences, not words, that [the translators’] texts try to translate. And texts in turn are part of cultural groups through which different versions of the world are expressed” (31). In this sense, a text in translation is neither a translation word-for-word, nor an English version of the original text. Rather, in the work of translation the translator must make every effort to translate the whole cultural system which the original work participates in. For example, in translating *A Pale View of Hills* into Japanese,

despite the fact that the main parts of the plot take place in Japan, the novel participates in English culture. Ishiguro wrote the text in English originally, and Etsuko narrates the story from England to an English audience. Of course, this is complicated by how “Etsuko ... speaks in a kind of Japanese way because she’s a Japanese woman. When she sometimes speaks about Japanese things ... it becomes clear that she’s speaking English and that it’s a second language for her. So it has to have that kind of carefulness, and, particularly when she’s reproducing Japanese dialogue in English, it has to have a certain foreignness about it” (*Conversation*, 13). In a sense, as I will touch upon in greater detail later, the novel is a quasi-translation in that it takes an imagined Japanese story, Etsuko’s past, and narrates it in English as if translated. It is this whole which the translator must translate from English to, in this case, Japanese. Since Etsuko speaks in English but as a Japanese woman, the novel participates in English culture as an (imagined) text in translation from Japanese. It is this layered totality the translator must translate, making the task of translating especially difficult in this case.

Mikhail Bakhtin’s idea of heteroglossia and the socio-ideological languages that comprise it underlie my conceptualization of translating the layered totality. Heteroglossia points to how within a novel, the author “orchestrates all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types [*raznorečie*] and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions” (484-485). This multiplicity of voices in the novel spawn not only because a novel which is homoglot would be unbearably dull, but because there is no universally neutral language free of intent or implications:

For any individual consciousness living in it, language is not an abstract system of normative forms but rather a concrete heteroglot conception of the world. All words have the “taste” of a profession, a genre, a tendency, a party, a particular work, a particular person, a generation, an age group, the day and hour. Each word tastes of the context and

contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life; all words and forms are populated by intentions. (Bakhtin 504)

Written in such specific, intentional, and temporal language, the novel cannot but be heteroglot, where each of these “tastes” represent some social or ideological group to which they belong.

This is why Bakhtin claims language is socio-ideological; there is no neutral language independent from the whole linguistic system. Language must, thus, be conceived of as a living system in its associations and discourse, in its tangled web of references and stratifications.

Cross-reading the original and translation reveals heteroglossia in effect in cases not necessarily unique to Japanese culture. One such scene in *A Pale View of Hills* is a passage after Sachiko has drowned Mariko’s kittens in the river, and is talking to Etsuko nonchalantly about her American boyfriend back at her house: “The pale light from outside fell on one side of her face, but her hands and sleeves were caught in the glow of the



Fig. 1 提灯(Chōchin)

lantern. It was a strange effect” (169). While this scene already possesses an eeriness from the juxtaposition of the light and the dark, the translation of the words, “but her hands and sleeves were caught in the glow of the lantern” strengthens this eeriness: “Her hands and sleeves were bathed in the reddish glow of the lantern (*ryoute to tamoto wa chōchin no akami wo obita hikari wo abiteita*)” (my trans; 240, italics added). The reddish glow of the lantern is due to the typical color of the chouchin (fig. 1), the lantern by which Sachiko is lit in this scene. I have translated the phrase “浴びる (*abiru*)” into “bathed in” based on a re-translation of Onodera’s translation. The word “*abiru*”, like “bathe,” can be used in cases of both liquid and light. Because in the

previous scene we have seen Sachiko kill the kittens with her own hands, the Japanese description evokes an image of Sachiko's hands and sleeves stained in blood of the lives she has taken. Furthermore, this scene where Sachiko drowns the kittens in the river in front of Mariko and Etsuko is an echo of the story that Sachiko tells of the women who drowns her baby in a river in Tokyo in front of Mariko and Sachiko, another mother who has her hands stained in blood. The translation of the light effect evokes associations in the Japanese reader that is harder to see in the original, expanding the world of the novel. While the *chōchin* itself may be a part of Japanese culture, the scene in translation achieves the imagery through the translation of “caught” to “bathed,” a translation that is not culture-specific. The transformations through the translation reveals how each word of a text plays an essential role in the weaving of the entire textual world, creating a heteroglot novel.

One of the most noticeable changes between the original and translation of *A Pale View of Hills* occurs with the names of characters, for while the names themselves stay the same, in the translation, the names of the Japanese characters are written in kanji. Onodera writes about this stylistic choice in the translator's afterword:

I thought of writing the names in katakana, but I received an unexpected request from the author about his wish for a certain kanji to be avoided for a certain character, and I learned that he was expecting the names to be written in kanji. As I was thinking that this was more natural, and would give the characters reality, I decided to write the names of the characters in kanji. And in doing so, to make sure the names are not read mistakenly, I chose the kanji that are generally given the reading matching the name ... Exceptions to this are Sachiko and Mariko, and to these unique characters I gave characters which stand out. (My trans, 268)

Through this transliteration and translation of the characters and the framework, Onodera now has to consider, as he mentions through his allusion to Ishiguro's requests, the meaning with which the usage of particular kanjis can imbue the characters. Each kanji character can express a meaning on its own, almost like a prefix or a suffix in English, such that one can figure out the

meaning of a word they do not know if they know the kanji characters used in the word. Therefore, this means that to use certain characters in names will distort the character's persona. While Onodera does not explicitly state whose name and what kanji he was asked to avoid, the most likely possibilities are Keiko or Sachiko because the most typical kanji to be used in their names communicate happiness and fortune, which neither Keiko nor Sachiko seem to possess in the novel. In the case of Sachiko, the most common kanji for the "sachi" of her name is "幸", which means happiness or fortune, and this does not match the character exactly. In the translation, she is given the characters "佐知" (sachi), which is a more direct transliteration of the way her name is pronounced and does not convey additional meanings. For Keiko, on the other hand, "Kei" can be written using the kanji "恵" (kei), which means grace or blessing (*megumi*). In translation, she is instead given the character "景" (kei), which means scene or landscape, presumably to avoid the alternative positive connotation. While we cannot be sure of this, this exhibits how the translator and translation can transform the text, and expand the associations which the text may awaken, as Coetzee says.

A similar phenomenon to the names occurs with the setting, for to a Japanese audience, now the scenes set in Britain are foreign and the scenes in Japan appear more native. Perhaps most susceptible to the changes in setting in the novel is Etsuko's name. While in Japan everyone calls her Etsuko (悦子), the first instance we hear somebody call her name in Britain (Niki calls her Mother) is when she is called "Mrs Sheringham!" / "*Sheringham-San!*" (Eng. 49 / Jap. 68) by Mrs Waters. Not only is this the moment we learn of the family name of the English man Etsuko has married, the katakana writing of "Sheringham" exhibits the distance Etsuko has traveled from her Japanese world, both in time and geography. Etsuko has at this point become

half-foreign to the Japanese text, for we recognize the underlying translation process Etsuko has undergone to the Japanese audience, such that the Japanese audience can understand Etsuko but experience the foreignness she now possesses. Her name suggests as much as well, for her name has transformed from Etsuko Ogata (緒方 悦子) to Etsuko Sheringham (シェリングガム 悦子), a visible manifestation of the foreignness within Etsuko, as well as of the foreignness of the British world she now inhabits.

On the other hand, the foreignness of Niki's name emphasizes how "[Etsuko] — perhaps out of some selfish desire not to be reminded of the past — insisted on an English [name]" (9). Written such that Niki's name is the first thing we read of the story and the only katakana word in that first paragraph, the emphasis placed on her name is drastically increased in the translation. In addition, the sentence "Niki, the name we finally gave my younger daughter, is not an abbreviation" (*Niki, saigo ni kimatta shita no musume no na wa betsu ni aishō dewa nai*) (Eng. 9 / Jap. 7) is written in anastrophe like the original text to further emphasize her name. But Niki's name, written in katakana, also presents a direct contrast to Keiko's name, which is written in kanji. For if Niki's name is a wish "not to be reminded of the past", then Keiko's name written in kanji is exactly that which Etsuko avoided through Niki's name: a reminder of the past. While the names themselves do exhibit a contrast in English, the dynamics at play within the novel between Japanese and English, and between Japan and the West (the U.S. and Britain to be precise) are better expressed by the transliteration of the change in Etsuko's last name and Niki's name in katakana. Furthermore, returning to Niki's father's Orientalism (in Said's sense of "a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" (3)) in the previous chapter, the katakana names here can be seen as emphasizing the Orientalism that extracts Etsuko and Niki from Japan, while keeping a part of them Japanese. Katakana makes the

Orientalist violence easier to observe in the reader's eyes because it makes Etsuko and Niki foreign from Japanese and English, for katakana, despite is foreignness in Japanese, is nonetheless a part of the foreign language in the eyes of the English people.

Another significant change in the translation happens in the stylistic manner of the text, wherein the novel becomes an explicitly written narrative by Etsuko. The narrative tone established by Etsuko in both the original and translation signals to us that she is telling this story to an audience. However, one difference between the two is that whereas Ishiguro keeps vague what medium Etsuko is telling this story through (speech or writing), Onodera explicitly establishes Etsuko as a writer. This becomes clear when, while in the English Etsuko says: "I have no great wish to dwell on Keiko now [...] I only mention her here" (11), Onodera translates this as "I have no wish to write about Keiko here (*ima kokode amari Keiko no kotowo kakō towa omowanai*) [...] I only mention her here (10). The translation matches the original here, except for the ambiguity of the verb, expressed by "dwell on" versus "write about". This, despite the difference being a single word, alters the narrative frame completely, for now, Etsuko has earned an authorial function within the framing of the novel.

Michel Foucault writes in his essay "What is an Author?" that the author's name "seems always to be present, marking off the edges of the text, revealing, or at least characterizing, its mode of being. The author's name manifests the appearance of a certain discursive set and indicates the status of this discourse within a society and a culture" (211). In the phonetic system, as in most Western countries, the difference between an author within the novel and the narrator of the novel may not differ, for the spoken word corresponds directly with the written language, and the grand-author remains the author with the physical body, in our case Ishiguro. We cannot, as Foucault warns, "equate the author with the real writer as to equate him with the fictitious

speaker” (215), or in our case, writer. But in Japanese, this is not the case; there are elements, such as *furigana* and katakana, that can only be expressed in the written medium. As Onodera sets Etsuko up to be a writer, not just a narrator, we must then read the text as a written story by Etsuko to express certain things she may not be able to do in English. To return to the presence of katakana in writing her and Niki’s name, we can read this as Etsuko bringing to the surface the Orientalist violence of which she has become the victim in a way that she can only do in Japanese.

Another stylistic choice Onodera translates Etsuko as making is the *furigana* of “*Sheringham-San!*(シェリ<sup>きん</sup>ンガム夫人)” (68), which reminds the readers that the text is translated, and that parts of the text mimic a translation process in their textual style, but unlike the English version in which Etsuko translates the Japanese parts to English, Etsuko translates English into Japanese in the Japanese version. Returning to this scene, we can observe that the *furigana* signals to us that “夫人” (usually read “fujin”, meaning Mrs.) is to be read as “-san,” the most common Japanese honorific; and the second time Mrs Waters calls Etsuko immediately after, she is referred to as just “*Sheringham-San* (シェリ<sup>きん</sup>ンガムさん)”, without 夫人 (68). The *furigana* here establishes two effects: retaining the Mrs of Mrs Sheringham, a gendered, English honorific that the ‘san’ alone does not necessarily imply; and of the translation which Etsuko performs. The former effect, as I mentioned, reminds us that the story is being translated, and retains the taste of the original while providing a Japanese gloss, a welcoming of the foreign into the home language as it is. The latter effect is established by Onodera, through Etsuko, as a translation of the textual style: a translation of the foreign parts for the native reader by the protagonist. While Ishiguro gives the effect of Etsuko performing a translation of the Japanese parts into English for an

English audience, to do so in the translation would not have the same effect, for now, in translation, the audience becomes Japanese. In providing the *furigana* which establishes this reminder of translated-ness, Etsuko is newly positioned as the translator of the novel's English parts into Japanese for a Japanese audience. Thus, while the style of the original is echoed in the translation through this quasi-translation style, there is also a fundamental difference: Etsuko has set herself up as the author in a Japanese discourse, unlike the English original in which she simply participates as a storyteller. Obviously, this stylistic choice is something which can only be done in written text. This scene exhibits not only the practice of linguistic hospitality, but also a transformation of the whole novel-world through a faithful translation of the textual style.

In the case of *Never Let Me Go*, this can be seen in the translation of Judy Bridgewater's song, "Never Let Me Go" in an album titled *Songs After Dark*, of which Kathy sings a fragment: "Never let me go... Oh baby, baby... Never let me go..." (69). In translating this song which Ishiguro fabricates, Tsuchiya makes the choice to translate the effect of the song while reminding the reader of the translation process which underlies this. Both the album and song titles are translated into Japanese such that the meaning of the titles are kept: "*Songs After Dark (Yoru ni kiku uta)*" (106), and "Never Let Me Go (*watashi o hanasanaide*)" (110). The parallel between the title of the novel and the title of the song are kept as well, such that the centrality of this song to the text is not lost in any way. Tsuchiya does this with the lyrics as well, making sure the meaning and style are preserved in the translation: "Never let me go... oh, baby, baby... *watashi o hanasanaide* (never let me go)" (110). Since the phrase, "oh baby, baby" can be understood in its dual meaning, of the literal baby as well as a way of referring to someone dear to you, Tsuchiya keeps the phrase as is in the translation, transliterated into katakana. In the translation of the phrase "never let me go" at the start and end of the lyrics, Tsuchiya makes the choice to

transliterate the first time it is sung in katakana as it is, and translates the phrase the second time the phrase is sung to create the effect of echoing the title within the song lyrics. By keeping the first as “oh never let me go” and translating the second into Japanese to match the title, Tsuchiya translates the textual style while making sure readers remember the song is being sung in English.

Another change in the framework effected by translation in the case of *Never Let Me Go* is, like Etsuko’s becoming an author, the style in which Kathy tells the story, except that in this case the change occurs not with the narrator but with the audience. The novel starts close to where it ends, for Kathy mentions how she will not be a carer any longer at “the end of this year” (3) at the beginning, and once more that “by the end of the year, I won’t be driving around like this any more” (281) at the end. In telling her story, she expects us to know what she means by terms such as “donors” and “donations” (3) specific to the world of the novel, although we do not learn the significance of these terms until later. She frames the narrative this way because her audience is another carer: “I know carers, working now, who are just as good and don’t get half the credit. If you’re one of them, I can understand how you might get resentful” (3). This is not the case in the translated version: “From the view of those kind of people (*sōiu hito kara sureba*)” (my trans, 10). While the part preceding it is the same, and as such I have not quoted it, the part “if you’re one of them” which directly refers to the audience in the second person, is dropped in the translation, so Kathy does not specify who she is talking to in the Japanese version. We can observe this further, where Kathy mentions ‘collections’: “I don’t know if you had ‘collections’ where you were” (38) becomes translated to “I don’t know about other institutions” (my trans, 63). We thus no longer inhabit a position which is as sympathetic in the original version, for we are no longer in the same situation as Kathy. We are not necessarily

clones anymore. While this does not affect Kathy's story, this change in the framework is nonetheless significant for the relation of the reader to the narrator. The Japanese audience reads the story as a fantastical story about beings in their isolated bubble, characters to be read as if the audience was encountering ill-treated fairies or pixies. Not only are the Japanese readers further away from the physical location of the setting of the novel than Western readers, in terms not just of geography but of the distinction between the West and East, but through not being in a similar position as Kathy and the clones, the world of the novel becomes even more foreign to the Japanese reader.

Walkowitz's notion of "unimaginable largeness," a phrase she takes from Ishiguro's novel *The Remains of the Day* that "refers to the notion that any small action, including the polishing of household silver, needs to assume the same ethical and political significance as the more expansive system of actions in which it should be seen to participate" (218) is in a similar vein: "It allows us to consider how the way we understand the uniqueness of books relates to the way we understand the uniqueness of communities, and how our models of literary culture shape what we need to know about the nature and scale of social lives" (ibid.). The ways in which translation affects a culture of course differs depending on the culture, where for example in the case of Japanese with the katakana system, the culture performs an integration without assimilation. Again, translating a text requires that the whole culture of which the original text is a part, is communicated to the reader as much as possible. The process of translation does not end there, however, for then comes the question of how this translated culture becomes integrated, rendering the culture which the text is translated into slightly more foreign to the native readers of that language than before. Revisiting the idea of katakana, the importing of loan words, even if it is a way of integration without assimilation, does change the Japanese language

as along with the imported word is the imported object which that word designates. For example, in Japan it is with the translation of “internet (*intānetto*)” into the Japanese language that the internet, both as a technological invention and as a concept, becomes accessible in Japan, along with everything the internet provides in our lives. Thus, although translation may be, on the most basic level, importing a fragment of a foreign culture into another language and culture, the impact it has is not small.

In fact, the “veranda” (19) of Sachiko’s house exhibits how translation not only expands the world into which the text is translated, but also expands the original work as well. The house in which Sachiko lives is described by Etsuko as “the kind of cottage often seen in the countryside, with a tiled roof sloping almost to the ground” (12). While the description of the house is a rather direct translation of the English description, the translation of the line “Let’s go out on the veranda,” (19) becomes “Let’s go out on the *engawa*<sup>13</sup> (*Engawa e ikanai?*)” (22). Of course, as the description of the house hints, Sachiko’s house is likely a traditional Japanese house, and the veranda which Ishiguro writes points to the *engawa*, and thus, it is not odd that the translator chooses to translate veranda as *engawa* in this scene (Fig. 2).



Fig.2, Left: Engawa, right: veranda.

<sup>13</sup> A thin, long wooden flooring that stretches alongside a room of a Japanese-style house.

However, the interesting aspect of this example is that the word “veranda” exists in Japanese as it is (ベランダ, read as and means “veranda”). The word “veranda,” imported and written as a loan word, has failed to become the linguistic equivalent of the original word, as the word “veranda” had to be imported into Japan precisely to differentiate it as an architectural structure from the *engawa*, despite the common translation of the *engawa* as veranda. The use of the term “veranda” in the original by Ishiguro can be seen as none other than a compromise reached upon the failure to find the English equivalent to the *engawa* to a level where any reader can imagine the similar structured architecture, revealed by the re-translation Onodera performs. Of course, this happens because this part of the novel takes place in Japan, and Ishiguro is writing about Japan in English to an English audience, whereas Onodera is writing about Japan in Japanese to a Japanese audience. Returning to the earlier examples of udon and *chōchin*, we can observe a similar phenomenon, where the words “noodle” and “lantern” have been imported into Japanese, but with Western connotations like “veranda.” In the case of noodles, the definition of noodle (ヌードル) specifies the use of the term in pointing to those used in Western dishes: “In Western dishes, refers to the any string-like noodles” (*Kōjien*, 2246, my trans). In the case of lanterns, the term evokes in the reader’s mind the Western lanterns specifically, different from what one would imagine upon hearing *chōchin*. Nonetheless, in this re-translation of veranda and *engawa*, as in the case of udon and *chōchin* as well, the Japanese reader can better grasp the image of Sachiko’s house, and the original text’s world has been re-imagined, re-visited, and expanded in this light.

The postwar Japan setting adds significance to this linguistic historicity of veranda and *engawa*. While Sachiko’s house is a traditional Japanese house, all other houses and buildings have been leveled by the atomic bomb dropped in Nagasaki; for example, Etsuko lives in a

newly built apartment where “the floors were tatami, the bathrooms and kitchens of a western design” (12). The modern Japanese apartments would not have an *engawa* like the traditional houses, but would have verandas for each apartment room (Fig. 2). While no scene appears in which we read of the veranda of Etsuko’s apartment (perhaps it does not have one), if it did, it would be obvious that the translator would choose to translate those as “veranda” rather than *engawa*. But this difference would not occur in the English version; both verandas are nothing but verandas despite their presumable architectural differences insofar as the translator has chosen to translate *engawa* into veranda before referring to veranda, the loaned concept in Japan. Especially in scenes where there is a mix of Western and Japanese cultural influences, which occurs often in the post-war setting in which life is becoming increasingly Westernized with the American occupation, the translation has the advantage of being able to use both the loan and traditional word to express the historicity behind the word, whereas the original often cannot do so.

This expansion can be seen in the case of *Never Let Me Go* as well, through the contrast of the two boats: the actual fragment of a boat at the art gallery in Norfolk, and the boat in the marshlands. In the original version, Ishiguro refers to both as boats: “here and there, you’d see a bit of fishing net, or a rotted piece from a boat stuck up near the cornicing” (160), in the gallery; and “beyond the dead trunks, maybe sixty yards away, was the boat, sitting beached in the marshes under the weak sun” (220). We can already observe the contrast between these two boats in the original. Whereas in the gallery, the boat is in fragments, in the marshland, the trees are cracked and dead, and the boat is in better condition although “its paint was cracking, and [...] the timber frames of the little cabin were crumbling away” (220). In other words, in the case of the former, the fragments of the boat serve to decorate the gallery-space as object. In the case

of the latter, however, the boat itself is the central object, and the scene is set around it. The significance of this difference lies in the timing of when each boat appears in the novel. Kathy enters the gallery when they are in Norfolk, searching for Ruth's possible, and it is in this gallery that everyone realizes the possible is not anything like Ruth. On the other hand, Kathy, Ruth, and Tommy see the boat in the marshlands in the scene before Ruth apologizes for her actions in the past which kept Kathy and Tommy separate, and hands Madame's address to Tommy, expressing her wish that they try to apply for a deferral. In short, the first boat in fragments represents the death of a future for Ruth; the second boat represents a possible future for Tommy and Kathy.

This contrast between the two boats is emphasized in Tsuchiya's translation. One of the translated elements through which this emphasis occurs is in the difference in the kanji characters attributed to each boat. The first boat in the gallery is transliterated as “舟 (*fune*)” (249), and the second boat is transliterated as “船 (*fune*)” (341). While the two characters sound identical when read aloud, the difference in the written characters arises from a difference in the size of the boat referred. The boat in the gallery is a smaller boat, often rowed by hand; the boat in the marshes refers to a bigger one, often with an engine. This contrast runs in parallel to the contrast between the scenes in which each boat appears. For while both future possibilities are revealed to be false, the latter boat has more energy propelling it forward in contrast to the former. Indeed, Kathy and Tommy come closer to the truth about the clones and the possibility of a future, the deferral, than Ruth does through her possible. This divide between Ruth on the one hand, and Kathy and Tommy on the other, is deepened through a translation of these two scenes, when Ruth and Kathy are discussing the boat in the marshes for the first time, and are talking about the cabin of the boat. The description, “With a little cabin for a couple of fishermen

to squeeze into when it's stormy" (212) is translated into "with a little cabin for about *two* fishermen (*futari kurai nara*) to squeeze into when it's stormy" (329). The difference here arises from the specificity of reference to numbers. While in English the phrase "a couple" does not necessarily mean two exactly, but rather a relatively small number in general, Tsuchiya translates this to a specific number, "two." Although he does suggest the possible variance, the explicit statement of the number cannot go unnoticed. As Kathy and Ruth are planning to go see the boat with Tommy as well, the observation that only "about two" people can fit seems to be a line which divides the three into two: Kathy and Tommy, and Ruth, reflecting the kanji for boat associated with each of them as mentioned earlier, and the future the boats signify. Despite this rather sad consequence, the translation has nonetheless expanded the novel's world, creating intertextual effects where there were none. In the case of the *engawa* and the boats in each of the respective novels, we can observe how translation awakens new associations and symbolic significations in ways not necessarily possible in the original work, expanding the novel's world to both the English and Japanese readers in this case.

Expansion by translation happens in a larger cultural dimension as well, wherein the work of translation brings in an author and their critical associations into the native culture along with it. Kojin Karatani uses the example of the canonical status of Shakespeare to illustrate this process. Shakespeare is one of the most renowned Western poets/playwrights in Japan. Studies of Shakespeare are done in Japanese, and novels and films inspired by Shakespeare's works. Yet, without a translation of Shakespeare into Japanese, a significantly limited population in Japan would have known him, and works inspired by him may not have been born. Indeed, looking back at history from the present moment, we can clearly see the canonical gap which

Shakespeare fills. However, we must recognize that the gap itself can only be seen because Shakespeare entered the system at some point in the past, and opened up a canon where none existed before. Natsume Sōseki, a Japanese author, writes in the published notes of a lecture under the title *A Theory of Literature*: “When I appeal to my own experience, I learn that the realm of poetry created by Shakespeare does not possess that universality that European critics ascribe to it. For us as Japanese it requires years of training to develop a proper appreciation of Shakespeare, and even then this is only a dim appreciation” (Karatani quoting Sōseki, 12-13). Sōseki reveals how while Shakespeare was imported into Japanese culture along with the fame and acknowledgement of his talent he possessed in the West, readers had to train themselves to understand what had been imported. If Shakespeare had the universally distinctive talent that Sōseki identifies Western critics as seeing in Shakespeare, this learning process would not occur. Like a missing puzzle piece, it would have fit right in to the space designated for Shakespeare. This is not the case, however, and a canon was developed around Shakespeare in Japan in order to appreciate him. There was no gap that needed to be filled in the eyes of Japanese critics until translations of Shakespeare opened up that space for him. The translated work and author, thus, does not fill a canonical gap preceding translation, but rather creates a space, expanding the linguistic and cultural system of a country irreversibly in a way that conceals this developmental stage.

Furthermore, the concealment of the creation of a space by translation does not occur within some political vacuum. Transcribed into a world which is inscribed with power dynamics that create a complex flow of cultures globally and unequally, translation that traverses at least two cultures cannot be a power-neutral act. One aspect of translation is that it is selective, not only in terms of which works are selected to be translated, but also in terms of which languages

are translated to and from. These selections are neither random nor fair; circulation is intentional. With politics and economics in mind, publishers filter which texts will enter into global circulation. There is a reason why English is taught as the second language in places where English is not the only language of the country: English is the universal language of the world. Thus, English is most often one of the two sides: the text is either originally written in English, or is translated into English first.

In a book titled *日本語が亡びるとき—英語の世紀の中で* (*The Fall of Language in the Age of English*) by Mizumura, expresses this worry about the English-centered worldview:

たとえば、どうやってかれらが知ることができるでしょう。どのような文学が英語に翻訳されるかというとき、主題からいっても、言葉の使い方からいっても、英語に翻訳されやすいものが自然に選ばれてしまうということ。すなわち、英語の世界観を強化するようなものばかりが、知らず知らずのうちに英語に翻訳されてしまうということ。どうやってかれらが知ることができるでしょう。かくしてそこには永続する、円環構造をした、世界の解釈法ができてしまっているということ—世界を解釈するにあたって英語という言葉でもって理解できる〈真実〉のみが、唯一の〈真実〉となってしまうということ。そして、そのなかには、英語で理解しやすい異国趣味などというものまで入りこんでしまっているということ。どうやってかれらが知ることができるでしょう。この円環構造をした世界の解釈法がああなる栄誉あるノーベル文学賞を可能にし、しかも、それによって、さらに強化されてしまっていることを。(Jap. 113-114)

[Writers in English] are not condemned to know, for instance, that the works that are usually translated into English are those that are both thematically and linguistically the easiest to translate, that often only reinforce the worldview constructed by the English language, and preferably that entertain readers with just the right kind of exoticism. They are not condemned to know that there is thus a perpetual hermeneutic circle—that in interpreting the world, only “truths” that can be perceived in English exist as “truths.” They are not condemned to know that this hermeneutic circle is further consolidated by the honorable Nobel Prize in Literature (Eng. 63)

While the worries Mizumura outlines here is from the perspective of the writer writing in a language which is not English, if non-English texts translated into English perpetuate the “hermeneutic circle,” then it goes without saying texts written in English will feed into this circle as well. Ngũgĩ expresses a concern in the similar vein in *Decolonising the Mind* when he writes:

English, like French and Portuguese, was assumed to be the natural language of literary and even political meditation between African people in the same nation and between nations in Africa and other continents [...] [The dominance of English] language and literature were taking us further and further from ourselves to other selves, from our world to other worlds [...] [because] language carries culture, and culture carries, particularly through orature and literature, the entire body of values by which we come to perceive ourselves and our place in the world. (6, 12, 16).

Non-English languages and cultures, as writers like Mizumura and Ngũgĩ express, have always been *decentered* from the world in which English was located in the center intentionally, and everything was made to feed into the English world. Inscribed into such global dynamics, translation, both into English and from English, seem to only expand the hegemonic empire, expanding not benevolently but rather viciously in a vortex with English at the center. The possibilities of translation, in this light, appear to be expansive in the same way colonial tactics were expansive: they serve to enrich the Western nations.

I have used the word “decentered” in the previous paragraph in direct opposition to Franco Moretti’s concept of the cultural “periphery.” Periphery performs as a description of a condition passively: it fails to recognize how cultures have been *made* peripheral, often by scholars, politicians, businessmen of the Occident. Decentering, by contrast, describes an intentional act, wherein the actors concealed in “periphery” become revealed, and show how the Euro-centric perspective has defined and created a center and the peripheries. Thus, when Moretti recognizes world literature to be “[o]ne, and unequal” based on the world system of “international capitalism” (162), he fails to recognize that none of this has been fatally configured in our world yet. We do not need to accept the model international capitalism puts forward, and in fact should resist such models if they willingly accept and exacerbate inequality, as Moretti himself acknowledges. In short, in problematizing world literature in pointing to its inequality and basing the rest of his argument off of this problem, he negates alternative

possibilities outside of this system, outside of international capitalism. We have seen already, through *A Pale View of Hills*, what a world based on this system can do to relationships one can have with the foreign, since the U.S. occupation of Japan was a project of democratization, but also of introducing capitalism in Japan against communism of the Soviet Union (Takeuchi 95). Moretti has identified the problem of this for us: “international capitalism is a system that is simultaneously *one*, and *unequal*: with a core, and a periphery (and a semi-periphery) that are bound together in a relationship of growing inequality” (162). This unequal relationship bleeds into personal relationships as well, as in the case of Etsuko and Niki, and makes attaining an alternative impossible in reality, which makes the dream of being elsewhere the best state to be in. In problematizing world literature, the whole system in which it is inscribed must also be problematized, and thus should not be even conceived as an “initial hypothesis” (Moretti 162), for anything that follows will inherently be a problem that needs to be resisted.

Karatani, in examining the development of modern Japanese literature, also observes how the Western canon manifests its hegemonic powers stealthily. Developing on Sōseki’s discussion of Shakespeare, he writes:

To the poets and playwrights trained in Latin, the “universal tongue” of their time, Shakespeare’s work was beneath consideration. It continued to be ignored until the nineteenth century, when the German romantic movement discovered Shakespeare along with ‘literature.’ It was at this juncture that the image of Shakespeare—individual of genius, self-conscious artist, poet at once realist and romantic—was born. But [...] Shakespeare was not a realist, and he was not attempting to represent what was “human.” When the notion of universality was established in nineteenth-century Europe, its own historicity had to be concealed. (13)

Here, in talking of universality, Karatani refers to the “universal character of English literature” (12) that Sōseki discusses, and specifically about how the value and significance of English literature is regarded as universally true regardless of the reader’s background. Yet, as Karatani writes, Shakespeare had to be discovered in order for anyone to associate Shakespeare with his

universally accepted talent. Shakespeare was not always universal, realist, or romantic as Karatani points out. Literary critics have merely configured him to be so at a certain point in history, and have configured him as central not just to English literature, but to the whole canon of world literature. In other words, Karatani points to how a universal canon has been formed around Western, specifically English, values, which hides its cultural locality and expands its hegemonic empire. In this way, Karatani shows how Shakespeare's "universality," and the wider canon which designates him so, is revealed to be local, both geographically and historically, operating with an intent of cultural imperialism. This does not necessarily deny the talent of Shakespeare, for that is a different question altogether; nor is it necessarily Karatani's intent to see Shakespeare, the playwright, as an imperialist. Rather, he points out that Shakespeare is an epitome of the hegemonic system of Western culture, specifically of Western literature, which stealthily invades literary disciplines on a global scale while concealing its own locality. The consequences Karatani seems to suggest through this example point in the same direction as Mizumura and Ngũgĩ do, displaying the work of the hegemonic English-vortex projected to swallow the globe unified under the English worldview.

One scene in *A Pale View of Hills* in which this English hegemony surfaces occurs when Sachiko talks of her aspiration to study English when she was younger. One of the intertexts Ishiguro references in relation to this aspiration is *A Christmas Carol*, when Sachiko explains her ability to speak English: "my father brought a book back from America for me, an English version of *A Christmas Carol*. That became something of an ambition of mine, Etsuko. I wanted to learn English well enough to read that book" (110). The underlying premise in Sachiko's quote is that Charles Dickens has already been "discovered" (to borrow Karatani's word) and canonized, as we can see in the fact that although Dickens is a British author, her father brings

the novella back from the U.S. to Japan, showing the global permeation and circulation of *A Christmas Carol*. As an item symbolic of the West in Sachiko's life before her marriage, the ability to read the novella in its original language becomes her own benchmark for having successfully attained bilingualism. Since she dreams of "go[ing] to America one day" and "becom[ing] a film actress" and is told by her father that "if [Sachiko] learnt [her] English well enough, [she] could easily become a business girl" (109), the ability to read a canonical Western text in its original language becomes her passport for entry into the West. Sachiko's assertion that the novella was "an English version" also suggests that non-English versions were already in circulation at this time, and presumably in Japanese as well since neither Sachiko, Etsuko, nor Ishiguro explains this point further. Nothing needs to be explained beyond its title and the language it has been written in, because every other factor has become globally circulated to the point that the title can act as a kind of shorthand for author and plot. Thus, the story itself is no longer the significance of the novella. The achievement of having read the text in English, and thus achieving bilingualism, becomes the purpose for which the novella is brought into Sachiko's life. Universality has been achieved; the novella is no longer part of an English literary canon, but a global literary canon. As in the case of Shakespeare, Dickens' historicity has been concealed under the umbrella of such a universal canon, requiring no further explanation beyond the version and title. While this is not to say that Ishiguro perpetuates this stealthy hegemony through his writing, it does point to how there exists a global force which perpetuates this canonizing globalization consciously and subconsciously, keeping the English empire intact. Like Shakespeare, Ishiguro is not necessarily the conscious agent enacting cultural imperialism, but is rather an inevitable agent of this global force.

However, through translation, the concealed historicity is revealed, for while the

canonization has not been undone, the hegemonic canonization has become visible once Onodera inserts Dickens' name in the translation: "'I remember once,' Sachiko went on, 'my father brought a book back from America for me, an English version of Dickens' *A Christmas Carol*.'" (153). In translating the text, Onodera explicitly names Dickens in order for the text to be faithful to the original in its nonchalant reference to the novella, but only by unfolding the abbreviated author's name in Sachiko's speech in translation. Thus, while the universality of Dickens' novella remains intact, the most fundamental assumption, the fact that it goes without saying that *A Christmas Carol* was written by Dickens, has been undone, revealing the global permeation as incomplete. Although this does not undo the hegemonic force which "Dickens' *A Christmas Carol*" exerts, the translation reveals the process of the development of the global canon, and the stealth with which it operates. It is perhaps ironic that it is the bilingualism which Sachiko strives to achieve through *A Christmas Carol* that reveals the underlying foundation of this Western hegemonic canonization. In being able to speak in multiple languages, the foreigner acquires the perspective of an other, coming to realize that the West is not a global truth, but a constructed power consciously working its hegemonic poison on a global scale. It is by becoming a foreigner that one comes to imagine an alternative, seeing the history of the world we inhabit today as constructed and variable, not singularly true and absolute.

But what alternatives remain in the face of a hegemony which continually perpetuates itself, expanding the perpetual hermeneutic circle ever larger? Mizumura reaches one conclusion in her first publication of the book<sup>14</sup>:

英語の世紀の中で、日本語で読み書きすることの意味を根源から問い、その問いを問いつつも、日本語で読み書きすることの意味のそのままの証しとなるような日本語であり続けること—その

---

<sup>14</sup> The English translation does not include the last chapter in which this passage appears, as Mizumura "decided to substantially rewrite the final chapter [in the English version] to describe the current linguistic and cultural mess we Japanese find ourselves in and to sketch in terms relevant to foreign readers how we might yet escape from it" (Preface XI) in collaboration with her translators, Professor Mari Yoshihara and Professor Juliet Winters Carpenter.

ような日本語であり続ける運命を、今ならまだ選び直すことができる。(404-405)

To question from the root, in the age of English, the meaning of reading and writing in Japanese, and while continuing to ask this question, to strive to be the Japanese language in a way that proves the value of reading and writing in Japanese—we can still choose to walk the path of living in a Japanese as such. (my trans).

This conclusion Mizumura reaches arises from an earlier point she makes, where she writes of a certain “hope” non-English writers possess precisely because of their writing in another language:

それは、一度この非対称性を意識してしまえば、我々は、「言葉」にかんして、常に思考するのを強られる運命にあるということにほかなりません。そして、「言葉」にかんして、常に思考するのを強られる者のみが、〈真実〉が一つではないということ、すなわち、この世には英語でもって理解できる〈真実〉、英語で構築された〈真実〉のほかにも、〈真実〉というものがあろうこと—それを知るのを、常に強られるのです。(113)

For those of us who know we are living in this asymmetry are the only ones condemned to perpetually reflect upon language, the only ones forced to know that the English language cannot dictate “truths” and that there are other “truths” in this world that cannot be perceived through the English language. (63)

The “非対称性” (asymmetry) she refers to here is of “the asymmetrical relationship between the world of English and the world of non-English” (62) in an English-centered world. Thus, the alternative that Mizumura sees in response to being in the “Age of English” is to consciously choose to inhabit a language and a world that is not English, and realizing that such other worlds are worlds only reachable in that particular language. In other words, inhabiting another language allows one to conceive of other world systems, an alternative that Moretti rejects outright. To return to Ishiguro and his works in translation, it is by reading his work in the original and the translation that we can envision an alternative. It is by reading the work in translation not as a translation of the original but as a unique text born out of the process of translation into another language, in this case Japanese, the alternative that Mizumura points out, of living in another language as a reader, comes into view. In other words, realizing that there are differences, and even sources of richness, caused by a text being translated into another language

is a proof of the fact that there are other worlds which need not operate with an understanding of English as the “center.”

Furthermore, upon realizing this alternative, we can look back at the English world in a different lens. Ngũgĩ asks: “Why, we may ask, should an African writer, or any writer, become so obsessed by taking from his mother-tongue to enrich other tongues? [...] We never asked ourselves: how can we enrich our languages? [...] And why not create literary monuments in our own languages?” (8) Having chosen to inhabit one’s own language, the English world presents itself not as a standard to which one must conform, but as another source of reference to “enrich our languages”. After all, there is nothing “natural” about the English language in itself which makes it a vicious, hegemonic language; it is only the current power dynamics in which English is inscribed that makes it so. To quote Mizumura, “English is an accidental universal language” (202), not accidental in its motives, but accidental in its essence. As such, the alternative that Mizumura and Ngũgĩ propose, the choice to inhabit a different world upon acknowledging the hegemony of English and the power it asserts, being happy to be “condemned to reflect on language” in this asymmetrical relationship, ultimately allows the reader to look back upon English, and see it no longer as the hegemonic force it used to be, but as another alternative which one can choose among.

Ishiguro, in his Nobel lecture, says “we must widen our common literary world to include many more voices from beyond our comfort zones of the elite first-world cultures. We must search more energetically to discover the gems from what remain today unknown literary cultures, whether the writers live in faraway countries or within our own communities” (16). Indeed, there is not a single reader in the world who knows of all the literary gems in the world, and the discovery of such talents will always be a joy which readers must strive for. But as

Mizumura and Ngũgĩ have shown, those gems may be happier being foreigners to the English world, working to enrich their own language in the face of the expanding English world, rather than to contribute to the process of “widen[ing] our common literary world” where the “our” points to the audience at the Nobel Prize ceremony, a community which Mizumura explicitly identifies as a key player in the “perpetual hermeneutic circle” of the English language. That Ishiguro may be the last recipient of the Nobel Prize in Literature, at least for a while, because of the sexual abuse and corruption within *The Eighteen*, casts significantly more doubt on the values the Nobel Prize represents.

The state of the foreigner which I mention here is specifically what Julia Kristeva describes: “the foreigner is the one who does not belong to the state in which we are, the one who does not have the same nationality [...] The group to which the foreigner does not belong has to be a social group structured about a given kind of political power” (96). I wish to add to this definition that Kristeva offers: the foreigner must *choose* this state of not-belonging. The conclusions which Mizumura and Ngũgĩ reach are available to them in light of being able to be in a position of choosing to stay foreign to that dominant English world. Yet, to repeat Mizumura’s words, “English is an accidental universal language”, and one should not feel content if the same hegemonic force is employed by that language which they have chosen. If it is only by accident, as Mizumura says, that English is the language in the position of the “universal”, then we should also keep in mind, no matter how far it may be in the future, that a non-English language can come to occupy this role at some point. In that case, we should also be ready to break away from our language of choice that has done this, and choose to become a foreigner once again to that language to which one belonged at some point. It is, as Kristeva writes, only by “not belong[ing]” which we become foreigners, and to not belong one must see

the world which they wish not to belong to. As such, the state of foreignness is not only being outside, but rather choosing to be outside, not of a physical location, but of any world with a hegemonic power. For hegemonic power erases alternative possibilities centripetally. As I have noted to conclude the second chapter, foreignness is one's relation to the unknown, a sort of magic that gains its significance precisely through the possibility of an alternative world outside of the one that one inhabits. It is the ability to be critical from one's position within this relationship of being a foreigner which realizes Western hegemony and imaginations of alternatives in the world today.

The act of translation, which requires a visualization of at least two worlds simultaneously, performs this critical reading in its very nature, keeping us conscious of the existence of the two worlds in reminding us of the act of translation that has taken place, most concretely visible through the use of *furigana* in the case of Japanese. Thus, cross-reading the product of translation and the original work allows the reader to see not only the transformations the text has gone through in order to enter one's language, but also the transformations the language has gone through to welcome the work in translation, such as the creation of lexical "gaps" where no such space existed before. Finally, the potential of translation to expand the world as I have outlined through the two Ishiguro novels still possess a positive potential, insofar as the reader is conscious of what world the translation expands, and in acknowledging this, gains further insight on their own ideal positionality in regards to the multiple literary worlds it is possible to choose from. Mizumura and Ngũgĩ both refer to an "us," a community of people who have chosen this alternate world. The foreigner is not alone, despite having chosen consciously to break apart from the empire, having each other to stand with in standing against the hegemonic force.

Conclusion: Subversive Foreignness

I started my analysis of the role of foreignness in Ishiguro's work with *Never Let Me Go*, by analyzing the community the clones construct and the relationships they form between each other in the face of their bleak, short lives. By reading the clone students as characters made foreign from almost every aspect of their lives, I have attempted to broaden the concept of foreignness beyond being specifically about its political and geographical implications. As shown throughout the chapter, foreignness embodies the connotation of otherness that David Palumbo-Liu discusses in his work, while also pointing out how the rhetoric of sameness and otherness conceals the power dynamics into which they are inscribed. While the lives of the clone students may seem tragic and pitiful from our perspective, a closer examination reveals the happiness that they nonetheless possess in the humane affirmation of each other, which stands in stark contrast to the technological relationship the humans in the novel establish amongst each other. Thus, despite the sadness of the novel, the clone students in the novel seem to live a richer life than the humans in the novel, who always seem to have to struggle against the guilt that arises, perhaps subconsciously, from creating and perpetuating organ harvesting. *Never Let Me Go* portrays a space of happiness that foreignness provides when the dominant world, in the novel's case the human world, becomes decentered, such that the measurement of happiness is taken not by the longevity of life, but by human(e) interaction.

Although Ishiguro mentions in his Nobel speech how he conceived of *Never Let Me Go* through the question: "What if I stopped worrying about my characters and worried instead about my relationships?" (12), I have argued that his novels have in fact been focused on relation, particularly that of the native to the foreigner, since the beginning of his career. In reading *A Pale View of Hills* through the lens of "foreignness" disentangled from its usual definition in the

context of nation-states, I identified foreignness not as a description of the condition in which one finds oneself, but as a space which can only be observed through relationships. Etsuko fails to find happiness both in her marriage with Jiro and her new relationship with Niki's father because neither of these men regards her with a humane look: Jiro sees Etsuko only in terms of her contribution to his life, and Niki's father sees Etsuko as a way to possess "some vague echo of the East" (*PVoH* 9) through her. Niki also becomes a victim of this Orientalism her father exhibits, and her identity is produced through Etsuko as a kind of clone of the Japanese echo Niki's father wanted to possess. Whether as a cog or a vehicle, Etsuko cannot escape the technical role assigned to her by the others in her community. Niki, as the clone of the Orient her father imagines while also being an Oriental object as a biracial child, is forced to bear a guilt that does not originate from her. Foreignness becomes toxic to Niki because it is imposed upon her by her community in a way that treats her not as a human being, but a symbol of something else, whether it be of Japan, of England, or the exotic. The foreignness in *A Pale View of Hills* fails to provide a space of happiness because the foreignness Etsuko finds revolves around the English perspective, rather than herself, and the foreignness imposed upon Niki objectifies her, not recognizing her humanity beyond her symbolic foreignness. Yet, because the inhumane gaze appropriates the two differently, neither Etsuko nor Niki experiences the humane embrace that the clones experience through each other. Unlike the clones, they cannot locate a community which recognizes their humanity, but are only defined by those who configure them technically and inhumanely.

Finally, through my examination of the Japanese translations of both novels, I have argued that we can conceive of alternative versions of each novel's world, which have decentered the English empire in small but important ways. That the text awakens new

associations through being translated, as J. M. Coetzee notes, suggests that the process of translation not only introduces a pre-existing text into another language, but rather marks a transformation wherein the world within the novel expands. This expansive characteristic of translation alters the culture into which the novel is translated, which in turn inscribes translation within political power dynamics. As one side of the translation is most often English, translation can be viewed as expanding the English empire. This occurs either by invading and Occidentalizing foreign culture through translating English texts into the foreign language, thus contributing to a global canon centered around English; or through devouring and Orientalizing the foreign culture in selectively translating foreign texts into English, positioning texts as depicting the whole culture, reinforcing tendencies towards Orientalism, exoticization, and stereotyping. However, as it is only the current political power dynamics into which translation is inscribed that make translation a hegemonic actor of the English empire, following Minae Mizumura's and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's arguments of choosing to write in non-English languages, I have argued that it is in consciously choosing to be a foreigner from the English empire that we can find happiness like the clones do in *Never Let Me Go*.

However, having followed my own argument through, I acknowledge that I have written in English myself, despite the conclusions I reach in my last chapter. Ngũgĩ writes that "I believe that my writing in Gĩkũyũ language, a Kenyan language, an African language, is part and parcel of the anti-imperialist struggles of Kenyan and African peoples" (28). Mizumura writes in a similar vein towards the end of her English version of the book: "From a global perspective, defending the Japanese written language is something Japanese people owe not just to themselves but to the world" (200). She also mentions this in Chapter 7 of her book in Japanese,

which was omitted in the translation process, but goes on further to say in the Japanese version:

それでも、もし、日本語が「亡びる」運命にあるとすれば、私たちにできることは、その過程を正視することしかない。

自分が死にゆくのを正視できるのが、人間の精神の証しであるように。(405)

And even if Japanese is fated to ‘fall,’ the only thing we can do is to look straight at its falling process.

As if the ability to look straight at one’s own dying process is proof of the human spirit.  
(my trans)

Will this too, then, be the last English text I write, and, as Ngūgĩ and Mizumura suggest, write in Japanese “all the way” from now on, as my responsibility based on what I have written here?

As I have argued, foreignness is not a state one in which one finds one’s self, but rather a relation one has to others. Thus, in projecting hope in foreignness, I do not point to a certain place or culture in which one can find an alternative to the English world. In fact, to find hope in a geographical location or language places us dangerously close to Etsuko and Sachiko’s position, trying to find hope for an alternative life within the same system that violates their humanity. In aligning the alternatives to the English world with the position of the clone-students in *Never Let Me Go* as I have suggested, the alternatives Ngūgĩ and Mizumura offer can be seen as finding happiness in their own culture, rather than in comparison to the English world. In short, to exist in a state of foreignness means decentering the Occidental world from one’s own life.

To return to what Mizumura writes about what it is we can find outside of the Occident:

それは、一度この非対称性を意識してしまえば、我々は、「言葉」にかんして、常に思考するのを強られる運命にあるということにほかなりません。そして、「言葉」にかんして、常に思考するのを強られる者のみが、〈真実〉が一つではないということ、すなわち、この世には英語でもって理解できる〈真実〉、英語で構築された〈真実〉のほかにも、〈真実〉というものがあろうこと—それを知るのを、常に強られるのです。(113)

For those of us who know we are living in this asymmetry are the only ones condemned to perpetually reflect upon language, the only ones forced to know that the English language cannot dictate “truths” and that there are other “truths” in this world that cannot be perceived through the English language. (63)

While I agree that there are “truths” which can only be perceived by stepping outside the English language, to reject the English world in its entirety does not seem to be what either Ngũgĩ or Mizumura conveys through their respective texts. Ngũgĩ, referencing the “Recommendations of the Working Committee” that came out of a conference titled “The Teaching of African Literature in Kenyan Schools,” writes:

All in all, the report is shot through and through with a consciousness that literature is a powerful instrument in evolving the cultural ethos of a people. They see literature as part of the whole ideological mechanism for integrating a people into the values of a dominant class, race, or nation. Imperialism, particularly during colonialism, provides the best example of how literature as an element of culture was used in the domination of Africa. (99)

The role literature and language has played in colonialism, as Ngũgĩ and the English teachers who proposed the Recommendations highlight, cannot be denied. “[English] language and literature were taking [Africans] further and further from ourselves to other selves, from our world to other worlds” (Ngũgĩ 12). Packaged as a single monolithic culture on the continental level despite the diversity and multiplicity that of course exists within Africa, a flattened, packaged “African” culture was exported, like a natural resource, to the Occidental centers. Yet, as Mizumura points out, “English is an accidental universal language” (202). Inscribed in the Eurocentric world system, non-European countries have indeed been appropriated and exploited to enrich European cultures, as both Ngũgĩ and Mizumura point out. But if there is, as Mizumura suggests, nothing inherent in the English language itself, only in the system by which it has been incorporated, then perhaps there is a way to reverse this process: take from English and give nothing back. I thus propose to read the creation of a relationship to the hegemonic force as a foreigner as what Stefano Harney and Fred Moten calls the “*undercommons of enlightenment*” (26).

Under the section title, “The Only Possible Relationship to the University Today is a Criminal One,” Harney and Moten describe the ideal relationship a black scholar can have with the American university:

“To the university I’ll steal, and there I’ll steal,” to borrow from Pistol at the end of Henry V, as he would surely borrow from us. This is the only possible relationship to the American university today [...] it cannot be denied that the university is a place of refuge, and it cannot be accepted that the university is a place of enlightenment. In the face of these conditions one can only sneak into the university and steal what one can. To abuse its hospitality, to spite its mission, to join its refugee colony, its gypsy encampment, to be in but not of – this is the path of the subversive intellectual in the modern university. (26)

The undercommons is a space Harney and Moten designate for American black fugitivity. As such, the space foreigners occupy will not be the undercommons, but a relationship of foreignness in line with the concept of the undercommons. While Harney and Moten talk of the university environment specifically, insofar as culture and language are intricately tied together, and a range of resources have become globally circulated from the English world, there is knowledge and wisdom to be stolen from the English world. Of course, to steal the whole English system only replicates the hegemonic force, so we must be selective in what we steal, and appropriate it such that it becomes disentangled from colonial, hegemonic, dehumanizing violence. As I mentioned towards the end of the third chapter, to be a foreigner means specifically to be outside the hegemonic system. As English became the universal language, many of us were taught English, whether willingly or not, as a second language if not the first. This bilingualism gives us the benefit of the critical perspective, wherein we are able to examine a concept from at least two perspectives. To be foreign in relationship to the hegemonic violence, the alternative choice Ngũgĩ and Mizumura ultimately find, means “to be in but not of,” to borrow from Harney and Moten. This bears a resonance to what Chandra Talpade Mohanty writes in her article “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist

Struggles,” that “I no longer live simply under the gaze of Western eyes. I also live inside it and negotiate it every day” (530), although her article focuses on her feminist positionality in the global context. As globalization means that one does not have to be in an English-speaking country to be under the English empire, the space one inhabits as a foreigner can retain elements similar to fugitivity.

I finally wish to return to where I started, with Ruth, Tommy, and Kathy. Ruth has donated her life, not to the humans, but to the other clones in her efforts to keep alive hopes such as the deferral—not only for Tommy and Kathy, but for Chrissie and Rodney through her lies about having heard about the procedures of applying for a deferral. Tommy inherits the hope of deferrals which Ruth has left them, and carries the hope of escape until the end. Kathy, in a way, has achieved an escape from the clones’ shortened life, having inherited Ruth and Tommy’s efforts and prolonging her life story up until she starts to donate her organs. In resisting her own donations through not depicting them, she carries on Tommy’s wish and achieved what he could not do upon the foundation that Ruth has set up for them: to escape donation. The three were able to realize this alternative in the face of a bleak and harsh dystopian world, and this should give us hope.

Furthermore, by not letting Hailsham become merely the sentimental farm that Miss Emily and Madame conceived it to be, and by recreating the space as a place in memory where their most valuable community was formed, the clones appropriate a part of the novel’s bleak world. By rendering it a dream they hold tightly within themselves, they take Hailsham out of the hands of the guardians and humans. Kathy claims, at the end of her narrative: “It’s like with my memories of Tommy and of Ruth. Once I’m able to have a quieter life, in whichever centre they send me to, I’ll have Hailsham with me, safely in my head, and that’ll be something no one can

take away” (281). Kathy practices something like the undercommons in this scene, resisting to give up those values central to her life while her physical insides are extracted from her.

This is the difference between Etsuko and Kathy, for Etsuko ultimately gives up her happy memories with Keiko to Niki’s poet friend:

“That calendar I gave you this morning,” I said. “That’s a view of the harbor in Nagasaki. This morning I was remembering the time we went there once, on a day-trip. Those hills over the harbor are very beautiful.”

[...]

“Oh, there was nothing special about [that day]. I was just remembering it, that’s all. Keiko was happy that day. We rode on the cable-cars. [...] No, there was nothing special about it. It’s just a happy memory, that’s all.” (182)

This is the first and last time we hear of Keiko being happy. Yet Etsuko gives up this private memory of Keiko’s happiness for Niki’s friend in London to write a poem about. She leaves herself nothing to hang onto in her solitude, whereas Kathy embraces Ruth, Tommy, and Hailsham. These respective moments encapsulate how, for a foreigner, being able to embrace something similar to the undercommons determines whether foreignness can become a source of hope or hopelessness in one’s life. Thus, while Mizumura sees the future of the world as a fall of non-English languages, and stresses the importance of still choosing not to be a part of the English empire in the face of the falling home language, I believe this alternate choice is the only way in which we can avoid precisely the fall of languages. We cannot surrender our happiness for the English empire to appropriate and sentimentalize, as Etsuko does in giving her happiness to Niki’s friend to “appreciat[e] what [the hardships of leaving Japan] must have been like” (*A Pale View of Hills* 89). Even if we may face the inevitable end of our language, we cannot give up the happiness we can still hold onto in the age of English, as Mizumura refers to it. For in comparison to Kathy in the face of her fatal donations, the fate of non-dominant languages is not dire, and maybe even hopeful, although it may be heading towards a fall. But this hope can only

remain insofar as we take action against the hegemonic force that threatens to engulf the world. Ngũgĩ writes in his introduction, “[t]he classes fighting against imperialism [...] have to speak the united language of struggle contained in each of their languages” (3). We must create a subversive space of foreignness that operates in a similar way to the undercommons, connected in solidarity with each other such that we recognize the beauty and happiness that only the full-fledged diversity of languages can orchestrate.

## Works Cited

- Akiyasu, Tōdō. *The Gakken Dictionary of Kanji (Gakken Kan-Wa daijiten)*. Gakken, 1978.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition, Verso, 2016. EBook.
- Apter, Emily. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. Verso, 2013. EBook.
- , editor. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton University Press, 2006, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7s10g.1](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7s10g.1). Accessed 14 Sep. 2018.
- Baker, Courtney R. *Humane Insight: Looking at Images of African American Suffering and Death*. University of Illinois Press, 2017.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Novel: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1900-2000*, edited by Dorothy J. Hale, Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 481-510.
- "Balcony/veranda ō Kaiteki de Tsukaiyasuku Reform Shitai!" *HOMEPRO*, 23 May 2016, <https://www.homepro.jp/balcony/balcony-basic/14118-co>. Accessed 01 Oct 2018.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." *Selected Writings Volume 1 1913-1926*, edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Brown, Andrew. "The Ugly Scandal that Cancelled the Nobel Prize." *The Guardian*, 17 July 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/jul/17/the-ugly-scandal-that-cancelled-the-nobel-prize-in-literature>. Accessed 19 Nov. 2018.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Difference." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, Edited by Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, Blackwell Publishing, 2004, pp. 278-299.

“Driving lessons and learning to drive.” *Gov.uk*, Government Digital Service,

<https://www.gov.uk/driving-lessons-learning-to-drive>. Accessed 24 May 2018.

Ellyatt, Holly. “Putin reveals new Russian missile that can ‘reach any point in the world’.”

*CNBC*, 1 Mar. 2018, <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/03/01/putin-new-russia-missile-nuclear.html>. Accessed 24 May 2018.

“Engawa – JapaneseClass.jp.” *JapaneseClass.jp*,

<https://japaneseclass.jp/trends/about/%E7%B8%81%E5%81%B4>. Accessed 01 Oct. 2018.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Second Vintage Books Edition, Vintage Books, 1995.

---. “What Is an Author?” *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology (Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984 vol. 2)*, edited by James D. Faubion, translated by Robert Hurley et al., The New Press, 1998, pp. 205-222.

Hayot, Erik. “On Literary Worlds.” *Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. 72, no. 2, 2011, Duke University Press, pp. 129-161.

Harney, Stefano and Fred Moten. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*. Minor Compositions, 2013.

Hotta, Eri. *Japan 1941: Countdown to Infamy*. Vintage Books, 2014.

Igarashi, Yoshikuni. *Bodies of Memory: Narratives of War in Postwar Japanese Culture, 1945-1970*. Princeton University Press, 2012. Project MUSE, <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/30501>. Accessed 26 Oct. 2018.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *A Pale View of Hills*. Faber and Faber, 2005.

---. *Never Let Me Go*. Faber and Faber, 2006.

- . *My Twentieth Century Evening – and Other Small Breakthroughs*. The Nobel Foundation, 2017.
- Kojin, Karatani. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Translated by Brett de Bary, Duke University Press, 1993. Print.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Strangers to Ourselves*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Mizumura, Minae. *Nihongo ga Horobiru Toki—Eigo no Seiki no Naka de* (The Fall of Language in the Age of English). Revised Edition (*zōho*), Chikuma Shobō, 2015.
- , et al. *The Fall of Language in the Age of English*. Columbia University Press, 2015, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/mizu16302](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/mizu16302).
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles.” *Signs*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2003, pp. 499-535, The University of Chicago Press, JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/342914>. Accessed 20 Nov. 2018.
- Moretti, Franco. “Conjectures on World Literature and More Conjectures (2000/2003).” *World Literature: A Reader*, edited by Theo D’haen, et al., Routledge, 2013, pp. 161-170.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*. Translated by Robert D. Richardson and Anne E. O’Byrne, Stanford University Press, 2000.
- , *The Inoperative Community*. Translated by Peter Connor and Lisa Garbus, Michael Holland, and Simona Sawhney, Edited by Peter Connor, University of Minnesota, 1991.
- “Negai no Zone.” *Nagasaki City*, 01 Mar. 2013, <http://www.city.nagasaki.lg.jp/heiwa/3030000/3030100/p005151.html>. Accessed 16 Sep. 2018.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*.

James Currey, 1986.

“North Korea: We have nuclear weapons to defend from US.” *The Guardian*, Staff and agencies,

10 Feb 2005, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/feb/10/northkorea>. Accessed 24

May 2018.

Onodera, Takeshi, translator. *Tōi -Yamanami no Hikari (A Pale View of Hills)*. By Kazuo

Ishiguro, Hayakawa Publishing, 2001.

---, *Onna Tachi no To'oi Natsu (A Pale View of Hills)*. By Kazuo Ishiguro, Chikuma Shobō,

1994.

*Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 2018, [www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com).

Palumbo-Liu, David. *The Deliverance of Others: Reading Literature in a Global Age*. Duke

University Press, 2012.

Rao, Nagesh. “‘Neocolonialism’ or ‘Globalization’?: Postcolonial Theory and the Demands of

Political Economy.” *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2000, pp. 165–184.

*JSTOR*, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/41209050](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41209050). Accessed 26, Oct., 2018.

Rebuck, Mark. “The Function of English Loanwords in Japanese.” *NUCB Journal of Language*

*Culture and Communication*, vol. 4, no 1, 2002, pp. 53-64, CiNii,

<https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110001046022/en/>. Accessed 16 Sep. 2018.

Ricoeur, Paul. *On Translation*. Trans. Eileen Brennan. New York: Routledge, 2006. EBook.

Robinson, Ronald. “Non-European Foundations of European Imperialism: Sketch for a Theory

of Collaboration.” *Studies in the Theory of Imperialism*, Edited by Roger Owen and Bob

Sutcliffe, Longman House, 1972.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1979. EBook.

- “Sanshaku Maru Chōchin Aka Muji.” *Atta*, 2013, [https://www.attav.com/products/detail.php?product\\_id=8800](https://www.attav.com/products/detail.php?product_id=8800). Accessed 01 Oct. 2018.
- Shaffer, Brian W. and Cynthia F. Wong, editors. *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*. University Press of Mississippi, 2008.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*. Edited by Maurice Hindle, Revised Ed., Penguin Books, 2003.
- Shinmura, Izuru editor. *Kōjien*. 7th ed., Iwanami Shoten, 2018.
- Shklovsky, Viktor. *Theory of Prose*. Trans. Benjamin Sher, Dalkey Archive Press, 2009.
- Specia, Megan and Rick Gladstone. “Border Agents Shot Tear Gas into Mexico. Was it Legal?” *The New York Times*, 28 Nov. 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/28/world/americas/tear-gas-border.html>. Accessed 03 Dec. 2018.
- Suter, Rebecca. *The Japanization of Modernity: Murakami Haruki Between Japan and the United States*. Harvard University Asia Center, 2008.
- Takeuchi, Michiko. “‘Pan-Pan Girls’ Performing and Resisting Neocolonialism(s) in the Pacific Theater: U.S. Military Prostitution in Occupied Japan, 1945-1952.” *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War Two to the Present*, Edited by Maria Höhn and Seungsook Moon, Duke University Press, 2010.
- Tillman, Laura. “Scenes from the Southern Border: Asylum-Seekers, Border Guards, Activists and More.” *Literary Hub*, 17 July 2018, <https://lithub.com/scenes-from-the-southern-border-asylum-seekers-border-guards-activists-and-more/>. Accessed 03 Dec. 2018.
- Tsuchiya, Masao, translator. *Watashi ō Hanasanaide (Never Let Me Go)*. By Kazuo Ishiguro, Hayakawa Publishing, 2008.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards and Ethics of Difference*. Routledge, 1998. EBook.

Walkowitz, Rebecca L. "Ishiguro's Floating Worlds." *ELH*, vol. 68, no. 4, 2001, pp. 1049–1076, *JSTOR*, *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/30032004](http://www.jstor.org/stable/30032004). Accessed 06 Dec. 2017.

---. "Unimaginable Largeness: Kazuo Ishiguro, Translation, and the New World Literature."

*NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2007, pp. 216–239. *JSTOR*, *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/40267701](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40267701). Accessed 24 Mar. 2018.