



Interpellation of Clones: Unveiling the Social Realism in Films based on Human Cloning

Soham Sinha

Abstract

With a general propensity to shun human-cloning as a potentially destructive human enterprise often orchestrated under the watchful eye of the quintessentially evil scientist, films have been marred by accusations from the scientific community as being the single biggest source of misinformation with regard to scientific cloning. I think it is necessary to sensitize people to the fact that films are not the proper source to get one's scientific information from. Instead, we could encourage alternate interpretations which are of social importance. Inherent in some of these films, I find a very poignant portrayal of social realism despite the gross exaggeration of human cloning. Therefore, I propose that instead of dismissing these films as being scientifically inaccurate, it would be prudent on our part to promote alternate modes of reception. In essence, what I am suggesting is that while these films talk about an imagined future, perhaps it would help to better understand them if we take into account the contemporary vantage points which the films have and therefore view the films as futuristic projections of contemporary socio-political conditions.

Keywords: Interpellation, Clones, Human, Control, Subversion, Resistance.

Introduction: Cloning and Society

Perhaps the most controversial and fascinating aspect of genetic engineering is the aspect of cloning which has always occupied a contentious position in modern discourses ever since Ian Wilmut and his colleagues announced in *Nature* that they had successfully cloned a sheep from a cell of another sheep. While the scientific cloning of Dolly was looked upon with general interest and curiosity, the response of the mainstream scientific community at large towards the prospect of human cloning was that of strong disapproval. The then Clinton administration, in the United States, banned funding of projects dealing with this prospect until the ethical implications and legalities associated with it could be reviewed by the National Bioethics Advisory Commission. The beginning of the executive summary of the report submitted by the National Bioethics Advisory Commission rightly pointed out that – “[t]he idea that humans might someday be cloned—created from a single somatic cell without sexual reproduction—moved further away from science fiction and closer to a genuine scientific possibility on February 23, 1997” (NBAC, 1997, p. i).

In order to understand the implications associated with the practice of cloning, we need to take into account the fact that the wide use of the term cloning is a generalized terminology used in scientific quarters to cover a diverse range of subjects under it. With regard to this, Kaebnick and Murray talk about “two simple distinctions – one between animal and human cloning, and another between reproduction and research” (Kaebnick &

Murray, 2001, p. 53). The ethical and moral implications are bound to vary based on the scientific aspects that each of the elements in the matrix entails. Kaebnick and Murray state that the “benefit of animal cloning is the prospect of being able to produce very close physical copies of a valuable animal—a prize milk-producing cow, for example” (Kaebnick & Murray, 2001, p. 53). However, this also poses the problem of restricting “genetic diversity” which may render the cloned herd susceptible to being wiped out by a disease. The benefits, therefore, are largely identified in relation to human needs. For instance, even animal cloning for medical research is largely aimed at benefitting human beings, as Kaebnick and Murray state - “cloning could be valuable both for generating and then reproducing animals whose genetic modifications make them useful research subjects” (Kaebnick & Murray, 2001, p. 53).

Within human-cloning, Kaebnick and Murray identified and differentiated between two types of cloning based on their goals – therapeutic cloning and reproductive cloning. Reproductive cloning in films has been generally presented as an alternative form of procreation that may call into question the existing indispensability of the biologically endowed roles played by the sexes in the process of sexual reproduction. This aspect of artificial reproduction possibly displacing the human functions of procreation has been discussed by Luciana Parisi in her book *Abstract Sex*. Parisi points to an inherent paradox of attaining this scientific tool of artificial reproduction (including cloning) – “As demanded by feminism, the female body is now free from the biological destiny of procreation. Yet, at the same time, the patriarchal dream of independence from nature and the female body is also completely reached” (Parisi, 2004, p. 3). While Kaebnick and Murray prefigure the use of reproductive cloning for purposes ranging from cloning famous individuals to cloning dead children, Parisi is concerned with what it, along with other forms of artificial reproduction, means for the existing agencies of reproduction, and she recognizes it as a liberating prospect as well as one that may entail other patriarchal implications. The reason I am insisting on viewing these two distinct perspectives is because I intend to highlight the fact that human-cloning and its prospects are shrouded in complexities and simply elucidating on what it can entail from a scientific point of view is not enough to gauge its implications. Therefore, the question that plagues the debates and discourses is – after acknowledging that there are indeed certain advantages to it, where do we finally draw the line between which aspects of human cloning may be acceptable and which aspects may be dismissed as being unethical, unequalitarian and discriminatory?

1. Cloning in Films: A Site of Misinformation Versus a Poignant Portrayal of Social Reality

It may be noted that film representations of cloning largely draw from what has been scientifically constituted as reproductive cloning. However, films like *The Island* (2005) have incorporated the therapeutic argument of human-cloning into the narrative while maintaining the recurrent horror that is aroused by reproductive cloning. Thus, more recent filmic representations associate the promise of human cloning with advancements made in the field of medical science, and therefore paradoxically present a hope for some at the cost of despair for others. In an interesting article titled “Human Cloning in Film: Horror, Ambivalence and Hope,” Kate O’Riordan observes that with changes within the discourse of cloning driven by the distinction between therapeutic cloning and reproductive cloning, the filmic representations become “ambivalent, pointing towards hope” (Kate, 2009, p. 146). O’Riordan suggests a careful treading when dealing with films on human cloning because she observes that far-fetched speculations may lead to the films becoming problematic sites for misinformation. To support her statement, she cites Wilmut and Highfield’s *After Dolly: The Uses and Misuses of Human Cloning* (2005) in which there are multiple mentions of *The*

Interpellation of Clones: Unveiling the Social Realism in Films based on Human Cloning

Boys from Brazil, a 1978 film, which portrays a fictive cloning-project of creating multiple duplicates of Adolf Hitler, and “is referenced repeatedly in the book as an example of what human cloning will not be used for” (Schaffner, 1978, p. 148). Similarly, in “*Godsend* no blessing for cloning research,” Arthur L. Caplan criticizes the excesses in speculative films by stating – “[t]hanks Hollywood. Just as people were beginning to understand cloning, you have put greed before need and made a movie that risk keeping ordinary Americans afraid and patients paralyzed and immobile for many more years.” I agree with the proposition of Highland and Wilmut, and I empathize with Caplan’s feeling of frustration. However, I do not believe that the films need to be dismissed completely from public discourse because of their portrayal of unreal scientific possibilities. It would be more sensible to draw the attention of the audience away from the pseudo-scientific representations to the more understated but poignant social realism that these films seem to harbor.

In the study of speculative films and novels about the implications of human-cloning, I suggest that we take for granted the fact that we are already discoursing within a realm that is dissociated to some extent from the science that governs it. While these films may be scientifically inaccurate, the representations of the horrors of human-cloning and the dubious objectives behind it may be understood as being deeply rooted in existing social and political discourses. Therefore, while speculating, albeit ambitiously, about the extent of human-cloning beyond the scientifically assumed paradigms of reproductive and therapeutic cloning, films dealing with the implications of human-cloning are essentially speculating about the human-clone dynamic as an extension of existing social dynamics. Hence, they are predicting the possibilities of certain societal and institutional reconfigurations to accommodate a robust cloning enterprise based on human needs.

2. Necessity for Regulating the Subjectivity of Clones: The Objective of Cloning in a Film and the Control it Entails

I propose that the ethical or moral questions of a cloning project are intimately tied to the objective or agenda of the respective project. Fictional and cinematic accounts of clones often set their futuristic premise along the assumption that the cloning project or enterprise is intended towards certain predetermined functions that the clones are expected and programmed to perform; functions which are purely in the interest of the human. Therefore, in the fictional cloning projects, the first basic right that a clone is deprived of is the right to an open future. The recognition of this deprivation may cause psychological distress which may further lead to transgression which could adversely affect the project. As a result, in films based on human cloning, we may identify certain machineries that are tasked to regulate the social conditions of the clones. It is upon these control machineries, and their overt and covert strategies, to ensure that the clones either falsely believe that they have an open future or accept the fact that they have a closed future without recognizing a possibility of attaining an open future through resistance. These regulatory machineries may often be observed to be extensions or modifications of existing machineries that are used to enforce desirable human behavior and actions.

The objectives of cloning projects seen in films range from the surrogacy of human labor as seen in *Multiplicity* (1996) and *Blade Runner* (1982) and organ harvesting as seen in *The Island* (2005) and *Never Let Me Go* (2010), to the creation of cloned versions of Adolf Hitler in *The Boys from Brazil* (1978). In order to ensure the success of these projects, it is imperative that a strong propensity to adhere to the designated path towards the predetermined future is zealously inculcated in the clone. This may be achieved by means of repression or through ideological conditioning, and its indispensability to the success of the project cannot be undermined. For instance, *The Boys from Brazil*, based on Ira Levin’s 1976

novel of the same title, deals with a vicious neo-Nazi operation, spearheaded by Dr. Josef Mengele, an Auschwitz doctor, of returning Adolf Hitler to the world. Hitler's DNA, conserved since the Second World War, is implanted into the wombs of ninety-four surrogate mothers with the hope that one or more of the clones would end up as replicants of Hitler. The film acknowledges a notion that is scientifically endorsed, that is, mere genetic duplication will not ensure that the clone will grow up to be an indistinguishable replica of the original. For a clone to grow up as an exact replica of Hitler with identical personality and characteristics, the people responsible for the project figured that they had to reproduce the social and environmental detail that influenced Hitler's upbringing. This entailed that each clone of Hitler had to be "a lonely little boy, with a domineering father, a customs officer, who was 52 when he was born. And an affectionate, doting mother who was 29. The father died when he was 65, when the boy was nearly 14" (Schaffner, 1978, 1:33:00 – 1:33:39). Therefore, the fathers had to be systemically eliminated when the clones attained the age of thirteen to simulate Hitler's loss of his father. For the project to be successful, it is imperative that the children acquire the same personality traits as the original Adolf Hitler and consequently, external control is wielded by the custodians of the project to regulate the social factors determining the upbringing of the children.

The Island (2005) is set in a dystopian world where clones are confined within a heterotopic, heavily guarded and surveilled facility, oblivious to the fact that they are clones, and with a promise of winning "the lottery" to go to "the island" which is advertised to them as a utopic land of opportunity to "go out and breathe the fresh air. Swim in the ocean" (Bay, 2005, 05:33). They have been conditioned into believing that the world outside their facility has been contaminated and deemed unsuitable for human existence and the island is "nature's last remaining pathogen free zone" (Bay, 2005, 06:05). Therefore, through careful exercise of control and systemic manipulation of their consciousness they have been convinced into believing that their restricted life within the secured facility accompanied by the promise of a better future in the island is a manifestation of their good fortune. The island that bears for them a symbol of hope and freedom is a deceptive façade created by the facilitators to ensure the voluntary, but unwitting subjugation of the clones to donate organs to their human sponsors. Within the facility the clones are interpellated to become subjects and strive towards the ideal that is inculcated in them, while remaining unbeknownst of the fact that everything that has gone into constituting them as subjects are a means to regulate their existence. Their subjectivity is institutionally constituted as a transitional prerequisite between their creation and their end. Every ideological conditioning that they undergo, including the promise of the island as an ideal place, is configured precisely to ensure that they end up unwittingly serving their purpose without putting up any form of resistance.

The control that is exercised is aimed at creating a "false consciousness" among the clones and reflects a similar kind of interpellation of individuals into subjects as is identified by Marxist scholars with regard to class differences in a capitalistic society –

The individual, whose duties give him the status of a subject, finds that, in fulfilling his duties as a citizen, he gains protection for his person and property, consideration for his particular welfare, satisfactions of his substantial essence, and the consciousness and self-awareness of being a member of the whole. (Hegel, 1991, p. 285)

The clones in *The Island* believe in their falsely programmed consciousness leading them to willfully embody the ideology of their beneficiaries. Therefore, it would suffice to say that movies like *The Island* covertly portray the exploitation of the proletariat, by portraying the exploitation of a new underclass of clones and endowing them with a "false consciousness" to abet in their own subjugation.

Interpellation of Clones: Unveiling the Social Realism in Films based on Human Cloning

In cloning projects aimed at surrogacy of labor or organ harvesting, the most crucial aim of the controlling agencies is to initiate a human-clone dynamic in which the clone will willingly or unwittingly accept his or her subjectivity as a dispensable “other.” Therefore, the control functions work towards enforcing a difference through physical isolation of clones from the human world as we see in *The Island* and *Never Let Me Go*. However, the control mechanism may not be uniform because of the varying demands that each cloning projects may pose. For instance, in the project aimed at recreating a replica of Adolf Hitler, alongside genetic imitation the clone has to be reconciled with his human original and assume the former’s identity as his own. Whereas in an organ donation project like the one we see in *The Island*, genetic imitation is required, but it would be in the interest of the project if the clone did not acquire the personality traits of his or her original. As a result, it may be noted that along with a “false consciousness,” the clones in *The Island* are endowed with a falsified memory to keep them in the dark about the possibility of a normal life outside the facility.

Apart from the surrogacy of labor and organ harvesting, some films have portrayed another pragmatically possible objective of human cloning, that is, its use as an alternative form of reproduction. A lot of the arguments, including those from certain religious spheres, in favor of cloning, rely on the praxis that human cloning offers a promise for procreation in circumstances where traditional procreation is impossible. For instance, in the National Bioethics’ Commission’s report of 1997, there is the mention of Rabbi Tendler who insists that “a young man who is sterile, whose family was wiped out in the Holocaust, and [who] is the last of a genetic line” should by all means be cloned to ensure the continuation of his line (NBAC, 1997, p. 55). As we saw earlier in this paper, in Luciana Parisi’s assertions regarding the inherent paradox of artificial sex (including cloning), cloning is not simply a polar proposition that can be endorsed or dismissed based on it being good or bad. For instance, cloning as an artificial means of procreation may liberate the female body from its institutionally constituted biological destiny of procreation, while at the same time crowning “the achievements of the male model of sex defined by the drive towards discharge, the channeling of all flows towards a final climax, the pleasure of self-satisfaction” (Parisi, 2004, p. 1). Thus, it relieves the female of the biological destiny institutionally bestowed upon her, but it also retains the patriarchal design by enhancing it further through dissociation from the “flesh.”

A film like *The Boys from Brazil*, tends to highlight the perverse side of reproductive cloning, but there are other films like *Womb* (2010) or the German film *Blueprint* (2004) which deal with this theme from a more profound perspective upon what it may lead to for the relationship between the clone and the human who intends to substitute some void in his or her life through the existence of a clone. Both the films portray complexities in relationships between the clone and the mother by having them completely subvert the traditional relationship that generally exists between a mother and her naturally born child. In films dealing with the theme of reproductive cloning, the onus of controlling the trajectory of the clone remains largely with the family apparatus. Herein, we see that the people involved in the cloning project are torn between their personal desires and the societal or institutional expectations which are based on the traditional concept of the family. In *Womb* for instance, the female protagonist, Rebecca, gives birth to the clone of her deceased lover and is thus torn between her institutionally constructed identity as the mother of her child and her innately repressed desire to reunite with her lover. While the female protagonist had the cell of her deceased lover implanted in her womb to be re-united with him, the traditional concept of the family warrants that the re-born clone essentially has a mother-son relationship with Rebecca. Therefore, the societal norms serve as the control mechanism to enforce the normalcy of behavior. However, there are two contradictory control functions that are being

exercised over the clone. The first is the society conditioning him to be a son so as to not give into his oedipal tendency. The second control is that of his mother/lover who stands to curb his individuality by having him be what she desires him to be.

Similarly, in *Blueprint* we see a mother and a daughter transgress the traditional mother-daughter dynamic when the daughter becomes a prototype of her mother and begins to imbibe her sensibilities and tastes. The mother, Iris, upon learning that she is suffering from multiple sclerosis gives birth to a cloned version of herself so as to pass on her musical talents to her daughter/clone. From her birth, the clone/daughter, Siri, is destined to be what her original/mother has desired her to be. However, the conflict arises when the clone's (daughter's) resemblance to the original (mother) becomes so indistinguishable that it threatens Iris about losing her own identity. They get embroiled in conflict over their musical careers and their love lives. It is implied in the film that because of being a clone and not a traditionally conceived child, Siri is bound to acquire all the features of Iris; however, Iris who is the human agent in this cloning enterprise seeks to control the clone (Siri) so that she attains only those attributes which Iris would want her to.

In *Womb* and *Blueprint*, the identity of the protagonists as clones becomes decisive in determining the trajectory of their respective lives. The human agent in *Womb* is inclined to consider the clone, which she gave birth to, to be the clone of her lover and not a natural human being. If she blurs the line between humans and clones, then she would have to accept the clone not as her lover (as was her repressed objective), but as a completely new individual, that is, her son. In *Blueprint*, on the other hand, Iris's objective is more specific and stratified. Therefore, she intends her daughter to be a semi-clone. In both the films discussed above, one thing is strikingly familiar, that is, the onus of adjusting to the whims of the human agent falls entirely upon the clones. Thomas in *Womb* is controlled into being an exact replica of his original (father), while Siri's social conditions are controlled in such a way so that she inherits only those traits which her mother would want her to inherit. Therefore, the clones are obstructed by their human agents from following their natural trajectories within the constructed social reality in the films.

3. The Human Clones' Potential for Subversion as the Primary Reason for Devising Means of Control over Them

Akin to the ancient Roman obsession for control in order to maintain cohesiveness in the society, films have shown three types of controls that have been proven and tested on pre-clone humans, namely – physical control, organizational control and psychological control. Physical control as the name suggests, constitutes the coercive force that is intended towards physically compelling the clones into submission. Organizational control ensures the existence and maintenance of a well-coordinated hierarchical structure in the society with a well-defined task cut out for each section. Psychological control is wielded by inculcating a fear of retribution or penalization. The three forms of control are further regulated by a greater and more effective control mechanism in the form of ideological conditioning. Ideologically the clones are subjected to psychological control which makes them wary of the horrors of the physical control. The fear of the physical control leads to the acceptance of the organizational control which is crucial for the sustenance of the cloning enterprise. Therefore, akin to our socially realistic existence, ideological conditioning of clones as shown in films seems to induce a cyclical model of entrapment within which the clone's subjugation is initiated by the psychological control, leading to the avoidance or exertion of physical control as required, which in turn leads to the sustenance of the organizational control. This cyclical process keeps repeating itself until a resistance strong enough can spiral out of it.

Interpellation of Clones: Unveiling the Social Realism in Films based on Human Cloning

In studying how clones in films are conditioned to act and behave in a certain way, Judith Butler's theory of performativity may be useful. Butler largely talks about how performance is socially cultivated in order to enforce gender binaries and socially desired heterosexuality –

the category of sex and the naturalized institution of heterosexuality are *constructs*, socially instituted and socially regulated fantasies or “fetishes,” not *natural* categories, but *political* ones (categories that prove that recourse to the “natural” in such contexts is always political). (Butler, 1999, p. 161)

I propose that in films dealing with the social implications of human cloning, a similar binary between the human and the clone is shown to be socially constructed. As a result, the clone comes to be identified as a clone because of behaving in a way that is unidentifiable within the domain of the human. Scientific opinions suggest that reproductive cloning, if ever a reality, would not entail creating adult clones (as we see in *The Island*) but would probably be another process of artificial reproduction (as we see in *Womb*), following which the clone would need to undergo everything that a naturally reproduced baby undergoes. Therefore, without the construction and enforcement of distinct behavioral or performative aspects in the clone, the clone would be indistinguishable from the human.

This takes us back to the posthumanist assertion voiced by the likes of Cary Wolfe, that is, everything that defines what it means to be “human” is actually external to the human – “[i]ndeed, the human is itself a prosthetic being, who from day one is constituted as human by its coevolution with and coconstitution by external archival technologies of various kinds” (Wolfe, 2009, p. 295). Aspects ranging from memory and consciousness to a prosthetically enhanced imagination are acquired from external sources and come to be considered as the essence of the human. If we take for granted the fact that clones are indeed human beings, we should realize that the same external factors that have gone on to socially condition a human to perform his or her identity could stimulate similar performativity in the clones as well. However, owing to the fact that these aspects are essentially external to the innate state of being, they can be controlled and tweaked as may be observed in the case of clones in films. The purpose of clones in fiction and films is often to alleviate human conditions and this requires the clone to be deemed as disposable human resources. Therefore, it becomes necessary for such cloning projects to ensure that there is a ridge between what it means to be human and what it means to be a clone. This gap has to be institutionally maintained because a bridging of this gap would possibly ensure the collapse of the transhumanist aspiration that lies in the heart of fictional cloning projects. When a clone begins to transcend its existence despite the ideological barriers, it may be seen as an act of subversion. Therefore, there has to be robust control machinery in place to avert such an event.

This brings me to my second proposition about the primary reason behind the necessity of the aforementioned control factors. Apart from the specific aims of the controlling agencies to effectuate desirable performances from the subjects, the fundamental aim of the control and the regulatory functions is to curb any possibility of resistance. The subjectivity that is externally constructed is not the actual essence of the being and there is always the possibility of disidentifying with one's socially enforced identity and reclaiming the agency of self-determination for oneself. Therefore, complex ideological measures are undertaken to mitigate the possibility of any subversion and in case they fail, repressive measures are employed to reinforce order. As a result, we may observe that the external aspects which imprint upon the human what it means to be human are strategically manipulated in *The Island* by promulgating a dissociative theory about the clones' existence and their humanness. The protagonist in *The Island*, a clone named Lincoln Six Echo, unwittingly subverts the norm by drawing from the memory of his sponsor, the real Lincoln. At the onset of his resistance we see that the control mechanism malfunctions and the

memory that had been artificially inculcated in him fails to prevent him from drawing upon the consciousness of his original. This leads him to deliberate forms of subversions and resistance which ultimately shatters the ideological cover of the parasitical cloning project.

Means of Control: The Use of Existing and Modified Ideological Apparatuses to Enforce Desired Behavioral Aspects in Clones

In “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” Louis Althusser writes about the ways in which a capitalistic society ensures the reproduction of not only the means of production but also the reproduction of the productive forces. Althusser maintains that the reproduction of the labor forces “is ensured by giving labor power the material means with which to reproduce itself: by wages” (Althusser, 1971, p.131). However, he envisions that while wages take care of the material conditions of existence, in order to ensure the reproduction of the productive forces, there has to be certain favorable social conditions. He states that while it is of utmost importance to reproduce the material means of production and oversee the reproduction of a skilled and diversified labor force, it is equally important to ensure –

a reproduction of its (labor’s) submission to the rules of the established order, i.e. a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, so that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class “in words.”(Althusser, 1971, p. 132)

According to Althusser, the favorable social conditions for the reproduction of labor are simulated through ideological conditioning as performed by Ideological State Apparatuses in the forms of schools, religious institutions, army and family. For instance, Althusser writes that besides learning to read and write in a school, “children at school also learn the ‘rules’ of good behavior, i.e. the attitude that should be observed by every agent in the division of labor, according to the job he is ‘destined’ for” (Althusser, 1971, p. 132).

In other words, the school (but also other State institutions like the Church, or other apparatuses like the Army) teaches ‘know-how,’ but in forms which ensure subjection to the ruling ideology or the mastery of its ‘practice.’ All the agents of production, exploitation and repression, not to speak of the ‘professionals of ideology’ (Marx), must in one way or another be ‘steeped’ in this ideology in order to perform their tasks ‘conscientiously’ – the tasks of the exploited (the proletarians), of the exploiters (the capitalists), of the exploiters’ auxiliaries (the managers), or of the high priests of the ruling ideology (its ‘functionaries’), etc. (Althusser, 1971, p. 133)

Therefore, Althusser is explicitly suggesting that in order to ensure the reproduction of labor, along with the necessary skills and wages, there needs to be a certain form of control upon the social conditions of existence, so as to ensure that the individual willingly accepts the social position bestowed upon him or her even if that entails working against one’s own interest.

In the previous sections of this paper, we have discussed how cloning projects in films necessitate the exercise of certain control over the social conditions of the clones. The reason for this control has been chiefly construed as means to curb the human clone’s potential for subversion and ensure the success of the cloning project, or to guarantee the reproduction of the means of the cloning enterprise. Therefore, in their representation of control mechanisms over the clones, these films reflect what Althusser had stated about the reproduction of the existing class relations in order to reproduce the means of production. This brings me to my third proposition, that is, the control over clones as portrayed in the films is exercised essentially by a mix of the existing Ideological State Apparatuses and repressive state apparatuses.

Interpellation of Clones: Unveiling the Social Realism in Films based on Human Cloning

Additionally, in the preceding section, I mentioned the three forms of control that are deemed necessary for a society to uphold its cohesiveness – physical control, organizational control and psychological control. The physical control is exercised unanimously by what Althusser would refer to as the repressive State apparatus - namely the police or the army. There may also be extra-governmental entities which can be outsourced the function of disciplining subjects through physical exertion. For instance, in *The Island* we see a privately owned repressive apparatus being wielded to reinstate order when the ideological conditioning fails. The organizational control is largely sustained by the ideological institutions' (ISAs) psychological control. Therefore, the control is holistically exercised by a combination of ideological and repressive apparatuses and this reflects the ideological conditioning and repression of human beings within contemporary social contexts.

The role of ideology, as wielded by extensions of existing ideological institutions upon clones in films to create an underclass of people who would serve the needs of the privileged class, is reflective of the real-life interpellation of the working class which Althusser talks about. The same ISAs which are believed to be instrumental in enforcing desirable behavioral aspects in humans are shown to be active in enforcing desirable behavior in clones in the films. In order to further understand this argument, it would perhaps help to look at instances where extended versions of some of the individual ISAs have been portrayed in the films as being determining factors behind the clones' interpellation as subjects.

In the film *Never Let Me Go*, one of the protagonists, who happens to be a clone named Kathy H, and is destined to be an organ donor, asserts that she feels “a great sense of pride” in her job as a “carer” and a “donor” (Romanek, 2010, 2:15 - 2:17). The linguistic euphemism inherent in the term “carer” is unmistakable. It renders the closed future of the clones in the films as something that is coveted. As is evident from Kathy H's assertion of her pride in her job, the clones that are produced to serve as organ donors are ideologically conditioned into willingly serving as “donors” and “carers” to alleviate human predicaments. They have been endowed with a “false consciousness” about their existence and they voluntarily comply with the tenets of their viability as disposable “others” to their human counterparts.

However, what I find significant about *Never Let Me Go* is its portrayal of the role of the educational institution in generating desired subjectivity of the clones. Althusser had listed schools or educational institutions as one of the most prominent Ideological State Apparatuses because of their scrupulous precision in cultivating desired behavioral traits alongside teaching pragmatic “know-hows” – “it is by an apprenticeship in a variety of know-how wrapped up in the massive inculcation of the ideology of the ruling class that the relations of production in a capitalist social formation, i.e. the relations of exploited to exploiters and exploiters to exploited, are largely reproduced” (Althusser, 1971, p. 156). In *Never Let Me Go* there is an effective representation of the role of the school as an Ideological State Apparatus in the form of “Hailsham”. The deepest agenda of “Hailsham” is to ideologically steer the clones away from any deviation from their pre-ordained and closed futures. Therefore, “Hailsham” serves as a prototype of actual educational institutions. Through the services it imparts on behalf of the cloning-project which is represented in the film, it reflects the real role played by educational institutions in ideologically tempering children to grow up as subservient citizens with repressed potential for subversion and an innate sense of fidelity to the existing social structure. Thus, we see that in order to ensure the success of the cloning enterprise, the school as an Ideological State Apparatus assumes a central role. The existing model of the boarding school is extended and modified in the film to suit the agenda of the cloning project.

In *Never Let Me Go*, the human-clone binary is inculcated in the clones so that they do not long for anything else beyond what their conditions predicate. This is especially evident when one of the guardians, Miss. Lucy, makes an impassioned speech in the class enlightening the clones about who they are and what they would become and that “none of [them] would do anything except lead the life that has already been set out for [them]” (Romanek, 2010, 24:07). This act on the part of Miss. Lucy threatens to instigate a possible challenge from the clones against their destined fate. The fear lies in the fact that once a clone recognizes the possibility of leading a human life, he or she may actively attempt to abandon his or her destiny as a clone. Miss. Lucy, even though a human agent in the business of cloning, acts in a way that could lead to upheavals in the smooth functioning of the control machinery. Therefore, while she is penalized by being dismissed from her duties as a guardian, her fate is exhibited as an example to the clones of the extent to which physical control can be exercised if the ensuing organizational control is threatened. In the film, “Madame” makes an announcement of Lucy’s dismissal before the assembly of clones and states – “it is hard, is it not! To continue in the face of deliberate subversion! There are those who seek to thwart us, this is clear. And we are aware that the tide is not with forward thinking, it never is. No, the tide is with the entrenched mindset . . . but I will not be coerced” (25:41 – 26:40). Thus, with a combination of a repressive action inducing psychological control (fear of penalization) and an ideologically laced speech appealing to the core values already inculcated in the clones, Madame nips the possibility of a resistance in its bud. Consequently, the clones passively accept their condition without acting upon it.

In *Womb*, we see the momentary disintegration of the family as an Ideological State Apparatus because the protagonists fail to abide by the societal norm pertaining to the kind of familial relationship that they should have with each other. The failure of the family ISA does not imply the lack of intent on its part to ensure adherence of the subjects. In the film, there is the portrayal of a general feeling of disgust towards the act of cloning dead human beings as it is considered to be amounting to a deviation from the norm. One of the characters in the film refers to it as “artificial incest” (54:45). It is ideally the job of the family and the community in general as Ideological State Apparatuses to sensitize the individual to the socially unaccepted sexual and reproductive taboos. Therefore, in the film, artificial reproduction through cloning is further demonized as an incestuous act because of its upsetting of the social order of how a family is built and conditioned to co-exist within the social community. The climactic act of the clone of Thomas engaging in sexual intercourse with Rebecca, who birthed him through artificial means, symbolizes resistance towards the established order which depends upon the conglomeration of the Ideological State Apparatuses (Family ISA and Cultural ISA) for its existence.

However, in the post climactic scene, we encounter the clone Thomas referring to Rebecca by name and not as his mother as he did prior to learning about his past. In the end he leaves her because the ideological conditioning is ultimately successful in reinstating the accepted norm by having the characters realize the absurdity of their relationship and recognize the impossibility of a private life together as a family in whatever relational dynamic they choose for themselves. They find themselves ideologically restrained from reinstating their former mother-son dynamic as well as from establishing a dynamic as lovers as either would amount to a complete demolition of the traditional structure of the family. With this final subversion averted, we ultimately see the triumph of the Ideological State Apparatus because the desirable social order is fully reinstated when Rebecca conceives a natural born son through her natural act of sexual intercourse with her artificially conceived son/lover.

Interpellation of Clones: Unveiling the Social Realism in Films based on Human Cloning

The portrayal of the cloning projects in the films may be characterized under three specific categories. The first category is that of “therapeutic cloning” which largely relates to the objective of organ harvesting as we see in films like *The Island* and *Never Let Me Go*. In projects like these, it is imperative on part of the control measures to retain a human-clone binary so that the clone can willingly subjugate itself as a disposable “other” to the original. The possible act of subversion on the part of the clones in these projects is to deny their falsely created clone identities and strive to reconcile with their human selves. The major Ideological State Apparatus which seems to exercise control in these projects mimic the educational institutions. In *Never Let Me Go*, it is an enclosed facility in the mold of a boarding school, while in *The Island* it is an isolated compound for adult clones where they are ideologically programmed and endowed with a “false consciousness” pertaining to their existence. The efforts of the human agents of the cloning projects to inculcate the ideology of the ruling class into the clones reflect the practice of “cultural hegemony” as envisioned by the likes of Gramsci and later critiqued by Althusser. Thus, the films hypothesize that with advancements in technology it is likely that class distinctions in its current form may undergo a change with time and in order to keep the social hierarchy intact, a new underclass will be required to be constructed to serve as the new proletariat or the new working class with an even greater degree of compliance to the rules laid out by the dominant human class.

The second category is that of “reproductive cloning” as we see in films like *Womb*, *Blueprint* and *The Boys from Brazil*. The objective of “reproductive cloning” is generally shown to be a way of substituting a loved one with a clone. In *Womb*, the protagonist intends to replace her deceased lover while in *The Boys from Brazil* the Nazis seek to bring back Adolf Hitler. In *Blueprint*, the protagonist attempts to substitute her former self by trying to retain her fleeting vigor in a cloned version of herself whom she conceives as her daughter. In “reproductive cloning” projects, as represented in films, the center stage of the controlling agency is occupied by the family apparatus. The resistance possible in this kind of project largely involves the subversion of the traditional norms of the family and the community.

There is a third category represented in many films which further diminish the semblance of fidelity to the scientific possibilities of cloning. In films under this category, the clones are often conceived as exact adult replicas of the original and the objectives range from replacing dead people as seen in *The 6th Day* to creating duplicates to distribute the work load of an individual as seen in *Multiplicity*. In these kinds of films, especially the hardcore action-based films like *The 6th Day*, we see the repressive apparatuses in action.

Each of the three types of cloning represented in the films has diverse agendas and differ in the scope they accord to the clones to exercise their subversive potential. Based on the scope and extent of possible subversion, the required control measures are employed. The control functions are largely performed through ideological conditioning by the existing or modified forms of Ideological State Apparatuses which work in tandem with the repressive machineries to enforce desirable clone behavior. Therefore, by portraying the interpellation of clones as subjects, these films often reflect real social conditions. The speculations regarding future scientific possibilities may be dismissed as being rooted in inaccuracy, but in their speculations about the social dynamics in a scientifically enhanced futuristic world, there is a resounding resemblance to the contemporary social order.

References

- Althusser, Louis. (1971). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, pp. 127 – 187.
- Bay, M. (Director). (2005). *The Island* [Film]. DreamWorks Pictures; Warner Bros. Pictures; Parkes/MacDonald.
- Butler, Judith. (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.
- Caplan, Arthur L. (2004). *Godsend no blessing for cloning research*. Alden March Bioethics Institute. <https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna4865240>.
- Fliegau, B. (Director). (2010). *Womb* [Film]. Olive Films.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1991). *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Cambridge U P.
- Kaebnick, G. E., & Murray, T.H. (2001). Cloning. *The Concise Encyclopedia of the Ethics of New Technologies*, pp. 51 – 64. Academic Press.
- National Bioethics Advisory Commission. (1997). *Cloning Human Beings: Reports and Recommendations of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission*. Rockville.
- O’Riordan, Kate. (2009). Human Cloning in Film: Horror, Ambivalence, Hope. *Science as Culture*, 17(2), pp. 145-162.
- Parisi, Luciana. (2004). *Abstract Sex: Philosophy, Bio-Technology and the Mutations of Desire*. Continuum.
- Ramis. H. (Director). (1996). *Multiplicity* [Film]. Columbia Pictures.
- Romanek, M. (Director). (2010). *Never Let Me Go* [Film]. DNA Films; Film4 Productions.
- Schaffner, F. J. (Director). (1978). *The Boys from Brazil* [Film]. ITC Entertainment; Producer Circle.
- Schübel, R. (Director). (2003). *Blueprint* [Film]. United International Pictures.
- Spottiswoode, R. (Director). (2000). *The 6th Day* [Film]. Phoenix Pictures; Columbia Pictures.
- Wilmut, I., and R. Highfield. (2006). *After Dolly: The Uses and Misuses of Human Cloning*. W. W. Norton.
- Wilmut, Ian, Angelika E. Schnieke, Jim Mcwhir, Alexander J. Kind, and Keith Henry Stockman Campbell. (1997). Viable Offspring Derived from Fetal and Adult Mammalian Cells. *Nature*, 385, pp. 810–813.
- Wolfe, Cary. (2009). *What is Posthumanism?* U of Minnesota P.

Bio-note

Soham Sinha is a research scholar who recently completed his M.Phil from the Department of Comparative Literature at Jadavpur University. He completed his M.A in English from the University of Calcutta in 2017.

Email id: sohamsinha28@gmail.com