the Booker Prize in 1989 for his chilling rendition of a bootlickingly devoted but morally blank English butler, *The Remains of the Day.* It's a thoughtful, crafty, and finally very disquieting look at the effects of dehumanization on any group that's subject to it. In Ishiguro's subtle hands, these effects are far from obvious. There's no Them-Bad, Us-Good preaching; rather there's the feeling that as the expectations of such a group are diminished, so is its ability to think outside the box it has been shut up in. The reader reaches the end of the book wondering exactly where the walls of his or her own invisible box begin and end.

Ishiguro likes to experiment with literary hybrids, and to hijack popular forms for his own ends, and to set his novels against tenebrous historical backdrops; thus, When We Were Orphans mixes the Boy's Own Adventure with the 1930s detective story while taking a whole new slice out of the Second World War. An Ishiguro novel is never about what it pretends to pretend to be about, and Never Let Me Go is true to form. You might think of it as the Enid Blyton schoolgirl story crossed with Blade Runner, and perhaps also with John Wyndham's shunned-children classic, The Chrysalids: the children in Wyndham's novel, like those in Never Let Me Go, give other people the creeps.

The narrator, Kathy H., is looking back on her school days at a

Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishigura 169

superficially idyllic establishment called Hailsham. (As in "sham"; as in Charles Dickens's Miss Havisham, exploiter of uncomprehending children.) At first you think the "H" in "Kathy H." is the initial of a surname, but none of the students at Hailsham has a real surname. Soon you understand that there's something very peculiar about this school. Tommy, for instance, who is the best boy at football, is picked on because he's no good at art: in a conventional school it would be the other way around.

is taken for granted—as slavery was once—by beneficiaries and been overcome. By now the rules are in place and the situation objections might have been raised to such a scheme have already happening. We assume—though it's never stated—that whatever efits they can confer, but it doesn't wish to look head-on at what is world wants these children to exist because it's greedy for the benous morality, is wrapped in euphemism and shadow: the outer twist.) The whole enterprise, like most human enterprises of dubiterms has originated with Ishiguro; he just gives them an extra being deprived of their organs; then they will undergo up to four "donations" themselves, until they "complete." (None of these period of being "carers" to others of their kind who are already can't have children. Once they graduate, they will go through a organs to other, "normal" people. They don't have parents. They been brought into the world for the sole purpose of providing In fact, Hailsham exists to raise cloned children who have

All this is background. Ishiguro isn't much interested in the practicalities of cloning and organ donation. (Which four organs, you may wonder? A liver, two kidneys, then the heart? But wouldn't you be dead after the second kidney anyway? Or are we throwing in the pancreas?) Nor is this a novel about future horrors: it's

set not in a Britain-yet-to-come but in a Britain-off-to-the-side, in thirty-one in the late 1990s, which places her childhood and adomusic via tape, not CD teachers and "guardians," even the fact that Kathy listens to her scapes, the kind of sports pavilion at Hailsham, the assortment of of their own.) And so the observed detail is realistic—the landhave seen many young people dying far too soon, through no fault he was five. (Surely there's a connection: as a child, Ishiguro must who was born in 1955 in Nagasaki and moved to England when lescence in the 1970s and early 1980s—close to those of Ishiguro, which cloning has been introduced before the 1970s. Kathy H. is

in her case, the connection between her "best friend," the bossy put-down and cold shoulder and gang-up and spat. It's all hidis intelligent but nothing extraordinary, and she prattles on in the and manipulative Ruth, and the boy she loves-Tommy, the ami farm. Like most people, she's interested in personal relationships: establishment like Hailsham rather than on the standard organ Indeed, she considers herself lucky to have grown up in a superior sations and registering every comment and twitch and crush and able football-playing bad artist. Ishiguro's tone is perfect: Kathy kept a teenaged diary. eously familiar and gruesomely compelling to anyone who's ever obsessive manner touchy girls have, going back over past conver Kathy H. has nothing to say about the unfairness of her fate.

they're only going to die young anyway? Are they human or not? away? Why does it matter to anyone that they be educated, if these children make art, and why is their art collected and taken teries that have been bothering her. Why is it so important that There's a chilling echo of the art-making children in Theresien-In the course of her story, Kathy H. solves a few of the mys-

> theless made paper cranes. stadt, and of the Japanese children dying of radiation who never-

pose the characters have been hoping for. out to have a purpose in Never Let Me Go, but it isn't quite the purand teachers start squabbling over school curricula. Art does turn nineteenth century. It lingers with us still, especially when parents has been around at least since Plato, and was tyrannical in the to be for something, that it must serve some clear social purpose extolling the gods, cheering people up, illustrating moral lessonsconnection with the arts: What is art for? The notion that it ought their own circumstances, but surely they speak for anyone with a What is art for? the characters ask. They link the question to

and the other donors form a proud, cruel little clique, excluding Kathy H. because, not being a donor yet, she can't really undertheir own marginalization: even as they die, Ruth and Tommy among themselves. The marginalized are not exempt from doing ment of out-groups, and the way out-groups form in-groups, even One motif at the very core of Never Let Me Go is the treat-

Who owns your body? Who therefore is entitled to offer it up? The of the Hallsham "students" is bound to become more general. organs—help for an afflicted sibling, for instance—the dilemma at large. With babies already being created with a view to their fices, offered up on the altar of improved health for the population in which the happiness of the many depends absolutely on the read as a sister text. The children of Hailsham are human sacrishort story called "The Ones Who Walk Away from Omelas," arranged unhappiness of the few, and Never Let Me Go could be make sure we ourselves get a soft ride. Ursula K. Le Guin has a The book is also about our tendency to cannibalize others to

of self in things quite far away from her own body, and thus less likely to be injured. are intensely present. It's as if Kathy has invested a lot of her sense sex is oddly bloodless. But landscapes, buildings, and the weather know much about what the main characters look like. Even the anything much in this book, nobody smells anything. We don' of physicality of Kathy's descriptions of their life. Nobody eats them—pain, mutilation, death—may account for the curious lack reluctance of Kathy H. and her pals to really confront what awaits

of control. In Ishiguro's world, as in our own, most people do what scionable things being done to him but then apologizes for his loss an office job. Tommy reacts with occasional rage to the unconabout herself, and in daydreams—maybe she'll be allowed to get "normal" members of society. Ruth takes refuge in grandiose lies thinks about running away or revenging themselves upon the breaking. This is what traps them in their cage: none of them being taken from becoming too distressed; to be a "good donor," approval. The children's poignant desire to be patted on the someone who makes it through all four "donations"—is hearthead—to be a "good carer," keeping those from whom organs are Finally, the book is also about our wish to do well, to attract

next few years. stress; unless I'm much mistaken, they'll loom ever larger in the doing? These questions always become more pressing in times of Who defines "normal"? Who tells us what we are supposed to be of the book: "wherever it was that I was supposed to be going." might expect, is normal. The other is supposed, as in the last words Tellingly, two words recur again and again. One, as you

> darkly. people in it aren't heroic. The ending is not comforting. Neverwho has chosen a difficult subject: ourselves, seen through a glass, theless, this is a brilliantly executed book by a master craftsman Never Let Me Go is unlikely to be everybody's cup of tea. The