

University of Oregon

Bean as Our Future

How *Ender's Shadow* Disputes the 1997 Backlash against Human Cloning

Seth Temple

HC 223 “Artificial Births in Speculative Fiction”

Dr. Elizabeth Raisanen

June 6th, 2016

Abstract:

In 1997, Dr. Ian Wilmut and colleagues at the Roslin Institute performed a successful somatic cell nuclear transfer on a female sheep named Dolly. Fear-mongering media coverage of Dolly immediately postulated concerns surrounding potential human cloning. In 1999, Orson Scott Card reimaged the Enderverse with the genetically enhanced clone Bean as the protagonist for *Ender's Shadow*. Bean exists as Card's counterexample to the aforementioned speculation. Card's portrayal of Bean posits a world in which cloning technologies maintain human dignity, respect individuality, and benefit mankind's pursuits. This paper demonstrates the historical concerns surrounding cloning as inadequately corroborated through analyses of Bean and Ender as literary foils, of Bean and Nikolai as unique personalities despite being genetic copies, and of Bean as a helpful wholesome clone due to the Christian education Sister Carlotta provides him. By presenting a contradiction to dispute the media's fallacious and unfounded claims, Card requests more discourse over the cloning debate and pleads for an understanding of various perspectives.

The runt in *Ender's Game* turned savant-hero in *Ender's Shadow*: enter Bean. A product of somatic cell nuclear transfer¹ and gene therapy², Bean is the hyper-rational strategist and creative genius behind Ender's venerated accomplishments. Described as the "children in space" franchise, Orson Scott Card's so-called Enderverse³ imagines interplanetary warfare between mankind and the Formics (an alien invader race) in which gifted juveniles undergo battle training and command space fleets. In Card's inaugural novel *Ender's Game* (1985), Card elevates Andrew "Ender" Wiggin as the emotionally-intelligent born-commander to defeat the Formics, independent of outside help.

This paper investigates why, fourteen years later, Card revisits his seminal work. In particular, this paper analyzes Bean's status as a genetically enhanced clone and places *Ender's Shadow* (1999) in the historical context of the 1990s cloning debate. Following the aftermath of the Dolly the sheep announcement, media and political institutions determined human cloning to be taboo and postulated concerns surrounding its practice. I see Bean in *Ender's Shadow* as Card's model supposition to contradict the non-sequiturs and slippery slopes broadcasted to the public concerning human cloning. By comparing Bean and Ender as literary foils, recognizing Bean and his twin Nikolai as unique personalities despite being genetic copies, and highlighting Bean as a helpful wholesome clone due to the Christian education Sister Carlotta provides him, I show the contemporary concerns regarding cloning technology as inadequate, and I suggest that Card calls for more perspective and discourse on the cloning debate in his novel *Ender's Shadow*.

¹ Sister Carlotta asks Dr. Volescu how he knew that Bean was a boy. He replies: "How do you think I got the genes I worked with? I implanted my own altered DNA into denucleated eggs" (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 207).

² "So that was the secret. The genome that allowed a human being to have extraordinary intelligence acted by speeding up many bodily processes. The mind worked faster. The child developed faster. Bean was indeed the product of an experiment in unlocking the savant gene" (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 173).

³ The Enderverse is an affectionate name for the *Ender's Game* book series and/or for books whose plot occurs in the sci-fi universe Card imagined originally in *Ender's Game*.

In 1997, two years before Card published *Ender's Shadow*, Dr. Ian Wilmut and his colleagues at the Roslin Institute published their research on the first successful somatic cell nuclear transfer of a mammal. Immediately, this event galvanized public debate. Media, political, and religious institutions offered the receptive public an image of human cloning littered with references to eugenics, totalitarian control, misguided science, depraved individuality, and debased human significance. Richard Holliman shares his study on the media coverage of cloning, writing that “interventions shifted the emphasis from the scientific announcement towards the political and ethical implications of experiments” and that there was “a lack of discussion of the agricultural applications of [animal] cloning” (115). In other words, journalists ignored the research’s focus on agricultural applications and instead initiated a doomsday tirade on human cloning.

Moreover, Holliman’s study presents a media apprehensive to science rather than a media looking for utility from science. Card certainly implies the prospects of cloning in *Ender's Shadow*, demonstrating Bean, as a representation of the results of biotechnology, contributing to Ender’s victories. The media further discussed cloning in regards to human cloning, invoking “references to science fiction and descriptions of the historical links between eugenics and political extremism” (Holliman 118). Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932) remained the popular literature to allude to, pointing to the horror of the biologically engineered and psychologically conditioned class consciousness. Similarly, media implicated Ira Levin’s film *The Boys from Brazil* (1978), making a strikingly explicit connection to eugenics by involving a Hitler *doppelgänger*. Such media interweaves feelings about cloning with notions of totalitarianism and the eugenics movement.

Literature, however, rarely offers readers such obvious messages as the 1990s media would suggest. The media distorted the complexity of the science fiction genre. In “Cloning humans, cloning literature: genetics and the imagination deficit”, José van Dijck claims that the sci-fi novels invoked in the cloning debate “were systematically reduced to their seemingly unequivocal or unambiguous plots, without acknowledgment of their rich, multi-interpretable and educational content” (9). For example, one could read *Brave New World* as a polemic against industrialization or pharmaceuticals. Simplifying *Brave New World* as a totalitarian state gone wrong is both a retrospective rhetoric and a manipulation of an uneducated crowd. Media took advantage of popular sci-fi to make a one-sided didactic argument against cloning research. Van Dijck concludes, “I would like to see that we exploit the great potential of science fiction novels to address the important philosophical, ethical and moral questions” (21). Card obliges van Dijck’s request with his science fiction, exercising fantasy as a way to explore new vantage points. In an interview, Card laments, “by and large, you’re hearing the fad philosophy of the last five years, expressed through characters acting it out. That’s unfortunate because you’re not examining anything” (G. DeCandido and K. DeCandido). The 1990s consensus on human cloning strongly opposed all forms of the practice, so much so that journalists and politicians labeled it taboo. Card, however, writes to disrupt unchallenged assumptions. In contrast to the aforementioned literature, the references to cloning in *Ender’s Shadow* cannot be missed or misconstrued. *Ender’s Shadow* is a response to the conservative media. Clones like Bean would not be innately evil and could be of legitimate use. This argument, supposing Card meant it, is particularly persuasive because it takes the same vehicle of science fiction to arrive at the polar opposite destination.

Faith-based groups communicated distress over the education of hypothetical clones and that education's influence on their vices and/or virtues. Card appeals to this sentiment, manufacturing Bean as a good Christian due to Sister Carlotta's mothering of him. Theologian Stephen Werber concedes to the inexorable ambition of science in regards to cloning, and instead hopes to steer science on an ethical path. He affirms that "the legal and moral imperatives of theology are all the more important. The values they represent may lead to a universal societal demand that the development of cloning and related genetic research be used for good rather than evil" (Werber 1119). Notably, Card is a devout Mormon and regularly harkens to scripture in *Ender's Shadow*. His characterization of Bean agrees with Werber's recommendation. Sister Carlotta rescues Bean from Achilles' street gang and teaches him the Gospel. Bean learns morality from Sister Carlotta and displays this in the climactic moment before he sends his fleet to certain death. Turning on his speaker, Bean addresses his squadron:

‘O my son Absalom,’ Bean said softly, knowing for the first time the kind of anguish that could tear such words from a man’s mouth. ‘My son, my son Absalom. Would God I could die for thee, O Absalom, my son. My sons!’

He had paraphrased it a little, but God would understand. Or if he didn’t, Sister Carlotta would. (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 454)

Here Bean experiences empathy, feeling the emotions of his comrades and tormenting himself for having to sacrifice their lives. Moreover, David's cry for Absalom embodies self-sacrifice for the family. Bean sees himself as a parent, both nurturing to and willing to sacrifice himself for, his soldiers. In addition, the religious connotations in Bean's words offer compassion to the dying soldiers. Lastly, Bean invokes Sister Carlotta in a reference to an earlier passage in which Sister Carlotta likewise invokes David's cry. Bean interprets this parable and contextualizes it to

his situation, showing an understanding of Christian morality and how it manifests in his character. In comparison, Ender's mother in *Ender's Game* denies her Mormon faith due to government pressures, and Ender, accordingly, showcases no signs of faith-based education. Clearly, Card sees Christianity as quintessential to Bean's character: the religious features of the newly-envisioned Bean appeal to the religious concerns surrounding cloning.

Historical concerns surrounding cloning jumped to the hasty conclusion that clones might be objectified or used as instruments. John Robertson attributes this concern to overbearing parents, saying, "A pervasive concern about cloning is the risk that choosing the child's DNA will turn the child into a mere instrument or object to satisfy parental agendas that conflict with treating the child as an end in herself" (1455). Implicit here is consideration for the welfare of the cloned child. Objectification of the clone harms the clone's right to determine his or her future. Robertson further elaborates on this argument where viewing clones as instruments becomes a way to exercise "despotic or narcissistic power over others, thereby depriving them of the uniqueness and autonomy that seems central to human dignity" (1385). Again the idea of tyranny percolates into the cloning debate. Biotechnology seems to be the appropriate avenue to resurrect faith in individuality and strike terror into the populace.

Card, however, offers up Bean as a case in which biotechnology exists free of hegemonic control. Bean rejects any and all efforts to be manipulated by the Battle School teachers in contrast to Ender who naively trusts the system. At Battle School, teachers implore the students to play video games in their free time because they can psychoanalyze their interactions with the interface. Bean refuses to play because he "was not going to give them a chance to learn more about him than he knew himself" (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 125). This quotation holds special relevance since Bean is a clone. Bean fears an oppressive force experimenting on him and

passing judgment. In contrast, Ender plays the game and struggles to beat the Giant's Drink challenge in which whatever vial he chooses always kills him. After experiencing repeated frustration at the rigged game, Ender improvises. His avatar jumps at the Giant's face, clambers up his lip and nose, and begins to dig into the Giant's eye (Card, *Ender's Game* 64). Ender's reaction to the Giant's Drink video game foreshadows his reaction to the final battle with the Formics. The teachers like this reaction because it showcases Ender's proclivity for violence. Furthermore, the teachers observe Ender as an improviser and a competitor who never accepts defeat.

While the teachers beguile the innocent Ender, the intuitive Bean instead spites them. He crawls through the vents and spies on them, he hacks into the computer system, and he writes fake diary entries. In response to one particular diary entry, Bean thinks, "Let them stew on *that*. Let them think he was trying to turn Battle School into the street life that he knew" (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 134). The repetition of "Let them" and the italicization of "that" underscores Bean's antagonistic tone. Moreover, the content of Bean's thoughts reminds readers that the Battle School teachers do not know Bean's past. They don't understand him because they didn't have surveillance on his childhood. Ender, on the other hand, wore a monitor in his youth. They know all about Ender's home environment, school life and family life. Bringing out this comparison highlights how Card pictures Bean as against manipulation and outside of the Battle School's scope of surveillance. Bean, Card's representation of biotechnology, is unaffected by parental or societal pressures to complete some predetermined task.

Some groups have theorized that human cloning would compromise the clone's sense of uniqueness and individuality, but the dynamic between Bean and Nikolai (Bean's genetic twin) exhibits a situation in which this speculative thinking might not happen. Academic research in

the fields of psychology and philosophy has responded to these hypotheses, finding them based on the unsteady ground of genetic determinism. Psychologists like Nestor Morales and Dan Brock affirm that one's construction of identity takes into account the interaction between one's genetic material, pre and post-birth environments, and cognitive processes. Morales argues that "the experiences of human clones in regards to the environmental stimuli will always be individual and unique" (45), and, because of this fact, a clone's identity manifests itself differently to that of its genetic copy/copies. Nikolai Delphiki experiences a happy childhood in Greece and his familial structure is traditional; meanwhile, Bean scavenges homeless in the streets of Rotterdam, looking for a familial structure—orthodox or unorthodox—in the form of a male plumber, Sister Carlotta, and Achilles' gang. The spatial and temporal contexts of Bean and Nikolai's respective developments contribute to their differences in character, namely Nikolai trusts the system and leans on his family for support whereas Bean questions the system and relies solely on his own genius. Brock purports that ignorance of one's genome enables an authentic construction of self (315). Though Bean and Nikolai eventually discover the truth of their births, they learn this later in adolescence rather than in childhood. Bean does not try to emulate Nikolai and vice versa. Knowledge of the other's existence does not impair a natural formulation of identity. Once again, Card designs the clone Bean in a fashion which, according to the psychologists' opinions, rejects the theory of compromised identity.

Twin studies complicate the aforementioned assertion that Card believes the clone and the cloned would be unaffected by their origins. Barbara Prainsack and Tim Spector interviewed 17 identical and fraternal twins to ascertain their feelings about being twins. They conclude that "none of our respondents employed strongly genetically deterministic views" (Prainsack and Spector 2745). *Ender's Shadow*, on the other hand, depicts Bean and Nikolai as having a special

bond. Nikolai is Bean's only friend and the only person who understands him. Bean, in turn, shows the most empathy in his friendship with Nikolai. The text explains that "No one had ever had such a conversation with Bean before" (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 160). Here Card suggests that identical twins share some bond due to their genetic similarity.

On another note, Prainsack and Spector realize that most twins would fear being a clone due to the situation's impact on the parent-child relationship (2748). Card, however, illustrates the Delphiki family as unconditionally loving. In the end, the Delphiki family embraces both children equally, as shown in the text when "she [the mother] held them in her arms, and her tears fell on them both, and her husband's hands rested upon both boys' heads" (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 466). The plural language and the emphasis on "both" stress the equality of treatment. Card objects to the idea that a parent's love of a clone would be any different than the parent's love for the original. Ultimately, Card maintains some myths of genetic determinism while also quarrelling with some rampant speculation.

Philosopher Nicholas Agar puts forth a self-perpetuation theory achieved through cloning in which the clone's identity is compromised, but Card's formulation of Bean yet again circumvents the psychological concern. In "Cloning and Identity", Agar discusses Parfitian survival—a situation in which continuation of a person occurs if two individuals share similar enough phenotypes and enough psychological connections and memories—and gives reasons for Parfitian survival being more likely with clones (18). First, I oppose the idea of Parfitian survival because the continuation theory depends on a vague notion of "enough". Second, Parfitian survival offends the diversity of individuals, calling two persons similar enough to effectively be the same. Nevertheless, Bean cannot be a continuation according to Agar's definition. Agar states that some environments are "hostile to the formation of psychological connections" (23).

Growing up on the streets of Rotterdam, Bean's environment is hostile to the formation of psychological connections between him and Nikolai. Moreover, Nikolai argues that Bean is a genius and he is not (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 394). The characters distinguish themselves among the group. Though I object to Agar's argument, Card still accounts for looser definitions of individuality by presenting ways to avoid Parfitian survival.

Questions relating to sense of self inevitably turn to questions of a clone character's humanness in the category of young adult science fiction. Fictional narratives of clones traditionally exercise the clone character as a literary trope to comment on the human experience. I see Bean rather as a clone human in the full sense of the word, not merely a literary device. In "Is He Still Human? Are You?", Elaine Ostry surveys many adult sci-fi books that deal with clone adolescents, and she claims that "The texts, in short, use biotechnology as a metaphor for adolescence" (223). She suggests that the physical experiences of one's body that a clone feels relate to adolescents' experiences of puberty. Bean does feel awkwardly small in comparison to his peers, but he exploits this physique to crawl through the vents. His abnormality is less a source of shame and more an opportunity for espionage. In addition, Bean's growth trajectory differs from normal human maturity during puberty. Bean starts tiny, but will eventually sprout up indefinitely and die an early death. Ostry corroborates her claim by attesting that the post-human body in the genre is comfortingly familiar (243), yet Bean's body goes through a grotesque transformation. Bean is not a metaphor for adolescence, and a cursory reading of either *Ender's Game* or *Ender's Shadow* would highlight how Card plays with heavier themes than puberty or loss of innocence.

In the same vein, Ostry speaks to genetic engineering, explaining that "the characters in the books generally stand against, or regret, experimentation with the human form. Scientists are

seen as fallible” (241). Bean, however, never concerns himself with his corporeal form. As stated before, Bean opposes experimentation on his psyche, not experimentation on the body. When debating his humanity, Bean articulates “He had never seen any child show any desire or emotion that he himself had not felt” (Card, *Ender’s Shadow* 183). The mind matters more than the body. Bean is human because he feels human, not because he looks human. Only Sister Carlotta chastises the scientists Volescu and Anton, but her condemnation demonstrates a typical disagreement between religion and science. In short, *Ender’s Shadow* diverges from the clone fiction genre Ostry illustrates, instead casting Bean as Card’s ideal clone to counter the popular arguments against cloning that would deny the humanity of cloned people.

Mirroring the 1990s cloning debate, Card employs a multiple narrator structure in *Ender’s Shadow* to generate a conversation about Bean’s humanness and use as biotechnology. First and foremost, the multiple narratives distinguish Card’s Enderverse as atypical school stories. School stories often glorify the singular child’s perspective at odds with the tyrannical teachers. Christine Doyle and Susan Stewart indicate in “*Ender’s Game* and *Ender’s Shadow*: Orson Scott Card’s Postmodern School Stories” that the author humanizes the Battle School teachers by showcasing their flaws and their care for the students (191). Graff, the flight school lieutenant, certainly doubts whether Ender is the right commander in *Ender’s Game*. Card intensifies this doubt in *Ender’s Shadow* because Graff now has a choice between Ender and Bean. Furthermore, Graff doesn’t tell Ender he is actually decimating the Formic race, knowing that this information would cause emotional trauma. School stories cultivate a strong sense of didacticism as well. This didacticism follows from the limited first-person perspective.

In *Ender’s Shadow*, Card exposes readers to a religious perspective, a government perspective, and a clone’s perspective. According to Doyle and Stewart, “readers must think for

themselves and synthesize the various voices and ideas. Readers share subjectivities with several characters and assume multiple subject positions” (193). I agree with this analysis, but I extend the argument further, delineating how the various voices readers hear correspond to the various voices heard in the 1990s cloning debate. Political voices (like those of Bill Clinton and other heads of state) and religious voices weighed in against cloning. Interestingly, the clone’s perspective remained absent from the conversation. Though this comment sounds hopeful, my point is that the clone’s perspective had not been recognized before writers like Card. In this respect, I find Doyle and Stewart’s analysis all the more important since it means the readers now assume the clone’s position.

Card’s narrative structure provides the platform to compare and contrast three perspectives in regards to Bean’s humanness. While spying in the vents, Bean hears Dimak and Graff conversing:

‘Isn’t that debatable? The difference between humans and chimpanzees is genetically slight. Between humans and neanderthals it had to be minute. How much difference would it take for him to be a different species?’

‘Philosophically interesting, but in practical terms—’

‘In practical terms we don’t know what this kid will do. There’s no data on his species.’ (Card, *Ender’s Shadow* 181)

Here the military personnel employ a classification language “species” to exclude Bean. References to science also give false weight to their argument. Lastly, implied in Graff’s words rests the commonplace fear of the unknown. This quotation mimics the consensus opinion on cloning in the 1990s. Sister Carlotta likewise imitates the religious voice, as Bean experiences

consternation after realizing “*She* had raised the question of whether Bean was genetically human” (Card, *Ender’s Shadow* 185). Meanwhile, Bean comments on his humanness:

Besides, *his* problem was not figuring out whether he really was human or not. Whatever he was, he was himself and must act in such a way as to . . . get as much control over his own future as possible. The only danger to him was that *they* were concerned about the issue . . . (Card, *Ender’s Shadow* 185)

Bean sees Graff and Sister Carlotta’s concerns as farcical. Though Graff and Sister Carlotta want to include and exclude like a high school clique, how Bean behaves is what actually matters. Emphasis on pronouns accentuates this insider-outsider group dichotomy.

On the other hand, Bean’s never-before-heard voice identifies the slippery slopes human reason falls into. The third narrator reexamines previous arguments through a new lens. Doyle and Stewart explain that Card’s narrative structure “demonstrates the necessity of accessing and appreciating multiple perspectives” (198). I again agree with Doyle and Stewart and connect their argument to Card’s plea for better communication. Because Bean eavesdrops on the teachers’ conversations, he has better information and makes informed decisions. In contrast, the teachers deprive Ender of information and, as a result, he is deeply distraught after finding out he unknowingly committed genocide. The extermination of the Formics is due to a withholding of information. If Ender or the International Fleet had communicated with the Formics, perhaps the genocide could have been avoided. Card creates multiple narrators to demand more perspectives and discourse. He reminds the readership that informed decisions synthesize all available knowledge.

Although *Ender’s Game* and *Ender’s Shadow* share the same plot, the story is told from two different perspectives. How Card portrays Bean and Ender in the two works draws out

Bean's goodness and usefulness. To begin, Bean and Ender represent different types of leadership. Bean thinks mathematically and solves problems that no one else can. Meanwhile, Ender's charisma and genuineness resonate with the other schoolchildren. This leadership comes from how Ender values his soldiers and vicariously empathizes with them. This trait becomes clear when Ender discovers the Formic queen's egg:

The old queen . . . commanded her [the egg] to become herself, to become a new city, a new world, to give birth to many queens and many worlds—

How do I know this, thought Ender. How can I see these things, like memories in my own mind. (Card, *Ender's Game* 319)

I see Ender's focus on "how" as a sign of the innocence in his actions. Moreover, Card inserts commas instead of question marks after each inquiry. This choice suggests the inquiry as less of a serious question and more a sinking in of empathy into Ender's character. His empathy is natural, unforced. Finally, Ender decides to resurrect the Formic race which I read as further evidence of his loyalty to life and determination to a cause (both strong traits for commanders). In "Orson Scott Card's Ender and Bean: The Exceptional Child as Hero", Christine Doyle suggests that "it is Bean's superior creativity and Ender's superior leadership that carry the day" (309). While I concur with Doyle that the International Fleet needs both Bean and Ender's respective talents, I view Bean's giftedness more literally as a product of his genetic enhancement rather than a giftedness possible in our contemporary world. Doyle implies that we should recognize a diversity of intelligences, whereas I argue that Card sees the value in biotechnology, namely leveraging gene therapy. Ender assigns Bean special tasks in Battle School, precisely because only Bean with his genetically engineered intelligence can think outside the box. Both Graff and Ender eventually decide to use the biotechnology that is Bean.

The fact that Bean and Ender collaborate as a team dispels the concern that biotechnology would diminish the value of the human. A light flashes on Bean's monitor, and he faces the choice of taking over for Ender. But Bean resigns the thought, surmising that "For Ender, the others will do their best work. If I took over, they'd be so upset, so distracted, that even if I came up with a plan that had some kind of chance, it would never work because their hearts wouldn't be in it" (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 449). The stress on "even if" highlights that Ender possesses something Bean could never have, something that biotechnology could never manufacture. This distinction underscores that biotechnology could manufacture artificial intelligence, but it could never create a human soul. Doyle suggests that Bean doesn't take over because that switch would disprove the children's belief in Ender as the invincible hero (312). However, I argue instead that Bean doesn't take over because he recognizes Ender's human virtue as a commander. Bean compliments his human audience and assures them that he too is fallible. Thus, Card again disputes an anti-cloning argument.

Juxtaposing Bean and Ender as literary foils reveals the intrinsic goodness of Bean. Card devises this foil to expose the genetic fallacy advertised in the 1990s. Both Ender and Bean confront bullies, but Ender perpetrates violence whereas Bean elicits confession. As described in *Ender's Game*, "It was as if Ender had kicked a piece of furniture. Bonzo collapsed, fell to the side, and sprawled directly under the spray of steaming water from the shower. He made no movement whatever to escape the murderous heat" (Card, *Ender's Game* 211-12). The simile insinuates that Ender finds murder easy and natural. In comparison, Bean cannot kill and finds a nonviolent means to approach his bully Achilles⁴. He traps Achilles in the furnace room, forces him to explain how he murdered people, and records the confession. Bean considers taking

⁴ The name Achilles suggests that Achilles is Bean's one weakness, i.e. his Achilles heel.

retribution, but then tells himself “Bean, you’re no Brutus⁵” (Card, *Ender’s Shadow* 384). Here Bean attains justice in a legal manner and chooses pacifism. Throughout the story, he never resorts to murder, and part of why he cannot command the fleet is because he would not sacrifice his soldiers or perpetrate genocide. Notably, Ender reminds us that humans behave malevolently and that we cannot hypocritically suppose the wickedness of others. While Ender succumbs to his destructive passion, Bean learns from human history, holds Christian morals and is pacifistic.

The literary foil offers the viewpoint that human civilization needs Bean, the representation of biotechnology, more than it needs Ender. In her concluding note, Doyle suggests that

The final pages of *Ender’s Shadow* place Bean on the threshold of a world of postmodern fragmentation, where, with his ability to ‘think differently’ all the time, continually to come up with innovative solutions in a continually shifting landscape, Bean will be the new hero humankind needs. When one considers the traditional mythic hero is portrayed as a savior to his people, and that Bean is a clone—a new creation—perhaps Card is suggesting a new story pattern in which saving also involves creation. (315)

Doyle presents solid analysis, yet some of her claims require more evidence. I agree that *Ender’s Shadow* topples the apotheosis of Ender as the mythic human hero by showing how Ender’s friends support him and how Bean, in particular, supports him. I also concur that Card calls for innovative solutions and creative thinking to solve contemporary problems. However, *Ender’s Shadow* provides a comprehensive look at the cloning debate, and I doubt Card feels strongly one way or the other (for cloning or against cloning). Sister Carlotta epitomizes the paradoxical

⁵ Bean and the Battle School teachers often reference historical figures like Hitler, Napoleon, Patton, Caesar, and Alexander the Great. Bean educates himself by reading history. Here Bean has learned through reading about Brutus’s betrayal of Julius Caesar the sin that murder is.

feelings towards cloning: she condemns the scientists Volescu and Anton, but also loves and nurtures Bean. I imagine, just like theologian Stephen Werber, Card feels ambiguous in regards to cloning and struggles to reconcile his faith with science⁶. He exercises the multiple narratives structure precisely to request more discourse and portray various viewpoints. *Ender's Shadow* exists to reexamine the 1990s judgment of cloning as taboo, not to vociferously proclaim the opposite opinion.

Although *Ender's Shadow* contains a language accessible to all ages, Card still writes about mature themes, as he does with everything he writes. According to the foreword, “the parallax was created by a dozen years in which my older children grew up, and younger ones were born, and the world changed around me” (Card, *Ender's Shadow* 3). This paper connects *Ender's Shadow* to the changing world prompted by the Dolly the sheep announcement. A Mormon, homophobe, and inflammatory columnist, Card is a well-known conservative. Eric Oatman points out that Card has two websites devoted to voicing his opinions (Oatman). Laura Ciperon catches Card in an interview where he says, “My characters wrestle with real moral dilemmas where all the choices have steep prices. If they make the selfish choice, then I show the consequences. I’m not trying to teach that lesson, though it underlies everything I write” (Ciperon). Clearly Card writes with intent and believes in a right versus wrong binary. Graceanne and Keith DeCandido give a subjective interpretation of Card’s interviews: “‘I’m Kristin’s husband, Geoffrey and Emily and Charlie’s dad, I’m a Mormon, and I am a science fiction writer.’ Orson Scott Card describes himself in that way and in that order” (G. and K. DeCandido). I find this fact interesting though, because *Ender's Shadow* diverges from the religious and reactionary response to the 1990s cloning debate. Indeed, Card is not an anomaly.

⁶ I am of the opinion that Card is pro-life, in whatever form it comes in. This paper claims that Card feels ambiguous in regards to cloning because, much like Sister Carlotta, he would not actively seek out cloning technologies, but, if they were to become available, he would accept the clones as living beings that deserve respect and dignity.

No party line existed for Card to follow. Mass media, politics and organized religion domineered the cloning debate. Card's bias in *Ender's Shadow* is not for or against some policy: it is for discourse. He sees science fiction as a method to think differently, and he therefore wants his companion novel to rekindle the national debate on cloning.

Orson Scott Card creates the character Bean as a counterargument to historical concerns surrounding the 1990s cloning debate. Multiple narratives give more context and perspective, ultimately ending the deification of the perfect human Ender and identifying the worth of the genetically engineered Bean. Letting the media, the government and the church frame national debate and pass judgments on scientific research is aristocratic. All things considered, Card defends the democratic process in his science fiction. His books ask readers to reassess values and policies in the ever-changing world. Just like Bean, Card implores us to reexamine the continually shifting sociopolitical landscape, acknowledge numerous perspectives, and think creatively about the world we shape.

Works Cited

- Agar, Nicholas. "Cloning and Identity." *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 28.1 (2003): 9-26. *Religion and Philosophy Collection*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Brock, Dan W. "Human Cloning and Our Sense of Self." *Science* 296.5566 (2002): 314-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Card, Orson Scott. *Ender's Game*. 1985. New York: Tor, 2002. Print
- Card, Orson Scott. *Ender's Shadow*. New York: Tor, 1999. Print
- Ciporen, Laura. "PW Talks with Orson Scott Card." *Publishers Weekly* 247.47 (2000): 51. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- DeCandido, Graceanne A., and DeCandido, Keith R.A. "Orson Scott Card: According to This Science Fiction Writer, It Is Impossible to Tell a Story That Does Not Involve Moral Choices." *Publishers Weekly* 237.48 (1990): 54. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Doyle, Christine. "Orson Scott Card's Ender and Bean: The Exceptional Child as Hero." *Children's Literature in Education: An International Quarterly* 35.4 (2004): 301-18. *SpringerLink*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Doyle, Christine, and Stewart, Susan Louise. "Ender's Game and Ender's Shadow: Orson Scott Card's Postmodern School Stories." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 28.2 (2004): 186-202. *Project Muse*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Holliman, Richard. "Media coverage of cloning: a study of media content, production and reception." *Public Understanding of Science* 13.2 (2004): 107-30. *SAGE*. Web. 8 May 2016.

- Morales, Nestor M. "Psychological Aspects of Human Cloning and Genetic Manipulation: The Identity and Uniqueness of Human Beings." *Reproductive Biomedicine Online* 19.2 (2009): 43-50. *Elsevier ScienceDirect*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Oatman, Eric. "The Ornerly American: Orson Scott Card." *School Library Journal* 54.6 (2008): 38-41. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Ostry, Elaine. "'Is He Still Human? Are You?': Young Adult Science Fiction in the Posthuman Age." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 28.2 (2004): 222-46. *Project Muse*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Prainsack, Barbara, and Spector, Tim D. "Twins: A Cloning Experience." *Social Science & Medicine* 63.10 (2006): 2739-752. *Elsevier ScienceDirect*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Robertson, John A. "Liberty, Identity, and Human Cloning." *Texas Law Review* 76.6 (1998): 1371-456. *LexisNexis Academic*. Web. 28 April 2016.
- Van Dijck, José. "Cloning humans, cloning literature: genetics and the imagination deficit." *New Genetics and Society* 18.1 (1999): 9-22. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 8 May 2016.
- Werber, Stephen J. "Cloning: A Jewish Law Perspective with a Comparative Study of Other Abrahamic Traditions." *Seton Hall Law Review* 30.4 (2000): 1114-121. *HeinOnline*. Web. 8 May 2016.