

CHRIS EWART

Kidneys to Go: Dis-Ordering the Body in a Pretty Dirty Economy

On April 21, 2009 an online report from Madrid declares “the econom[y] has forced dozens of ‘desperate’ people . . . to put their organs up for sale on the Internet.”¹ A consumer association cites the current global economic meltdown as motivation for “Spaniards and Latin American immigrants” to “offe[r] kidneys, lungs and bone marrow” for prices of “15,000 to one million Euros (19,000 to 1.3 million [US] dollars).”² The brief article also manages to conflate individual property-like announcements of organ sales with the loss of a “once-buoyant property sector” and suggests such actions are a “phenomenon.” As so-called “donors” or prospectors await the highest bidder, the body becomes inseparable from and consumed by the global economy – a site of commodity extraction, piece by piece, moving from poor to rich where biopower consumes and redistributes itself. While also cautioning that prospective donors may become victims of international organ trafficking, the article’s economic terms say and show nothing of the people (and risks) involved in the disturbingly emergent trade.³ Whether through unscrupulous organ brokers or unsafe operating procedures, business continues largely unchecked. Short of affixing an “organ(s) for sale” sign on the body, has capital reached its end game? Does one sector of property simply replace another? Does capital require a *working* body, or just a body to work on and take from?

Given a contemporary climate of individuals selling their organs, I will update Michel Foucault’s notion of “bio-power”⁴ and Michael Davidson’s concerns with organ harvesting, globalization and disability and other theorizations of the body’s shifting applications in a migratory global economy in order to examine Stephen Frears’s film *Dirty Pretty Things* (2002). Its narratives of organ trafficking and exploitation of asylum seekers emanating from a makeshift operating room in the upscale “Baltic Hotel” in London reflect a paradoxical disablement of the body to stabilize a legal

identity. The film shows how a person might arrive at the “choice” to sell a kidney for a passport – for the apparent benefit of someone able to pay thousands of dollars – while exposing networks that make such acts possible.

THE BODY WITHIN GLOBALIZATION: A KIDNEY FOR THE WORLD

Organ transplant narratives operate as metaphor for the biopolitical exploitation of many poor and illegal workers worldwide and show how the extraction from the body of the body brings fear, bodily damage, and for some, a stable (but different) identity. In “Organs without Bodies: Transplant Narratives in the Global Market”⁵ Michael Davidson discusses stories of organ harvesting and their relationship to bodies under capital and how representing such physical, bodily transference generates tangible and disturbing results. He writes,

Narratives about organ transplants reinforce the links between the body and the global space of capital, between a body regarded as a totality of parts and a communicational and media space in which those parts are sold, packaged in ice chests, and shipped around the world. And organ trafficking is a discursive matter. Rumours of children stolen, soldiers’ bodies “looted,” hospital patients misdiagnosed for their organs add a gothic element to the organ sale narrative.⁶

That the live organ trade and its stories – from urban myth, to news services to cinema – necessitates discussion helps illuminate its often risky, behind-closed-doors status as an act. Organ trafficking implies means and destinations for its material – with variously motivated participants along the way.

Dirty Pretty Things’ seldom-discussed spaces represent such movement. The film’s main characters – Okwe, from Nigeria and Senay, from Turkey – signify a critique of global capital exploiting those without legal identification to travel and work freely. Ironically, the film’s portrayal of problematic identities and bodies⁷ relies on a mythical and very real “phenomenon” of organ extraction and sale to make its point as the act itself can limit movement and place its donors in peril just as it can

provide them with various forms of capital. If, as Davidson suggests, narratives of the trade in human organs operate as “*the allegory of globalization*”⁸ then how did the act gain such metaphorical significance? The commodification of the body begins with its labour, and ironically, capitalist-utopic lip-service regarding globalization as opening up economic opportunities *for all* return to disrupt the body as a site to strip-mine.⁹ Why must the body pay the cost for the fair request of “*a social wage and a guaranteed income for all*”¹⁰ under social capital? Must the gap between rich and poor mean some bodies¹¹ pay with more body parts than others to make up the difference?

The separation of the body from its respective parts results from (a) labour(er) leaving home and his or her physical labour becoming a means of productive property owned by the boss, rather than the worker. Okwe – whose role of perpetual labourer is also emblematic of the film’s critique of immigrant exploitation – declares bosses “are all the same”¹² in their continual demand of more work for less benefit. This separation process also involves various bodily and work identities that the film (which I discuss in greater detail in the next section) explores. For example, Okwe’s adoption of a new name and religion during the times he drives a taxi, and Senay’s sexual abuse in an illegal sweatshop reflects their existence as physical commodities in markets of labour, sex, and more recently under globalization, physical parts – central to the film’s narrative. In “The Right of Death and Power Over Life” Michel Foucault situates the shift from a sovereign power deciding who dies (and by the process of elimination, who lives) to people deciding upon issues of life and death. More specifically, death was “carefully supplanted by the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life.”¹³ How bodies have been “administered” as a means to manage life within a system of capital production over the past 200 years of various socio-technological revolutions allows biopower to control life through work. Foucault continues,

This bio-power was without question an indispensable element in the development of capitalism; the latter would not have been possible without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to eco-

conomic processes . . . [T]he growth of human groups to the expansion of productive forces and the differential allocation of profit, were made possible in part by the exercise of bio-power in its many forms and modes of application.¹⁴

The mechanistic “controlled insertion of bodies” into capital’s production-house provides living, social implications for all the possibilities this movement of people creates. A body is more than an automated cog in a machine, right? Humanist ideas of fair and equitable means of living for all – not dictated by the market – are lost despite the inclusiveness a global “ism” might imply.

Could Foucault have imagined that a burgeoning mode of biopower exists in the global trade of organs? Bioethicist Leon Kass describes organ trade and transplantation “as a ‘noble form of cannibalism,’ arguing that the “morality of organ procurement depends in part on whether it involves giving instead of selling.”¹⁵ Other authors on the subject advocate – in troubling neoliberal fashion – “free markets in human organs” and argue that treating “organs as commodities [will] boost supply, save lives, and free individuals to decide for themselves when selling their own organs makes personal sense” (44). Several characters in *Dirty Pretty Things* are coerced by the antagonistic hotel manager/organ seller, Señor Juan to use (or lose) body parts as a “happy” way to attain money, legal identity, passports and the ability to travel. Although unregulated trade in bodily organs seems nightmarish, it already occurs in an amoral system where markets (and agents) create and maintain an illusion of choice where none exists.¹⁶

Current unease of body/capital relations – fictional or otherwise – has a disabling history. Marx’s caveat of workers turning into “crippled monstrosit[ies]”¹⁷ because of production-line manufacturing and by extension the creation of capital at the physical/mental *expense* of the worker, provides a glimpse of sensationalism akin to the “social panic”¹⁸ around the dangers and disablement associated with narratives of organ trafficking – while also upholding equations of productivity as ability to physically contribute to the labour market. Within such (relatively recent) constructions of money and body, disability through work becomes an undesirable,

non-producing, negative identity. Similarly, organ harvesting through globalization carries physical risks, marks and undesirable social stigmatizations.¹⁹ Davidson writes, “from a global perspective . . . organ transplantation always involves an unequal exchange of genetic material, often on a black market and often resulting in the disablement of the organ seller.”²⁰ Thus, organ transplant narratives (and representations thereof) and the bodies that relinquish their parts often signify a state of inequality. He also suggests that such signification under the scope of globalization mirrors the metaphorical role of disability within narrative as lack,²¹ bodily inadequacy and social deviancy.²² That the organ trade fulfills ideals of “normal” able and healthy bodies for those with the means to pay while potentially injuring, disabling and killing those who sell (while providing profit for a third party) lends greater socio-economic and geographical importance to theories of globalization and disability alike. Akin to Frears’s portrayal of a debilitating, near-death post-operation experience of a Somali man in exchange for an “English” identity, such inequitable removal of body parts, ironically, brings attention to the global scope of disability because of capital in ways Marx and his “crippled monster” of a worker might not have guessed, either.

As the use of bodies to produce, maintain and grow capital has historically created, and continues to create disability around the globe, an ironic lack of capital keeps “two-thirds of the world’s disabled population in poverty.”²³ One’s job or necessity to sell an organ does not always create disability, but these acts are significant when combined with the effects of labour and its products over time and space. *Dirty Pretty Things*’ model of capital creation limits choices so that the idea of selling an organ seems plausible. If there are no jobs available, if fair and humane compensation for labour is non-existent or living conditions necessitate evacuation, then people will use the physical material of their bodies to live – through any available “modes of application.”²⁴

In “Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy” Arjun Appadurai discusses the movement of bodies and modes of biopower within globalization. He describes his notion of “ethnoscapes”²⁵ as

the landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live: tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guest workers and other moving groups and individuals [who] constitute an essential feature of the world and appear to affect the politics of (and between) nations to a hitherto unprecedented degree.²⁶

Here the body becomes geopolitical, global, and populates a “shift” of economy in our world for better and for worse. Movement in the late-capitalist system demands stable identity while demands upon the body push towards instability, hence any expertly forged passport will do. Capital becomes synonymous with body. With the exception of a majority of tourists, most groups seek employment. *Dirty Pretty Things* frames migratory workers within a traditionally touristic domain and reflects a contemporary fragmentary, threatened status of many bodies – of people as producers and products – making their stability and safety, even within their own communities, suspect. As nation-states dissolve in favour of international flows of traffic and organs, all prepare for “immanent labour”²⁷ wherever it might exist. The hegemony of national laws of identity – which Frears characterizes as an aggressive, somewhat bumbling immigration police duo – and travel belie international realities of identity manipulation and bodily exploitation. Once the body leaves the home (as Foucault points out in terms of sexual power via removal of domestic, biological “expectations” of women at home) parts of the body leave the body as a substitute for work. Globalization provides an organ trafficking model that disables the body through means of bodily removal – a contemporary metonym for Marx’s “crippled” worker. As the following discussion of *Dirty Pretty Things* will show, the sale of body parts (and bodies) reinforces societal fears of a body without unity, or a home. When the body leaves home, it seems the body leaves itself.

***Dirty Pretty Things*: HARVESTING MORE THAN OUR IMAGINATION**

Dirty Pretty Things begins and ends in a London airport and much of its middle is spent in a hotel and other transitional, temporary spaces – from cars and couches to a hospital mortuary. The unstable settings Frears’s characters inhabit

frame the film's bodily-destabilizing, exploitive organ-transplant narrative. Two workers/asylum-seekers at the hotel – Okwe, (Chiwetel Ejiofor) a Nigerian pathologist falsely accused of murdering his wife, and Senay, (Audrey Tautou) a Turkish Muslim woman awaiting British citizenship so she can travel to New York – endure violations of identity, labour and body as they attempt to gain enough capital (money, passports) to return to family – and the stability of a home. Although both of them are “illegal” workers and in a continuous cycle of menial labour, they manage to subvert the organ harvesting operation run by the Spanish²⁸ hotel manager, Señor “Sneaky” Juan (Sergei López).

We meet Okwe as he tries to get a taxi fare into London. He succeeds procuring one not initially his:

OKWE: “Would you like a car, sir?”

TRAVELLER: “Are you from [a company called] Sajit?”

OKWE: “I’m not here to meet you in particular, but I am here to rescue those that have been let down by the system.”

TRAVELLER: “Okay, let’s go.”

Okwe’s exchange reveals his ability to manipulate a system of capital that perpetually fails its users. Moreover, it frames him as the film’s protagonist, as someone capable of saving those less fortunate – a multi-skilled humanist without a passport or work permit. Upon return to the taxi office, another migrant takes Okwe’s keys – and identity. “You are now Mohammed,” Okwe says to his colleague while handing him a forged taxi license.²⁹ This scene places Okwe within a continuous cycle of labour and seemingly fluid identities.

As Hardt and Negri suggest, “There are no time clocks to punch on the terrain of biopolitical production”³⁰ and labour is always required of Okwe, always “immanent.”³¹ In less than three minutes of screen time he seamlessly shifts from taxi driver, to diagnosing his boss’ Chlamydia, then to work the nightshift as desk clerk at the Baltic.³² The viewer seldom sees him sleep, except while waiting in traffic. To reinforce his role as perpetual labourer, he consumes the stimulant Khat³³ throughout the film. Such behavior fits what Appadurai suggests about marginalized work-

ers in systems of global capital:

as international capital shifts its needs, as production and technology generate different needs, as nation-states shift their policies on refugee populations, these moving groups can never afford to let their imaginations rest too long, even if they wish to.³⁴

What time that exists for imagination, for stability, is slight if a person works illegally in a nation without state-recognized identity for protection. It is precisely this resting of the mind that the film's narrative and its pre-occupation with the body at work resist. Innocuous scenes of Okwe preparing dinner for Senay, and Senay giving Okwe his own key to her apartment, reveal a letting down "of the guard," and their "normalcy," ironically, becomes noticeable. The boorish duo from Britain's "Immigration Enforcement Directive" springs into hegemonic action because "neighbours talk" and have seen Okwe come and go. The destabilization of their short-lived cohabitation and domesticity becomes official. Senay is marked by the state as one to watch, while Okwe escapes out of her building shoeless, but with plenty of guilt. One reviewer locates their unrequited relationship historically and temporally as a "touching but impossible love affair between two members of London's recent-immigrant underclass."³⁵ Such "impossibility" is a byproduct of the oppressive biopolitical conditions under which they live.

Okwe's skills as a doctor allow for their exploitation. His discovery of a human heart blocking the toilet in Room 510 of the hotel coupled with Señor Juan's ignorant comment: "What the fuck do you know about hearts, Okwe?" opens a narrative door to his knowledge and links Okwe – no matter how he resists – to the organ-trafficking narrative at the *heart* of the film. Señor Juan, self-described as an "evil man . . . trying to save . . . li[ves]" receives cash per-kidney and the seller receives an expertly-forged passport. Señor Juan explains the organ transplant market system to Okwe as a means of persuading him to participate:

I sell the kidney for ten grand, so I'm happy. The person who needs the kidney gets cured, so he's happy. The person who sold his kidney gets to stay in this beautiful country, so he's happy. My whole business is based on happiness.

Señor Juan's disruptive ontology presents the continual diminishment and saleability of the human body within a globalized economy as a happy time. This passage offers a new application of biopower, as a means of "curing" the ill while stabilizing the kidney seller's identity. What Señor Juan's kidneys-for-passports business model forgets, however, is its "favouring [of an] unequal exchange of genetic material [which] often results in the disablement" of those giving up their organs.³⁶

Okwe's frustration after taking significant risks to procure medical supplies to save a Somali man suffering from infection after a kidney removal operation at the hotel who "swapped his insides for a passport" builds after realizing Senay's plans to sell her kidney as a means to escape sexual exploitation, and London. Although she does "bit[e] back," against a repellent sweatshop owner who forces her to perform oral sex on him under threat of "jail," she eventually capitulates to Señor Juan's kidney-for-a-passport scheme. Part of "the deal," he informs her, includes her rape. Okwe expresses the possible risks of her selling a kidney in a conflation of bodily shelf-life and economic class. He states "Because you are poor you will be gutted like an animal [and t]hey will take what they want and leave the rest to rot." He decides such dangers risks at the hands of organ traffickers are too risky and confronts Señor Juan in the hotel's parking garage demanding to "operate on her [him]self" to avoid her being "butcher[ed]." Although Okwe is consistent in his role as rescuer, he does appear to legitimize the illegal operation by demanding a passport in exchange for his skills.

Offering a glimpse of the "landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world"³⁷ Frears subverts the traditional "hotel" domain of tourists and focuses upon the perspectives of "illegal" workers to dispel English stereotypes and fears of asylum-seekers in Britain. In other words, it's easy to fear the unknown, and privileging the experiences of labourers – whether a prostitute or a doorman – along with the

perils and sympathies of maintaining work without government recognized identity, humanizes “life behind the shadows” for many viewers. The film’s predominant work narrative also dissuades xenophobic, fear-based nationalist narratives against lazy or threatening immigrants. Such pathos, however, does little to alter the defensive position of the often visible “other.” Even as larger social perceptions become more inclusive, political and economic constraints threaten the status of many bodies. Frears’s apparently good intentions, however, gain persuasion from a hyperbolized, threatening body image. He writes,

In multicultural London it’s OK, but the government sort of whips up the fears in the rest of England, as though these people have two heads or something. There’s no attempt made to explain the problem, to explain that these people are serious. It’s just assumed that they’re crooks or terrorists or somehow feckless; whereas, it seems to me that casting the world to get a decent living for your family is not something you do casually.³⁸

While Frears’s designation of social perceptions and treatment of “these people” as “OK” in London reveals a problematic perspective of privilege and scale, his motivation challenges wider cultural phobias towards difference. As Sarah Gibson notes, *Dirty Pretty Things* is “one of the first ‘British’ films to represent the . . . asylum seeker and . . . critique of the so-called ‘problem of asylum’ being circulated in the public sphere.”³⁹ The film does recognize the “problem” of asylum but avoids the question of fixing it. While Okwe and Senay also embody a serious desire to improve their conditions under capital, they live within and in spite of a different set of national constraints. All the while, as Emily Davis aptly points out, they have to “negotiate th[e] impulse to reduce [their] bodies to their constitutive pieces.”⁴⁰ How can such impulses under capital be part of our decision-making?⁴¹

In an emotive airport scene (and with her passport in hand) Senay and Okwe embrace. Her declaration “Always we must hide” suggests their cycle of perpetual labour, exploitation and shifting identities will continue – but presumably under less invasive biopolitical conditions. Consistent with the possible shifts in “modes of application”⁴² for the body within a biopolitical system of constraints limiting a

person's access to "legal" travel and employment, *Dirty Pretty Things* posits a model of exchange true to the commodification-of-everything rule of neoliberal economic globalization. As mentioned, the film – and by extension the system of global capital exploiting those without legal identification to travel freely – critiques ideas of destabilizing the body in order to stabilize legal identity. In other words, the narrative dehumanizes the human subject as a container for labour exploitation, sexual abuse, rape and kidney removal – but returns to a semblance of normalcy – as transition – by its end. Such a relatively clean-handed approach also leaves the larger issues of illegal organ harvesting and exploitation in play for some while stabilizing familial hopes and futures for others. Both characters evade a seemingly choice-less situation to remove or sell a kidney for a sick little girl in Saudi Arabia whose family brings her to London "hoping for a miracle" – if we are to believe Señor Juan's story. Although he becomes a dupe of his own organization, and an exploiter exploited, the kidney Okwe takes from him is merely a substitute for another and another.

REASSESSING HUMAN VALUE: WHERE IS MY CHOICE?

*she sits devoted, the paring knife close
to a harvest of veins*⁴³

Citing a real-world example of the paradox of stabilizing self and economy through destabilizing the body – in terms of placing a humanist value upon organs versus an economic one – anthropologist Nancy Scheper-Hughes recounts the story of a woman in India⁴⁴ who suggests "If only there were three kidneys, with two to spare, then things might be better."⁴⁵ The source of one person's hope is certainly a source of unease for another, but more importantly, her brief narrative suggests no end to organ harvesting as long as a market for it exists, regardless of one's values.

Such actualities challenge and destabilize "values" of life and death while creating new ones. Futuristic (often dystopic) narratives involving the cloning of people for organs (such as Kazuo Ishiguro's novel *Never Let Me Go*, Michael Bay's *The Island* [both 2005]) and the hybrid-cloning of organs for people (see Margaret Atwood's "pigoons" in *Oryx and Crake* [2003]) extend the biological power of the

body beyond the human. Davidson suggests these texts are “imagin[ed] through . . . a body that no longer coincides with a humanist subject” (221). Anosh Irani’s novel, *The Cripple and His Talismans* (2004), for example, takes the arms trade literally and makes theft and brokerage in limbs seem honourable. As bodily applications under capital change they seem to coincide with the imbalance of capital’s distribution worldwide. If a human’s “best interest” is tied to his or her biopolitical conditions, then better for some brings worse for many more.

Returning to the immediate of those apparently eager organ sellers in Spain – and I am certain if he could, the nefarious lecher Señor Juan would get his cut of the trade – seeking money for body parts seems inextricable from the enigmatic and often faceless act, or the unknown of “what really goes on” – a sort of fictionalization of fact. The taglines for *Dirty Pretty Things* (“Some things are too dangerous to keep secret” and “Every dream has its price”⁴⁶) enhance its thriller-esque capacity to market mystery and “social panic”⁴⁷ around ideas of organ trafficking. Its existence as a film also reinforces a “mediascape”⁴⁸ of capital control by those who have it representing those who do not.

Fig. 1.

IMAGE SOURCE:

http://img.dailymail.co.uk/i/pix/2007/12_01/kidneyDM0512_800x483.jpg



If some stories of illicit organ removal arrive from the stuff of rumour and urban legend⁴⁹ there are countless people wearing scars⁵⁰ (Fig. #1) to prove otherwise. My point is that narratives of marginalized communities (and bodies) – of people compelled to sell a kidney to “live a better life” or to get out of debt, who become disabled, further impoverished or die

because of the act – expose the normative, capital-laden mythology of continual *improvement* (in all its monetary senses) as problematic and disturbing while redefining ideas of the human. Organ transplant narratives generate agency of social awareness and connect theories of disability, identity, geography and economy. As transplants become more efficient – and more widespread – will donor risks decrease with less money available for the bodily product?

Given that Stephen Frears's *Dirty Pretty Things* connects the body to various spaces of disturbingly emergent flows of capital – from makeshift hospital rooms to Styrofoam coolers – it certainly makes sense to continue investigating stories that expose exploitive policies and behaviours when human lives are at stake. Such exposure might lessen the disconnectedness between – and double standard of – saving a life at the cost of another while privileging capital over life, regardless of one's passport.

CHRIS EWART is completing a PhD in English at SFU and working on a second novel. His first novel, *Miss Lamp* (Coach House, 2006), was shortlisted for a 2007 ReLit Award. He has taught at U of C, ACAD and written for the *Calgary Herald*. His creative and critical work often interrogates disability and normalcy in narrative and popular culture.

WORKS CITED

- Amago, Samuel. "Why Spaniards Make Good Bad Guys: Sergi López and the Persistence of the Black Legend in Contemporary European Cinema." *Film Criticism*. 30.1 (2005): 41-63. *WilsonWeb*. <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/hww/results/external_link_maincontentframe.jhtml?_DARGS=/hww/results/results_common.jhtml.30>.
- Appadurai, Arjun. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. 27-47.
- Atwood, Margaret. *Oryx and Crake: A Novel*. New York: Nan A. Talese, 2003.
- Ballard, Dustin. "What's the right price for a kidney?" *Marin Independent Journal*. 29 Mar. 2009. 22 Apr. 2009. <http://www.marini.com/lifestyles/ci_12021852l>.
- Brand, Dionne. *Inventory*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2006.
- Cohen, Eric. "Conservative Bioethics & the Search for Wisdom." *Hastings Center Report*. 36.1 (2006): 44-56 JSTOR. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3528597>>.
- Davidson, Michael. "Introduction." *Concerto for the Left Hand: Disability and the Defamiliar Body*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008. 1-34.
- . "Organs without Bodies: Transplant Narratives in the Global Market." *Concerto for the Left Hand: Disability and the Defamiliar Body*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008. 197-221.

Davis, Emily S. "The Intimacies of Globalization: Bodies and Borders On-Screen." *Camera Obscura*. 21.62 (2006): 33-73. Duke University Press. <[http://cameraobscura.dukejournals.org/cgi/pdf_extract/21/2_62/32???>](http://cameraobscura.dukejournals.org/cgi/pdf_extract/21/2_62/32???).

Derbyshire, David. "Inside the transplant tourist trade: The desperate men of One Kidney Island." *Mail Online*. 3 Dec 2007. 19 Apr.2009. <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-499486/Inside-transplant-tourist-trade-The-desperate-men-One-Kidney-Island.html>>.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum, 2008.

Dirlik, Arif. "Thinking Globalization Historically." *Global Modernity: Modernity in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Boulder: Paradigm P, 2007. 10-61.

Dirty Pretty Things. Dir. Stephen Frears. Perf. Ejiofor, Chiwetel, Audrey Tautou, Sergi Lopez. Burbank, CA: Buena Vista, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. "Right of Death and Power Over Life." *The History of Sexuality. Vol. I*. New York: Vintage Books, 1990. 133-159.

Gibson, Sarah. "The Hotel Business is About Strangers: Border Politics and Hospitable Spaces in Stephen Frears's Dirty Pretty Things." *Third Text*. 20.6 (2006): 693-701. *Informaworld*. <http://pdfserve.informaworld.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca818746_77_088_5140_767860883.pdf>.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. "The Multitude Against Empire." *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000. 393-413.

Harvey, David. "Freedom's Just Another Word..." *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. 5-38.

Irani, Anosh. *The Cripple and His Talismans*. Vancouver: Raincoast, 2004.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*. New York: Knopf, 2005.

Le Guin, Ursula K. "The Ones Who Walk Away from Omelas." Mankato, Minn: Creative Education, 1993.

Lucia, Cynthia. "The Complexities of Cultural Change: An Interview with Stephen Frears." *CINEASTE*. 28.4(2003): 8-15. *Wilson Web*. <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/hww/results/external_link_maincontentframe.jhtml?_DARGS=/hww/results/results_common.jhtml.30>.

Markoti, Nicole. "Introduction." *Special Issue on Film and Disability: Canadian Journal of Film Studies*. 17.1 (2008): 2-10. Kingston: Film Studies Association of Canada.

Marx, Karl. "Chapter 14." *Capital*. *Marxists Internet Archive*. 20 Apr. 2009 <<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch14.htm>>.

Mitchell, David T., and Sharon L. Snyder. *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2000.

"Organ trafficking and transplantation pose new challenges." *World Health Organization*. 1 Sept. 2004. 21 Apr. 2009. <<http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/82/9/feature0904/en/index.html>>.

- Schepper-Hughes, Nancy, and Veronique Campion-Vincent. "On Organ Theft Narratives." *Current Anthropology*. 42.4 (2001): 555-58. *UChicago*. <<http://www.journals.uchicago.edu.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/doi/pdf/10.1086/322543>>.
- Sinclair, Iain. "Heartsnatch Hotel." *Sight & Sound*. 12.12 (2002): 32-4 *Wilson Web*. <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/hww/results/external_link_maincontentframe.jhtml?_DARGS=/hww/results/results_common.jhtml.30>.
- "Spaniards seeking cash for organs amid crisis: consumer group" *AFP*. 21 Apr. 2009. <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hhqNXZxhVifBh2Jj-ZFT_kMc1Hvw>.
- "Taglines for *Dirty Pretty Things*." *IMDB*. 20 Apr. 2009 <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0301199/taglines>>.
- The Island*. Dir. Michael Bay: Dream Works, 2005.
- "You've Got to be Kidneying." *Snopes.com*. 21 Apr 2009 <<http://www.snopes.com/horrors/robbery/kidney.asp>>.

END NOTES

- 1 “Spaniards seeking cash for organs amid crisis: consumer group” (*AFP*. 21 Apr. 2009. <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hhqNXZxhVifBh2Jj-ZFT_kMc1Hvw>).
- 2 Ibid
- 3 Significant source-nations include India, China, The Philippines, Pakistan, Egypt, Albania and Brazil. A 2004 World Health Organization report helps provide scale for the situation, stating, “Earlier this year, police broke up an international ring which arranged for Israelis to receive kidneys from poor Brazilians at a clinic in the South African port city of Durban. But such high-profile successes merely scratch at the surface.” “Organ trafficking and transplantation pose new challenges.” (*World Health Organization*. 1 Sept. 2004. <<http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/82/9/feature0904/en/index.html>>).
- 4 Foucault, Michel. “Right of Death and Power Over Life.” *The History of Sexuality. Vol.1.* (141). (New York: Vintage Books,1990). 133-159.
- 5 Davidson’s title inverts Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of bodies without organs. He suggests “with the body freed of its productive organic functions [,] we might now speak of ‘organs without bodies’, loosed from their role in constituting ‘Life’ and turned into commodities circulating within capital flows” (202). Thus, the economic potential of organs supersedes their biological function. (Davidson, Michael. “Organs without Bodies: Transplant Narratives in the Global Market.” *Concerto for the Left Hand: Disability and the Defamiliar Body*. (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2008). 197-221
- 6 Ibid, 199
- 7 Nicole Markoti defines the problem body as “denot[ing] a complicated approach to bodies deemed . . . problematic due to multiple forms of difference, including racialization, gender, age, queerness, and disability” (9). Markoti, Nicole. “Introduction.” *Special Issue on Film and Disability: Canadian Journal of Film Studies*. 17.1 (2008): 2-10. (Kingston: Film Studies Association of Canada.)

- 8 Davidson, 198
- 9 Arif Dirlik remarks that the “euphoria over globalization serves to disguise very real social and economic inequalities . . . and represents . . . the fulfilment of Eurocentric modernization” (21). Dirlik, Arif. “Thinking Globalization Historically.” *Global Modernity: Modernity in the Age of Global Capitalism*. (Boulder: Paradigm P, 2007). 10-61
- 10 Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. “The Multitude Against Empire.” *Empire*. (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000). 403
- 11 Ursula K. LeGuin’s dystopic allegory “The Ones Who Walk Away From Omelas” literally cages a suffering problem-bodied-other so that a “beautiful” world may exist for the rest of the townspeople.
- 12 *Dirty Pretty Things*. Dir. Stephen Frears. (Burbank, CA: Buena Vista, 2003).
- 13 Foucault, 139-140.
- 14 Ibid (141)
- 15 Quoted in Cohen, Eric. “Conservative Bioethics & the Search for Wisdom.” *Hastings Center Report*. 36.1 (2006): 44-56. (44).
- 16 The idea of a choice in a system where no choice exists is akin to discussions about “choices” within late-capitalism, as reflected by David Harvey’s comment, “Neoliberalization has meant . . . the financialization of everything” (33), kidneys included. If everything is a commodity, then everything is extractable and saleable – can buying and trading stocks in bodily organs be far off? Harvey, David. “Freedom’s Just Another Word...” *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. (Oxford: Oxford U P, 2007). 5-38.
- 17 Marx, Karl. “Chapter 14.” *Capital*. *Marxists Internet Archive*. 20 Apr. 2009
<[http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1 /ch14.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch14.htm)>.
- 18 Davidson, 201
- 19 Davidson also notes that males in rural Tamil Nadu [India], experienc[e kidney removal] as a form of castration, a significant loss of potency linked to conditions of pervasive debt. Women experience the operation as a component of family planning [and] are often told that in order to sell a kidney they must first undergo [an]

operation . . . to prevent future child birth. (205) Here, ideas of biopower as product replacing biological reproduction become very real.

20 Ibid, 203

21 For useful discussions of disability in narrative, consult David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder's *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse* (2000).

22 Davidson, 201

23 Davidson, "Introduction." (10)

24 Foucault, 141

25 His series of "scapes" also includes mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes, and ideoscapes (33). Appadurai, Arjun. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996). 27-47.

26 Ibid, 33

27 Hardt and Negri, 396.

28 For an interesting discussion of Frears's clichéd characterization of Señor Juan, and the trope of the evil Spanish male, consult Samuel Amago's "Why Spaniards Make Good Bad Guys: Sergi López and the Persistence of the Black Legend in Contemporary European Cinema." *Film Criticism*. 30.1 (2005): 41-63.

29 Okwe grabs a gold crucifix adorning his friend's neck as he says this, suggesting alternate identity for the sake of income also comes before one's religious beliefs. Okwe's attention to the icon implies his friend should hide it from view in order to protect his fake identity in case a passenger suspects (stereotypical) disjuncture between name and religion.

30 Hardt and Negri, 403

31 Ibid, 396

32 Often used in the UK as a term connoting cold weather conditions – similar to Canadian use of "freezing" or "Arctic." The hotel's moniker reinforces an icy reception towards global immigrants (and visitors) to international London – especially given the hotel's role as a front for illegal organ removal.

- 33 Khat is often used in Africa and the Middle East and is legal in Britain, but not in Canada.
- 34 Appadurai, 34
- 35 Sinclair, Iain. "Heartsnatch Hotel." *Sight & Sound*. 12.12 (2002): 32-4. (32)
- 36 Davidson, 203
- 37 Appadurai, 33
- 38 Lucia, Cynthia. "The Complexities of Cultural Change: An Interview with Stephen Frears." *CINEASTE*. 28.4(2003): 8-15. (9)
- 39 Gibson, Sarah. "The Hotel Business is About Strangers: Border Politics and Hospitable Spaces in Stephen Frears's *Dirty Pretty Things*." *Third Text*. 20.6 (2006): 693-701. (693).
- 40 Davis, Emily S. "The Intimacies of Globalization: Bodies and Borders On-Screen." *Camera Obscura*. 21.62 (2006): 33-73. (52)
- 41 On the subject of altering human behaviour in favour of neoliberal, individual-replacing-society ontology Margaret Thatcher employs a frightening scenario: "Economics are the method . . . but the object is to change the soul" (qtd. in Harvey 23).
- 42 Foucault, 141
- 43 Brand, Dionne. *Inventory*. (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2006). 29
- 44 Dr. Dustin Ballard comments upon the imbalance of capital between rich/poor, purchaser/seller. He writes

Desperate kidney purchasers, according to the late Israeli transplant nephrologist [kidney specialist] Michael Friedlander, are 'exposed to unscrupulous treatment by uncontrolled free enterprise.' And for the paid donors, the treatment is not much better. According to news reports, kidneys sold in India come from laborers such as P. Guna, a 38-year-old rickshaw driver with a fourth-grade education. For Guna, \$1,250 is certainly a lot of money, but considering that his kidney was sold for more than \$25,000, it sure seems like he was taken advantage of. (Ballard, Dustin. "What's the right price for a kidney?" *Marin Independent Journal*. 29 Mar. 2009. <http://www.marinij.com/lifestyles/ci_12021852l>.) (1)

- 45 Schepper-Hughes, Nancy, and Veronique Campion-Vincent. "On Organ Theft Narratives." *Current Anthropology*. 42.4 (2001): 555-58. (557).
- 46 "Taglines for *Dirty Pretty Things*." IMDB. 20 Apr. 2009 <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0301199/taglines>>.
- 47 Davidson, 201
- 48 Appadurai, 33
- 49 For an interesting discussion between a folklorist questioning the *validity* of narratives and communities affected by organ trafficking which Schepper-Hughes studies, consult "On Organ Theft Narratives" *Current Anthropology* 42.4 (2001): 555-8. On the lighter side, (no pun intended) the website "Are You Kidneying Me?" attempts to situate some myths surrounding transplant stories.
- 50 Derbyshire, David. "Inside the transplant tourist trade: The desperate men of One Kidney Island." *Mail Online*. 3 Dec 2007. 19 Apr. 2009. <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-499486/Inside-transplant-tourist-trade-The-desperate-men-One-Kidney-Island.html>>.