

This semester you will be writing some short weekly responses to your assigned readings. In this class we’re calling this kind of writing a “TCQ,” which stands for “Text, Connect, Question.”

→ Bring the TCQ as a hard copy to discussion. Late or emailed papers may not be accepted.

TCQs should follow this format (see the model that follows for an illustration):

1. 11 or 12pt regular (serif) font, standard formatting of 1” margins, 1.5-spaced text, first line of each paragraph indented (no extra space between paragraphs).
2. **At top left:** header with your name, “CH 212,” discussion leader name, date, and TCQ #
3. Write in essay form, not outline form. No subheaders or title are necessary.
4. Avoid addressing your reader directly: don’t use “you” (although “I” is perfectly acceptable).
5. No “Works Cited” section is necessary at the end.

***TEXT.** The TCQ begins with textual detail – a reference to a specific bit of text from the reading that you found interesting or puzzling in some way. This can be a brief quotation, or a paraphrase of a specific sentence or series of sentences. Put the page number in parentheses after the reference (1).

→ Print out the relevant page(s) from the reading. Staple the printout to your TCQ.

***CONNECT.** Write 250-350 words in which you **connect** this piece of text with the rest of that reading, to ideas in the other things we’re reading, if relevant, and ideas brought up in the lecture. Here are some (not all) possible ways you could do that:

1. Discuss why this text drew your attention. Why is it important? What idea does it contain?
2. What other assigned readings does it connect with? Is there someplace in another assigned reading it echoes, or disagrees with? (Remember to also document these by page number).
3. How does the big idea behind this little detail affect our past, present, and future?

***QUESTION.** Finally, what **question** (or set of questions) could you ask, or identify the writer as asking, that **relates to the entire reading**? Here are some (not all) possible ways you could ask a good question:

1. What big question does the writer seem to be asking in the rest of the text?
2. What more do you want to know about the idea behind this text?
3. If you were interviewing the writer, what challenging question could you base on this point?

Remember to make your question(s) connect back to the text. Don’t ask a vague or general question about something unconnected to the reading or the ideas in the course.

GRADING RUBRIC

Content (choice of text, how well you connect it with larger ideas)	... 2 points
Organization (how clearly you develop your discussion)	... 2 points
Style & Mechanics (how clearly and engagingly you write)	... 1 point

Priscilla Rowbottom
CH 202 – Daniel Deronda
October 17, 2015
TCQ #5

Frankenstein's monster tells his creator that it has "declared everlasting war against the species" (97). The word "war" reminds me of the way Hobbes and Locke define what they call the "state of nature," meaning what life is like outside of organized society. Hobbes argues that the natural state of humans is "war of every man ... against every man" (37), which is only held in check by the power of a strong leader. Frankenstein's monster is definitely in a state of nature. It's not just that people run screaming whenever they see it, but even Victor has abandoned his creature, which means the monster is totally rejected, and so there is no power to control him.

Locke writes about people having natural rights to life and property, and if those rights are denied by anyone, that person is put into a state of war with whoever denies his rights (116). In a state of war, anything goes, even murder. So if the monster has been denied its rights, according to both Hobbes and Locke (who don't usually agree) it is justified in seeking revenge against humans. "It is lawful for a man to kill a thief," writes Locke (116) and so according to Locke it would be "lawful" to kill to protect your right not to be chased, persecuted, and "struck violently ... with a stick" (97) by people you're trying to be nice to.

This raises a good question: is Frankenstein's monster human? Is it okay to kill William, Clerval, and Elizabeth in defense of its natural rights? I think Shelley wants us to think of the monster as human, because it thinks and talks and has emotions like humans do. But, if we create artificial consciousness in the future, will it too have rights? Do machines have natural rights that should be respected by society? If we don't grant them, will they declare war against us, like in the *Terminator* movies?

The wretch rejected by the Delacays

Frankenstein

97

rushed out of the cottage. Felix darted forward, and with supernatural force tore me from his father, to whose knees I clung: in a transport of fury, he dashed me to the ground and struck me violently with a stick. I could have torn him limb from limb, as the lion rends the antelope. But my heart sunk within me as with bitter sickness, and I refrained. I saw him on the point of repeating his blow, when, overcome by pain and anguish, I quitted the cottage, and in the general tumult escaped unperceived to my hovel."

The wretch
declares war

Chapter XVI

"CURSED, CURSED creator! Why did I live? Why, in that instant, did I not extinguish the spark of existence which you had so wantonly bestowed? I know not; despair had not yet taken possession of me; my feelings were those of rage and revenge. I could with pleasure have destroyed the cottage and its inhabitants, and have glutted myself with their shrieks and misery.

"When night came I quitted my retreat and wandered in the wood; and now, no longer restrained by the fear of discovery, I gave vent to my anguish in fearful howlings. I was like a wild beast that had broken the toils, destroying the objects that obstructed me, and ranging through the wood with a stag-like swiftness. Oh! what a miserable night I passed! the cold stars shone in mockery, and the bare trees waved their branches above me: now and then the sweet voice of a bird burst forth amidst the universal stillness. All, save I, were at rest or in enjoyment: I, like the arch-fiend, bore a hell within me; and, finding myself unsympathised with, wished to tear up the trees, spread havoc and destruction around me, and then to have sat down and enjoyed the ruin.

"But this was a luxury of sensation that could not endure; I became fatigued with excess of bodily exertion, and sank on the damp grass in the sick impotence of despair. There was none among the myriads of men that existed who would pity or assist me; and should I feel kindness towards my enemies? No: from that moment I declared ever-lasting war against the species, and, more than all, against him who had formed me, and sent me forth to this insupportable misery.

"The sun rose; I heard the voices of men, and knew that it was impossible to return to my retreat during that day. Accordingly I hid