In the middle section of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein,* Frankenstein finally comes face to face with his monster after it fled earlier in the novel. Through the monsters’ monologue, Frankenstein learns that the monster has developed into a seeming normal being, despite his countenance. Thus begins a debate between the two, trying to decide whether it is right or not for the doctor to create a bride for his first creation. Morality plays a huge factor as the creature argues for his last hope at acceptance and the doctor weighs the potential impact on the world at large. The creature should be able to have a companion, because humanity refuses to accept him, and for a social creature modeled after a human, it is necessary to have interaction.

The monster is very much like a human, he learned most of his understanding of the world through the influence of people; and in this way, he has the same basic needs as a human. The creature realizes his basic desire for a companion by seeing humans interacting with each other. Due to his physical appearance; however, the creature cannot have any hopes of joining any part of human society. The monster longs to be in their company, for the “lives of [his] protectors caused these impression to take root in [his] mind,” and has created in him the primal urge to be with others. (Shelley 116) This is why the monster comes to the doctor to ask for a bride: if the creature had not been so influenced by humans, and been shunned by them, he might not have had the desire for another like himself. The creature deserves a bride not because he wants one, but because he needs one; the society of humans has created the human need for companionship, and since no humans are willing, he should be able to live out his life with a companion.

The monster should not be given a bride because the monster is not human, and therefore cannot have human needs and passions for companionship, the only feelings it may have are those partially imprinted on him by the humans that he has been exposed to. The monster is not human, while he may be made of pieces of humans, even before the creature is brought to life, he is not regarded as human, even by the doctor as he “might infuse the spark of being into the thing that lay at my feet.” (60) This monster is not human, it is a “thing,” and to all the people who see in in the countryside, in Ingolstadt, and at De Lacey’s home, as they all are repulsed and afraid of the creature. While other people may not consider the monster human, does that mean that he cannot be human in his personality and behavior? That is debatable, for he had been there for many months learning the ways of the humans, and in this time learned how to read, write, and learned several aspects of human society. The comparison can be made to that of a parrot, the bird can learn to talk, and even to carry some mannerisms simply by observing them, but this does not give it the root desires or complex thoughts of a human. A human is able to have its complex thoughts and deep emotional desires because we have the higher intelligence and capacity for thought given to us by a more perfect creator than Doctor Frankenstein. The creature is imperfect, and not human, so it cannot have the same needs as a human. It is more like an intelligent animal, able to gain likenesses of humans; and for this reason, it should not be allowed to have a companion. Having a companion would only worsen the problem, because now two of these creatures would be trying to fit into society and face rejection by everyone.

While the arguments made against the monster seem valid, they are largely flawed on account of one fact that is not explicitly stated in the text. Since the monster is made of human parts, he must also have a human brain. Much like a child, the creature starts his life with little knowledge and understanding of the world, but be learns through observation and action. Since children are able to grow into morally responsible and conscience adults, then the creature should be able to mature in this way. Therefore, since he must develop like a human, the must have the same emotional needs as humans, and should have those needs satisfied with a companion who can care for him and whom he can care for. Additionally, the comparison of the creature to an animal is very false, because from the start of his life, the creature exhibits not characteristics that might classify him as an animal. When he is brought to life, his actions are like those of a baby in an adult’s body. As he matures, his actions become like those of a child, and then an adult in that his development in progressive. First developing cognitive skills, then gaining a moral compass, learning the value of life and reading and writing. His learned human personality comes from the fact that he has a human mind and develops with human needs.

Both sides discussed the humanity of the monster, and whether his desire for a bride was justified by his humanity. By defining the monster as a human, this has the potential to describe the impact that the monsters’ argument has on the doctor. This argument can describe how Frankenstein will view his creation’s argument. If Frankenstein is able to perceive his creation more as a human, and therefore and equal, he is more likely to connect with the monster, and wish to grant its’ request. This debate presents the issue of how the characters in the novel perceive what a monster is. By showing that a monstrous figure can not only be completely human on the inside, this might raise questions in the reader of both this paper and the novel on what a monster truly is. For, if the doctor did create another creature, what would this mean for the world, and in a greater sense, the mortality of man? By creating another creature, the doctor realizes the possibility that the two might procreate, and make whole race of the creatures. For the doctor this is an unbearable thought because he assumes the race would be horrid and violent by nature. By choosing to not create the creature, the doctor denies huge advancements to Biology and Technology and the happiness of his own creation, which has its own moral message rooted in the Bible.
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