

Let 'Em Play God

Suspense Evaluation

Having read “Let ‘Em Play God” by Hitchcock, go back and look at the three stories that we’ve read and studied so far (“The Landlady” by Dahl, “The Tell-Tale Heart” by Poe, and “The Monkey’s Paw” by Jacobs) and then evaluate the extent to which you think each story follows Hitchcock’s philosophies of building suspense (you can say that it totally follows, mostly follows, somewhat follows, or does not follow, for example). Your evaluation is based on two parts: part one is the main idea/philosophy that Hitchcock talked about to build suspense. Part two is the second idea that Hitchcock explained in his essay about building suspense. For each part, *be specific* in your explanation of how/why the story does or does not follow that idea. You do not need quotes from the short stories, but you **must** be specific in your paraphrase and summaries of the stories. For clarity, you only need to answer questions that have a bullet point—the other parts are simply telling you which part of the philosophy you must discuss.

“The Landlady” by Roald Dahl

- Evaluation of how much it follows Hitchcock’s philosophy (for example: totally, somewhat, not at all, etc.):

Hitchcock’s primary philosophy: Let the audience play God

- Reasoning and specific evidence of how/why this story follows/does not follow:

Hitchcock’s secondary philosophy: believable/realistic characters in plausible situations, avoid clichés, use contrast

- Reasoning and specific evidence of how/why this story follows/does not follow:

“The Tell-Tale Heart” by Edgar Allan Poe

- Evaluation of how much it follows Hitchcock’s philosophy (for example: totally, somewhat, not at all, etc.):

Hitchcock’s primary philosophy: Let the audience play God

- Reasoning and specific evidence of how/why this story follows/does not follow:

Hitchcock’s secondary philosophy: believable/realistic characters in plausible situations, avoid clichés, use contrast

- Reasoning and specific evidence of how/why this story follows/does not follow:

“The Monkey’s Paw” by W.W. Jacobs

- Evaluation of how much it follows Hitchcock’s philosophy (for example: totally, somewhat, not at all, etc.):

Hitchcock’s primary philosophy: Let the audience play God

- Reasoning and specific evidence of how/why this story follows/does not follow:

Hitchcock’s secondary philosophy: believable/realistic characters in plausible situations, avoid clichés, use contrast

- Reasoning and specific evidence of how/why this story follows/does not follow: