Writing Assignment #2: Thoreau and Kaczynski

# Prompt and AI Draft (Max 100 word prompt, 300 word AI draft)

## Prompt

Respond to the following prompt in about 300 words, using details from the specific texts to inform and back up your claims. This is the prompt you must respond to: “Compare Nanabozho as Original Man to the biblical first man Adam in the Genesis account. What different attitudes toward nature arise from their stories? Choose a specific element from each myth and compare how they contribute to the overall message of each story.”

**73 words**

## AI Draft (https://chatgpt.com)

Nanabozho as Original Man and Adam from Genesis embody fundamentally different attitudes toward nature—one characterized by kinship and interconnectedness, and the other by dominion and separation. Nanabozho, as described in Native American creation myths such as "The Creation of Turtle Island," emerges as both creator and creation, intertwined with nature. His role is collaborative: he depends upon animals, like the muskrat who sacrifices herself to retrieve earth from the ocean's depths, and the turtle whose back becomes the land. This partnership emphasizes a reciprocal relationship between humans and nature, reinforcing the belief that humanity exists within, rather than apart from, the natural world. Nanabozho's dependence on animal assistance symbolizes humility, cooperation, and mutual responsibility.

In contrast, Adam in the biblical creation narrative of Genesis represents humanity set apart from nature. God explicitly grants Adam dominion over all creatures, commanding him to "fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28). Unlike Nanabozho's cooperation, Adam names and categorizes animals, establishing a hierarchy with himself at the pinnacle. When Adam disobeys God by eating from the Tree of Knowledge, nature becomes hostile, as symbolized by thorns, toil, and hardship imposed upon humanity (Genesis 3:17-19). This introduces a fundamental separation: humanity is portrayed as superior to and estranged from the natural world, destined to rule over it rather than to coexist harmoniously within it.

Thus, a single symbolic element from each myth—Nanabozho’s reliance on animal aid versus Adam’s naming of animals—illustrates sharply contrasting worldviews. Nanabozho’s myth encourages stewardship rooted in partnership and respect for all life forms, viewing nature as sacred kin. Conversely, Adam’s narrative conveys authority and control, emphasizing humanity’s distinct separation from and superiority over nature, an attitude foundational to Western anthropocentric thought.

**283 words**

# Reflection (Min 200 words)

The AI tool’s output offers a clear and concise comparison between Nanabozho and Adam, effectively outlining the central contrast in their respective attitudes toward nature. It accurately identifies Nanabozho’s intimate, cooperative relationship with the natural world versus Adam’s dominion-based approach as depicted in Genesis. The response does well to draw on specific symbolic elements (such as the animal aid in Nanabozho’s narrative and the naming of animals in Adam’s story) to underscore these differences.

However, the argument does show some limitations. Despite correctly highlighting the dichotomy, it occasionally leans toward a simplified binary and neglects to fully engage with the complexities of each tradition. For instance, the nuances of Native American cosmologies and the broader cultural context surrounding the Genesis account receive only brief treatment. The piece could benefit from a more in-depth examination of the symbolic implications of these elements in their respective narratives, and an exploration of any overlapping themes or exceptions within these myths.

To strengthen the argument, it would be necessary to delve deeper into primary texts and include scholarly interpretations that address the cultural subtleties and the evolution of these myths over time. A more balanced analysis would recognize the inherent diversity in mythic storytelling, ultimately enriching the overall discussion on humanity’s relationship with nature.

**210 words**

# Revision and Expansion of AI Draft (Min 600 words)

Nanabozho as Original Man and Adam from Genesis embody fundamentally different attitudes toward nature—one characterized by kinship and interconnectedness, and the other by dominion and separation. By analyzing their respective texts, it becomes clear that these contrasting portrayals are not merely narrative choices but reflections of divergent cultural values and environmental ethics.

In Nanabozho’s myth, we see a world where the boundaries between human and non-human are porous, inviting a dialogue of mutual care and respect. This narrative does not position humans as masters over nature; rather, it depicts them as part of an extensive network of life, where every creature contributes to the collective well-being of the ecosystem. Nanabozho, as described in Native American creation myths such as "The Creation of Turtle Island," emerges as both creator and creation, intertwined with nature. His role is collaborative: he depends upon animals, like the muskrat who sacrifices herself to retrieve earth from the ocean's depths, and the turtle whose back becomes the land. In emphasizing these elements, the myth underscores an inherent humility and dependency that counters the modern narrative of human exceptionalism. This reliance on animal cooperation reflects a worldview that venerates the intrinsic worth of all beings—a belief that every element of nature holds a sacred purpose. Here, the muskrat and the turtle are not mere accessories to human existence but active, valued participants in the creation process.

This partnership emphasizes a reciprocal relationship between humans and nature, reinforcing the belief that humanity exists within, rather than apart from, the natural world. Nanabozho's dependence on animal assistance symbolizes humility, cooperation, and mutual responsibility. However, the richness of Nanabozho’s myth can be further illuminated by considering its broader cultural context. Native American traditions often stress balance and the cyclical nature of existence, where every action has a resonant effect on the whole community, human and non-human alike. Such narratives advocate for a respectful coexistence that honors natural processes and celebrates diversity in life forms.

In contrast, Adam in the biblical creation narrative of Genesis represents humanity set apart from nature. God explicitly grants Adam dominion over all creatures, commanding him to "fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28). This directive is emblematic of a fundamentally different relationship. Adam’s role is one of authority and control, marked by an early delineation between human beings and the rest of creation. By bestowing upon Adam the power to name and classify animals, the biblical account establishes a hierarchical order where human reason and will override the natural instincts of other creatures. Unlike Nanabozho's cooperation, Adam names and categorizes animals, establishing a hierarchy with himself at the pinnacle. When Adam disobeys God by eating from the Tree of Knowledge, nature becomes hostile, as symbolized by thorns, toil, and hardship imposed upon humanity (Genesis 3:17-19). This act of naming, rather than simply acknowledging the inherent value of each creature, is a symbolic assertion of dominance. It sets the stage for a worldview in which nature is seen not as a community of equals but as a resource to be managed, controlled, and even exploited. The ensuing separation between humanity and nature in the biblical narrative lays the groundwork for later developments in Western thought, where the natural world is often subordinated to human progress and profit.

Thus, a single symbolic element from each myth—Nanabozho’s reliance on animal aid versus Adam’s naming of animals—illustrates sharply contrasting worldviews. Nanabozho’s myth encourages stewardship rooted in partnership and respect for all life forms, viewing nature as sacred kin. Conversely, Adam’s narrative conveys authority and control, emphasizing humanity’s distinct separation from and superiority over nature, an attitude foundational to Western anthropocentric thought. As well, it is essential to consider how these narratives influence contemporary attitudes. The Nanabozho myth, with its emphasis on collaboration and interdependence, continues to inspire environmental movements that advocate for a return to more sustainable and respectful relationships with the earth. In contrast, the legacy of Adam’s story often underpins ideologies that justify the exploitation of natural resources, reinforcing a mindset that places human desires above ecological balance.

In summary, by comparing the specific elements—the cooperative animal assistance in Nanabozho’s myth and the hierarchical naming in Adam’s story—we see two divergent messages about nature. One calls for a harmonious existence within a community of life, while the other champions human supremacy and control over the natural world. This analysis not only highlights the distinct worldviews embedded in these ancient narratives but also invites modern readers to reflect on the enduring impact of these myths on our present-day environmental ethics.

**784 words**