

## Chris McCandless: Cliché or Pilgrim?

Read “To Build a Fire” by Jack London, the letter from Nick Jans (ITW p.71-72, Chapter 8), and Krakauer’s conclusion for Chapter 8 (last two paragraphs on p. 85). Then answer the following questions on your own sheet of paper.

1. In a well-written **paragraph (minimum 8 sentences)** that uses evidence from *Into the Wild* and “To Build a Fire”, defend/qualify/challenge Jans’ statement about Chris on p. 72:

*“(Jack London got it right in “To Build a Fire.” McCandless is, finally, just a pale 20<sup>th</sup>-century burlesque of London’s protagonist, who freezes because he ignores advice and commits big-time hubris)....”*

2. Why does Krakauer include Jans’ letter in Chapter 8? How effective is the strategy? Does it achieve whatever purpose Krakauer had in including the letter? Why or why not?

**(minimum = one 8 sentence paragraph)**

3. How does the tone in Jans’ letter differ, if at all, from Krakauer’s tone in Chapter 8’s conclusion? In your analysis, consider the following: what was each author’s purpose, what diction did each use when describing Chris, does connotation play a role in the author’s word choice, what sort of evidence does each use (if any), and what types of appeals are each of them depending on (ethos/pathos/logos)?

**(minimum = two 8 sentence paragraphs)**