

HST 201: History of United States ONLINE

F17 (Escobar 20886)

Home ► My courses ► HST 201 ONLINE F17 (Escobar 20886) ► Week 3 ► Week 3 Forum ►
Creatures of Empire



Week 3 Forum

Creatures of Empire

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Christopher Columbus Podcast

Christopher Columbus Podcast ▶

Display replies in nested form ▼

Move this discussion to ... ▼



Creatures of Empire

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, October 7, 2017, 9:46 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Creatures of Empire topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which question(s) you are addressing . Do NOT simply leave it RE: Creatures of Empire

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Differences in Ideology

by Vivian Hernandez - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 11:10 AM

DeJohn Anderson suggested the main problem with the European's domestic animals relating to the Indians is that Europeans believed their livestock was property that they had right to manipulate and exploit because of the Bible; whereas, the Natives believed that animals possessed their own spiritual power and their relationship was largely reciprocal. (Ward) This difference in ideology fueled the conflict when cows and pigs were roaming to Native territories and destroying crops, taking food from indigenous animals that they hunted, and fell into Native animal traps. Some Natives decided to kill the domestic animals when they fell into the traps and then the European's would drag them into court for destruction of property. The

domestic animals were creating a hardship for the Natives that they had to deal with everyday. The European's did not care about the Native's and continued to push them away. As King Phillip's war was beginning, one of his grievances against the European's was the livestock.

Dr Matthew Ward, review of *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America*, (review no. 471) <http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/471>

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Indians nonsense of the "property" term.

by Liliana Valladolid Salas - Saturday, October 14, 2017, 4:08 PM

I was confused when you said that,"Some Natives decided to kill the domestic animals when they fell into the traps". I had to go back to the interview minute 4 to exact to compare your analyzation.

My understanding was that Natives used traps for hunting and that if a domestic animal fell into their trap, they were tempted to treat that animal as if it was a wild animal. It wasn't like they wanted to kill those animals on purpose. But Indians ended killing the animal, they accused to be criminals. However, Indians had no sense of property and all they wanted was to avoid conflict with the behavior of English animals.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Creatures of Empire: A Matter of Religion?

by Allison Keeney - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 10:04 PM

The main problem concerning animals, suggested by DeJohn Anderson, was that the introduction of European animals disrupted the existing culture of the Indians. The Indians saw themselves as a part of the natural world, the same as the viewed animals, while Europeans saw animals as something they should have ownership over. The Europeans saw this as their 'biblically ordained right' to own these animals. When the Europeans arrived in America with their animals, these perceptions clashed. The Indians had never needed to show ownership of living animals before, just over dead ones that they hunted and killed. Now, if they caught one of the new European animals, which usually ran free over their land, even if they killed it, they did not own it. The Europeans still believed they owned the animal, even though the Indian had killed it. They believed that it was their 'biblically ordained right' to show ownership over animals, therefore believing they had the higher ground. Because of these differences in perception, this caused some controversy and strife between the European people and the Indian people.

I think that it is interesting to bring this historical issue and connect it to today's world. Even though most people would agree that owning animals is fairly common in today's society, they wouldn't go so far as to say that it is our 'biblically ordained right' to own animals. It is interesting that there are patterns throughout history that continuously repeat themselves. I have noticed that people tend to use their religions to justify their actions. I'm not saying that any certain religion is right or wrong, but using your religion as an excuse to engage in acts that are unethical is wrong. Is this pattern of using religion as an excuse constant throughout

history? Was the conflict between the Europeans and the Indians concerning their different views of animals just the beginning, or did the Europeans have this mindset because of the religious chaos they were fleeing from in Europe?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Animals as Property

by Andrew Smith - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 10:14 PM

The main problem concerning the relationship that Indians and Europeans had with animals is that they saw animals in different ways. For Europeans, their domesticated animals were property. The Indians believed there was a spiritual connection with the wild animals they hunted. They believed that the animals had spiritual protectors. To Europeans, the Indians beliefs went against Christianity. My views of animals are more closely related to those of the Europeans. I believe animals are property to an extent. The animals we've domesticated into food sources are necessary and so is ownership. That's just a part of life and feeding the ever growing population of this planet. I strongly believe in the most humane way of executing these animals though. I also believe that just because domesticated animals are our food source, they shouldn't be treated in that manner during their lives. Animals are living beings with feelings and emotions. There have been studies showing the detrimental effects that come from raising animals in close indoor quarters. I believe that yes ownership and domestication for a food source are necessary, but I believe the animals should be raised on a more natural free roam layout.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



What is property

by Peter Brasier - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 8:24 AM

The biggest thing that I found fascinating about this concept was the fight to view ownership and I believe that his is something that is important to this day. In the article there were these lines," Nowhere were these fundamental differences in attitudes to animals more apparent than in the ways in which English settlers turned animals into commodities for trade. It was possible to put a price on every animal from a cow to a swan, from a deer to a hog. As Anderson argues, 'classifying animals not just in terms of their utility but also their market value added a new dimension to the relationship of dominion. Putting a price on animals symbolized the conversion of creatures into commodities' (p. 68). This again was a concept entirely alien to Native Americans."

I felt that this has been a conflict that has been in America all its life the conflict of ownership, most colonies just started up right on the coast or a little inland and started living and trying to thrive. They didn't pay any head to the land that might have been "Owned" by the natives, but now that the colonists were on the land it was property. Then we move into the question of dominion and that poignant line," Putting a price on animals symbolized the conversion of creatures into commodities". I hate to say it but that describes the slave trade unfortunately perfectly. Most of the time people viewed slaves as property. This problem even spans into the gold rush and the Oregon trail of who owns what and what is the best land to live one. And it is viewable today in the stock market and corporate controlled land and money. Getting back to

the original idea, these animals that the colonist brought over sparked the war that ended the natives and began a nation everything from the plants and hogs to the dreaded cows and bees. My questions is why were the Indians so brutal with the cows, I thought they viewed everything with a spirt as the book stated, but cows were forced to starve and become quadriplegics why?

Sincerely,

Peter Brasier

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Problem between indians and europeans with new animals

by Ashley Davidson - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 10:43 AM

Indians and Europeans had a different view on animals. Indians had a more natural view in that they should run free, they were hunters and believed that animals possessed a spiritual power. As for the Europeans they believed in raising herds such as cattle. When the Europeans brought over their herds of animals it brought a lot of controversy with the Indians as well. A big problem with the Europeans herds is that they would get into the Indians crops which then would destroy part of their crops. The Indians felt that it was right to protect their field but if they did protect their field then they would be punished. Eventually Indians would raise herds of hogs but they let their hogs run free and would later butcher them and sell their meat. I can't say that that the Europeans and Indians were right or wrong I believe that both have great values in the way they look at animals. I personally don't believe that animals are spiritual however I am a firm believer in going out hunting for animals for meat to feed your family. However, I also believe in raising your own animals to be butchered its healthier meat and you know what's in it other than meat that you buy at a store.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Same Sides

by Vivian Hernandez - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 12:38 PM

Both the Native Americans and the Europeans used animals for their own benefit, but could not agree on why they were able too. Europeans believed it was biblical and Natives believed it was more spiritual. I think they were on the same side of this conversation, but could not see past other differences. The war would have happened regardless of this conflict, but I think this would not have been a big conflict if the Europeans took care of the animals. This would not have been one of the grievances the Natives had against the Europeans that started the war.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Problem between indians and europeans with new animals

by Peter Brasier - Friday, October 13, 2017, 10:16 AM

I have to but in on the discussion of indeians killing the animals that were the english colonist. I am not defending the english colonist for their actions were quite malicious even for their time period. Bring something a little modern to this discussion I had a friend that was a very poor driver in the luck department, of the akin of a lightning bolt struck his car while he was in highscool. But he would always say that it was better than what happened to his dad. At the time I lived in Idaho and in Idaho their are free range laws and areas they are marked by a little yellow cation sign that says cows. So my friends father was driving 50-55 miles on this back country road that was free range, he rounded a corner and slammed into old bessy obliterating the cow, their was nothing salvageable and neer totaling his car. What was found was the tack and marks of the farmer who promptly sued and won the case for the cow and was paid losses of 1500 plus street cleanup and car repairs. So looking at this situation in the past the Indians wanted to protect their crops but the English wanted to protect their cows (man cows have been causing a lot of problems through the years...) this conflict was destined to lead to casualties their were no ways to fix what was happening. I feel that the colonization of America was akin to a early marriage in the honey moon faze everything is fine but after the good sweet days are over the constant fights for what is yours and space take up until war/divorce or peace is found.

Sincerely,

Peter Brasier

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Problem between indians and europeans with new animals

by Ashley Davidson - Sunday, October 15, 2017, 8:23 PM

I don't disagree with you one bit. Honestly there is a lot of similarities to the here and now. Everyone wants to protect what belongs to them whatever it may be. As for the Europeans and he Indians they were just usong here ways to protect what was belonged to them, the Europeans protected there livestock and the Indians protected there crops. Could it have been done differently? Yes , sure it could have but first they didn't know any better and second if they would have done things different then it could have led to all sorts of changes in our history books.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Identify with both European and Indias.

by Liliana Valladolid Salas - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 11:12 PM

After Listening to the interview that professor Anderson gave to Backstory with the American History Guys. She explained that Christian Europeans saw domestic animals as their property. I also see domestic animal as property because I grew up raising cows and pigs. Mean while Indians had a different perspective of animals. Especially the deer, Indians saw the deer as their spiritual protector. Professor Virginia noted that Indians where having a hard time with livestock animals because they were invading their plantations and destroying their crops. I also sympathized with them because my family used to grow corn and that is hard work. I wouldn't stand an "Alien" animal destroying our crop.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Food vs. Friends

by Connor Baker - Sunday, October 15, 2017, 9:16 PM

Anderson suggests that the main issue was the europeans inability to control there livestock. But this issue was made worse by the cultural differences between the two groups. Natives didn't view animals as property nor did they feel animals to be inferior beings to humans, They thought of animals as "other than human persons". This clearly clashed with the European idea of animals being property and for the use of meat. The problem only worsened when Europeans were unwilling to control their livestock.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

◀ Christopher Columbus Podcast

Christopher Columbus Podcast ▶

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 201 ONLINE F17 (Escobar 20886)