

HST 201: History of United States F17

(Escobar Meta 20887 23004)

Home ► My courses ► HST 201 F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004) ► Week 3 ► Forum 1 ► Creatures of Empire



Search forums

Forum 1

Creatures of Empire

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Puritanism & IslamCreatures of Empire ▶

Display replies in nested form ▾

Move this discussion to ... ▾

Move

Pin



Creatures of Empire
by Joe Escobar - Friday, October 6, 2017, 11:09 AM

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](#)



Encounters with new animals
by Jack Swisher - Sunday, October 8, 2017, 3:22 PM

The Indians did not have the best luck with domestic animals that the Europeans brought across the Atlantic. The animals cause problems with the Indians in many forms ranging from destroying crops to becoming a reason for the King Phillip War.

In the podcast, DeJohn Anderson says there were many problems in the colonies caused from the domestic animals. She states at 3:06 in the podcast that the english colonists didn't have full control over their animal's behavior. The animals roamed free around native lands and disrupted many aspects of the Native American lifestyle. DeJohnson said that when the

indians first encountered the animals they were very confused because the animal was nowhere near a colonist. They wondered what the animal was and what it was doing by itself. After the natives figured out that these animals like pigs and cows belonged to the english, they learned that the colonists viewed their animals as property where as the indians did not.

After listening to the podcast and hearing DeJohnson talking about when the domestic animals roamed free and the animals would accidentally step in an indian's trap for furs and food. If the animal died, the indian who owned the trap would be responsible for the damage and would be obligated to go to court. Most of the time the natives would be found guilty. To me, this kind of relates to the civil right movement and even some more recent events in the United States. African Americans were always found guilty and getting in trouble for minor things. But when the colonist's animals destroyed the indian's crops there were no consequences.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Domestication and a lack of spirituality

by Alexis Romo - Sunday, October 8, 2017, 3:41 PM

DeJohn Anderson makes an interesting claim that animals were more alien to Indians than Europeans entering the New World. She states how Indians seeing a domestic animal for the first time would have to figure out what it was and what to do with it. Anderson goes on to say that the main problem concerning these new animals was the ideas about domestication that the English brought with them. The English saw livestock as property whereas the Indians saw them in a more spiritual and cultural way.

I can see how this huge difference created problems among these newly emerging cultures at the time. Indians saw animals as living beings who were sharing the earth with them. The English saw animals as property that was inferior to them. As I respect the spiritual ideas that the Indians have with animals, I do understand the act of domestication as well. As a person who doesn't eat meat, I don't agree with the ways in which today meat is overproduced for profit of a corporation. I see how the English view of domestication is important however I feel like as a society people have lost an important virtue that the Indians believed. There is a big disconnection between humans and animals in society today. I think it's important in having a moral system for meat production that is also beneficial for a population.

(http://media.lanecc.edu/users/escobarj/201/forums/1/8_domestic_animals_colonial_relations.r

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Beliefs with animals

by Jack Swisher - Tuesday, October 10, 2017, 9:04 PM

DeJohnson does state in her podcast that the big problem was the native Americans first encountering the European's domestic animals. Crazy enough, Native Americans had domestic animals themselves awhile back. According to the textbook on page 5 paragraph

two, "some natives raised guinea pigs, turkeys and ducks." This was because food was scarce from the depleted number of animal species. The lack of food led to a decline in human population. Some Natives used llamas to haul light loads in the mountains and used alpacas for their wool.

This being said, I think the biggest problem for the natives with the animals had to be religious and just how the English viewed their animals. Rather than a first encounter problem because the natives had some prior experiences with domestic animals. DeJohnson states around 2:30 that "indians believed that animals were different but not inferior." Europeans had more of a belief that animals should help and benefit them.

Natives also saw the animals as living beings that shared the earth. DeJohnson mentions that the natives saw the deer had spiritual powers and were protectors. This didn't go well with the beliefs of the Church of England. Today, I think my stance would be with the colonists to an extent. I believe that some animals are meant to be on this world to be hunted and consumed. While as others are used for helping people with work like horses or for the natives, llamas.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



What does DeJohn Anderson suggest the main problem was, concerning the new animals and their relation to the Indians, and Englishmen

by Amber Leonard - Sunday, October 8, 2017, 5:50 PM

Dejohn Anderson suggests that the main problem concerning the new animals and their relation to the Indians and Europeans was how they each viewed the animal.

The Indians saw it as part of the land and did not believe that they were greater than the animal and therefore did not believe in ownership of animals.

In the Creatures of the empire article it says,

" Native Americans viewed themselves as part of, rather than distinct from, the natural world... Native Americans' relationship with animals was largely reciprocal, reflecting the belief that many creatures possessed their own spiritual power or manitou.'(paragraph 3).

While the Native Americans believed the animals were equals to them, the Englishmen believed that they owned the animals and the animals were theirs to do with as they please and no one else had the right to do anything with them unless given permission.

In the same article paragraph 3 it says " English colonists ,in contrast, animals were property over which they had biblically obtained the right to assert dominion; they were an economic resource to be manipulated and exploited.

The English men believed that the animals existed to benefit them in different ways, while the Native Americans believed that the animals existed for the same reason that they themselves existed.

I look at animals the way the Native Americans did, I believe that they are creatures just like us and deserve to be treated well, and that they are a necessity for survival. I see no problem with farms, raising animals to be eaten as long as they are treated humanely and not shoved into tight cages all their lives.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: What does DeJohn Anderson suggest the main problem was, concerning the new animals and their relation to the Indians, and Englishmen**

by Peyton Hobie - Saturday, October 14, 2017, 8:04 PM

I Agree that animals do need to be treated humanly but when you look at the continuing growth of population it becomes difficult to give farming animals the "humane" standards they need to thrive when the demand for live stock meat is so high. It's a business that will only keep growing and there will always be demand for it. so it's difficult to have a lot these humane living conditions for livestock animals and keeping up with the demand for product. I want to re state I completely agree that animals should be treated fairly and deserve individual respect as creatures but sustaining the human population should be priority one.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Animal Taming: An unexpected annoying methods of Europeans for Indian Tribes**

by Tuan Tran - Sunday, October 8, 2017, 8:11 PM

The Indians have been hunting, fishing and do farming a long time ago before the English settlers landed in the New World. According to the "*American Indians and their environment*", it illustrates that "Indian men had the primary tasks of fishing and hunting. Each winter men from different tribes would join together for hunting expeditions. Deer meat, or venison, served as a supplement to the mostly agricultural diet. The Indians used other parts of the deer such as skin for clothing and bones for tools. The men also protected their village. The Powhatan Indians were primarily farmers planting fields that averaged one hundred acres in size. The women were responsible for working the fields and did so using various tools made from such materials as deer antlers. They grew corn, squash, pumpkins, beans, and sunflowers. They also gathered wild foods from the land around them such as nuts, berries, and roots. The women were responsible for making meals of these foods. Corn (maize) was the staple crop, and from it, women produced such foods as corn cakes and hominy" (paragraph 4,5). As an obvious result, they did not use to tame the wild animal into the domestical animal and it could not be the Indian cultures. Moreover, pigs and cattles have not existed in the New World's land so these animals were the strangest creatures which followed the command of the Europeans. The Europeans took their advantages to civilize their neighbor Indians by using animals taming as "*Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America*" mentions "Animals played such an important role in the colonists' lives that converting Indians into husbandmen, into livestock herders, was seen as an essential part of the English mission of civilising them. While other historians have noted the drive to convert Native Americans into European farmers, few have noted the particular significance of livestock here. By converting hunters into herdsman, Anderson argues, English settlers hoped that they could spread the qualities of the sedentary farmer amongst their Indian neighbors. However, Indians were reluctant to adopt English practices of livestock husbandry" (11). Once again, it's difficult for the settlers to convince the Indians to accept and follow the new "taming" guide to manage the empire animals due to Indian perspective: "Indian did not conceive of living animals as anyone's properties" (*Creature Of Empires audio*, 1:55- 1:59). The Indians were showing their aggressive manners toward these empire animals during war with Europeans settlers "s war

spread Indians specifically made clear their hatred for English animals, in particular, the despicable cow. Rather than killing the animals directly, Indian raiders would mutilate an animal by cutting off its leg or cutting out its tongue, and letting the animal die a slow and painful death, a death that their English owners would most likely witness" (*Creatures Of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America*- 13), these animals were also the primary reasons for the settlers to push the Indians out of their lands and took all their livestock.

What do you think about the animal taming method which Europeans tried to teach the Indians? Is it an effective tool for Indians' animal husbandry or the typical cause to take the lands from Indians by the Europeans?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: Animal Taming: An unexpected annoying methods of Europeans for Indian Tribes

by Alexxis Romo - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 7:33 PM

I think the taming method used by the Europeans was a beneficial part of society, however i think in trying to convert the Indians they were crossing a boundary. For the Europeans to come to a Native American homeland and tell them how to domesticate animals that they have never even seen before seems unusual to me. i also find it usual and I'm also a bit taken off by the fact that the Indians killed these animals in an almost torture-like way. Im taken off by this because it was mentioned that they saw animals as equal and even saw some animals in a spiritual sense. I wonder if they did this because the animals that the Europeans brought were not the kind of animals that they were used to.

In my opinion, its a culture shock for both the Indians and the Europeans and also unfair to try to push certain morals and views on a group of people. So, to answer your question, I lean more towards the idea that it was more of a cause to take the lands from the Indians.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: Animal Taming: An unexpected annoying methods of Europeans for Indian Tribes

by Kate Weiss - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 4:48 PM

The English views on animal husbandry are on opposite sides of the spectrum from the Indian's views, which created massive conflicts between both groups. On one side, the English saw European agricultural practices as central to this 'civilization', and "by converting Indian's into herdsman of cattle, they could quickly become settled and civilized" (Article paragraph 4). This would become very difficult for the English because Native Americans had a spiritual relationship with animals, and the English viewed animals as personal property and as an exploitable economic resource (Article paragraph 3). When the colonists couldn't contain their growing animals anymore, and

couldn't convert any Indians to their husbandry practices to help with the labor, they had to let their domesticated animals roam free in the woods (Paragraph 4), which were Indian hunting grounds. Over time, Indians became less tolerant of the colonists, who repeatedly brought them to court for murdering their free-roaming animals, and began "to kill any English animal they found in the woods" (Paragraph 13). It's important to remember the Indian's did view some animals as spiritual beings who possessed power, but not all animals, The creatures the English brought over were viewed as despicable, especially the cow. They forced the natives from their lands, often before the arrival of foreign colonists. I sincerely doubt any European animal possessed any spiritual manitou, and I'm sure the Indians cursed at the beasts that continuously ruined their crops. Johnson wrote it wasn't until the escalation of the Indian Wars when they turned from simply killing these animals to mutilating them and making them die a slow, painful death in the eyes of the English (Paragraph 14). I'm sure defiant actions like this reflected the Indian's indignation from being driven from their ancestral lands by the greedy colonists.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

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



Re: Animal Taming: An unexpected annoying methods of Europeans for Indian Tribes

by Kyle Shrope - Friday, October 13, 2017, 5:05 PM

Europeans taming method was useful to them and their culture, but not what the Indians understood or wanted. Indian culture didn't view animals the same way the Europeans did. They never knew what owning an animal was. Europeans also brought new animals that the Indians have never seen before. It was something completely new to them. But before the Europeans arrived the Indians were able to get by without domestication of animals. Instead they would hunt for their food. Domestication was a concept they fully didn't understand or need to understand.

As demand for meat increased around the colonies and in the west Indies, production also increased. Which meant the colonist needed more land for their animals. I do believe that this is a case of greed and the desire for europeans to gain more land for themselves. As talked about in class on thursday the concept of GREED, people looking for personal gain. With the increase of production the Europeans only had their self interest in mind, knowing they would need more land to keep up production. Also with their own self interest in mind Europeans wanted to convert Indians into herders to civilize them. They had no respect for Indian culture or care to know.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Animals and their effect on our nation

by Maclain O'Leary - Sunday, October 8, 2017, 10:11 PM

Professor Virginia DeJohn Anderson states that the main problem at first was not within the animals themselves but the views on the animals. Europeans believed that animals were their property while Indians believed that living animals were not anyones property. She brings up

the idea for Indians, they believed that while animals were not anywhere close to humans, they were not actually inferior to humans, and believed that many animals actually possessed spiritual powers. While the belief that animals had any sort of powers was sacrilegious the christian Europeans, which then also caused conflict. This plays into the "freedom of religion" concept that our nation is based on today. There are some religions out there that see animals as either protectors or spiritual guides or whatever it is, and they have every right to practice that religion in this country. Just because our country is predominately christian, does not mean we can fight with other religions in our country just because their views are different than most of our own. I agree that animals have a large role in our society today, whether that is through spiritual means, livestock means, or whatever else it is. Our views on animals, and how they should be treated has greatly impacted and helped shape our society today.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Animals and their effect on our nation

by Tuan Tran - Friday, October 13, 2017, 8:17 PM

The Indians and settlers had some opportunities to know more about each other after some events, they actually became allies. However, they did not want their animal friends to be extinct or destroyed by the other sides so they took actions to prevent the huge decrease in the number of animals. Animals are human friends, they are co-existing with us through decades but the practical beliefs turned them into " spiritual power" or " domestical product". God never said that we should keep the animals as our items, we do that by ourselves. I don't know if the Puritanism follows the God's words. Moreover, we cannot put the religion's belief into the animals issues between settlers and Indians. Both factors were competing for each other to reach to their wealthiest living accommodations.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Native Ideals, European Ideals, and Their Influence

by Carley Kramer - Monday, October 9, 2017, 9:03 AM

DeJohn Anderson suggests that the main issue with the Native Americans and domesticated European animals was how Naive American and European cultures viewed animals differently. While the Europeans saw animals as valuable property and an important part of their economy, the Native Americans didn't see animals as something you could own. This difference in ideals about animals went beyond the concepts of property and overlapped with the religious differences between Native Americans and Europeans. As Anderson says, Native Americans saw animals as "living beings sharing the Earth who were different from human beings, but not necessarily inferior to them," and that they believed animals could even have spiritual power or properties. In contrast to this, Europeans had no such ideas about equality with animals. In fact, the inferiority of Animals was an essential and explicit part of their Christian traditions and beliefs.

While I feel that more Americans identify with the European cultural view, there are some domestic animals such as cats, dogs, and other pets that we seem to think of in a way more similar to the Native American cultural view. America has been influenced by many cultures, and I feel that this is a topic where these influences can overlap. This interests me because

these viewpoints seem so contradictory. When I think of how I feel about animals in society, it feels somewhat hypocritical; one type of animal is seen with the European mindset, while another is seen with the Native mindset. We still feel we own our animals, but think of them in a way that seems much more sentimental than how they were thought of by Christian Europeans in America.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Native Ideals, European Ideals, and Their Influence

by Banyan Ryan - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 9:20 PM

I suppose the best place to start is with dogs, since the review article about Anderson's book makes a point to note that some Natives domesticated dogs before the English even arrived. In the 7th paragraph, he states "In part, this was simply an accident of geography; North America had lacked suitable animals for domestication. Native Americans had, at least partially, managed to domesticate dogs, but they roamed semi-wild around Indian villages, and to English eyes their similarity to wolves was proof of the Indians' inability to domesticate any animal".

But it still wouldn't explain why our current society sees dogs differently than how we see cows and pigs, even though both were being domesticated around the same time. Why do we scoff when we hear about countries that eat dogs while at the same time tend to automatically think of meat when we think cows and pigs? It's not like we never ate dogs or wolves, causing the thought to become odd over time. We know wolves were hunted by ancient humans, same with animals like deer. When did our perception of dogs change?

Searching online, I found a 2013 article on National Geographic by Virginia Hughes titled "People and Dogs: A Generic Love Story", trying to answer that very question. They say that it's possible that wolves actually approached us first, most likely to scavenge our food. It explains "If wolves had wanted to get human food, they would have needed to evolve both trusting behaviors and mechanisms for digesting starch". So perhaps our views today could come down to how we encountered canines differently than animals we simply grew accustomed to through hunting, creating a strong, longer lasting bond. And perhaps the same happened with the other ancestors of what we now consider "commonplace" household pets.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The Need for Space

by Andrew Erkert - Monday, October 9, 2017, 12:53 PM

I think the main problem Anderson expresses causing these conflicts arises from the need for space in societies. It is very clear that free ranging raising of animals takes up more space in general than spatial confinements such as fenced fields. Due to the rushed settlements of the colonies, people had built up and settled down enough to have confinements for all of their livestock, therefore the animals roamed the area. In the podcast, Anderson brings up a quote from a native saying that they would experience these problems "even if they moved 30 miles away." This expressed the inevitability of conflict with the colonists and the natives due to the

expansive nature of the settlers. They would continue to need more and more space due to the exponentially increasing population. In order to support that population, more livestock would be raised and more land would be taken, all at the expense of the natives.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



No space turns into negative life for indians

by Jack Swisher - Monday, October 9, 2017, 8:08 PM

There was definitely some conflicts dealing with land and lack of space in the colonies. On page 66, it explains that "Puritans expanded due to a need for more land to accommodate a steady stream of transatlantic migration." The animals roamed free due to the lack of supervision from the english colonists. DeJohnson explains that even if the indians moved thirty miles away, the cows would still roam free and destroy native fields. Unfortunately for the indians, the colonies were growing, which meant more domestic animals.

The Domestic animals caused a few more problems than just roaming freely. DeJohnson tells us in her podcast that the animals were quite a problem to the natives. The pigs would go along the coast and dig up shellfish which were Native subsistent. The animals caused a problem with the natives food by eating bark and grass which the deer and other animals that the indians hunted consumed. DeJohnson says that this lead to deaths of animals that the indians relied on to hunt. The biggest complication had to be the domestic animals destroying fields.

I agree that a problem in the colonies was the lack of land, and with the colony expanding, that problem would continue to grow especially with more livestock being raised. But I think the biggest problem besides DeJohnson stating that her opinon of the biggest problem being the natives trying to figure out just what these animals were when they first encountered them, is the fact that these animals were roaming free and really had a negative impact on natives lives.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Need for Space

by Tuan Tran - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 2:47 AM

As a number of settlers and domestical animals increases so does the land size. The settlers obviously need more lands to do farming, building houses for their families and exploiting the potential golds, diamonds, etc. They did not pay attention to their neighbor Indians so they kept remaining the dominative attitude toward the Indians which caused the aggressive manner of the Indian tribe. It leads to many consequences as the settler's massacre by the Indians and the revenge of the settlers. Indian people never considered domestical animal as their friends because they were European's monsters and worthy treasures- Europeans were willing to expand the land, push out the Indians, capture the potential natural foods for their domestical animals such as pigs, dogs, etc.. Moreover, they were greedy to take the Indian lands without permission.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Need for Space

by Maclain O'Leary - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 11:43 AM

I agree with your point. Which for me raises the question, had there been "more space" back then, would that have stopped a lot of the conflict going on? I do not believe so. As we have seen through the studies and videos in class, the Europeans did want to expand as much as they could. However, in many cases, it was the Indians who attacked first. Like the instance with the first settlers of Jamestown and the story of the Powhatans, the Europeans were actually relying on the Indians for survival, but instead, the Indians attacked them and picked them off one by one. I think "space" is a viable argument as to why there was so much conflict, however, I don't think it came down completely to the Indians "greed".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Isabel Aguilera-Muro - Monday, October 9, 2017, 4:01 PM

1. The problem between the Indians and the English settlers was not necessarily the English themselves, but instead the animals they brought along with them. The English viewed their animals as property, and the Indians had no understanding of the idea of a living and breathing animal to be thought of as property. Indians referred to these creatures as "other than humans persons" said DeJohn Anderson. Indians thought of animals as living beings sharing the earth who are different from us, but not inferior. Some animals were thought to have spiritual powers, or to be spiritual protectors. Although this was a strong belief practiced by the Indians, do to their Christian beliefs, English settlers thought that animals having spiritual powers was heretical (Anderson).
2. The spiritual/cultural belief I mostly identify with is the Indian belief of animals being living beings who we share the earth with, but they are not inferior to the human race. Although I agree with that belief, I do not believe animals can have spiritual powers as that would be something that would make them inferior to humans.
3. A constitutional issue that we face as a nation today is the discussion of abortion. Abortion is a sensitive issue that causes a lot of conflict between pro and anti abortion beliefs due to its involvement with religion. The book, Creatures of Empire, explains how English settlers had conflict with the Indians about animals having spiritual powers because of their strong Christian faith (Anderson). Now, anti abortion believers, are in conflict with pro abortion believers because of their differences in religious beliefs.
4. English settlers believed in the domestication of animals, while Indians had no understanding of animals as property. The book, Creatures of Empire, explains the conflict, and the fundamental reasons of why the English settlers brought new animals to the Chesapeake area. I agree with the domestication of animals to be used as livestock if it is done the Indian fashion. With some ways of the English settlers, Indians converted from hunters to herdsman.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Adam Pendell - Monday, October 9, 2017, 9:54 PM

“How did religious differences between these two peoples play a role” A huge difference between the native americans and the colonists, is that the native americans looked at most animals as having spiritual properties to them. Different animals have different meanings to them like the deer represents Healing, Gentleness, kindness & compassion. To the colonists they are just animals, a next meal to feed their family. Although the natives did have troubles with some on the new animals that the colonists brought over, for example according to Virginia DeJohn Anderson a professor at boulder university in colorado, pigs would go down to the shore at low tide and dig up clams that the natives thrived on leaving the natives struggling with this problem. Although the natives did not accept the animals I feel the animals have led to more pros than cons to this country and the colonists had the right to bring them here.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Tuan Tran - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 2:53 AM

The colonists have their unique religion: " Puritanism" and some are Catholics- they believe in one God and never trust in the animal spirits like Indian do. For the colonists, animals are their properties to be tamed and used to reproduce their daily foods. On the other hand, Indians has their strong belief in the existence of ancestor's spirits in animal forms who will guide the tribes to the wealthy and victorious life accommodation. Moreover, Indians never have a close contact or see the " Empire Animals" before the settlers arrived so they are afraid of those animals and aware of their food domination against nature American animal species. I wonder without the animals, the Indians will have more chances to stay in the lands and live peacefully with the settlers.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Different views of animals

by Joel Pedroza - Monday, October 9, 2017, 10:15 PM

Hearing John Anderson speak about European animals being brought over to the Americas with the settles was an interesting take. She mentions that the Indians first interaction with pigs or cows(which were brought over with the settlers) was in the wild. Indians had no idea what these animals were because they weren't near any colonists. Always expected that these animals were always next to colonists since they are the ones that brought them over to the Americas.

Another interesting take was that colonists viewed animals as property, while Indians viewed animals as part of the wild. I can see why that created conflict between them, an Indian could just see the animal as food and kill them, which would upset the English. As we can see, property was important to the English. Reading from history.ac.uk, Indians even started rebelling against the English by killing their livestock. I kept on thinking, throughout years, the number of English animals will increase as they reproduce, so what happens when an Indian accidentally killed one? According to DeJohn's book, Creatures of the Empire, commissioners

of Maine were ordered to kill any Indian that would kill their cattle. That is crazy to me, even if the settlers animals started to eat crops in Indian territory, Indians would not be able to kill them. This created even more tension between the settlers, which would (correct me if I am wrong) create a part of the start of King Philip's War.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Different views of animals

by Kate Weiss - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 12:45 PM

You are right by stating that the rising tensions between Indians and colonists regarding their free-range animals led to the start of King Philip's War, along with other constant grievances such as the shrinking Indian land for the settlers use and the fear of being weakened by proselytism (Textbook pg 81 paragraph 3). Conflicts arose when Indians tried taking matters into their own hands when these scavenging animals destroyed their fields and crops, and killed the trespassing beasts. The Indians would have to pay for their crimes in English court, of which Anderson wrote they "became less inclined to accept" (Article paragraph 5). The Englishman saw these animals as important trade commodities, and classified animals not only in terms of their utility, but also their market value (Article paragraph 8). Even though the Indians didn't accept the domestication practices of the Englishmen, they enraged them by successfully raising hogs, butchering them, and competed with colonial meat markets in Boston and Manhattan (Article paragraph 11), which continued to increase the economic pressures and tensions between both groups.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Different views of animals

by Joel Pedroza - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 2:54 PM

Adding to your point of animals destroying crops which ended in killing trespassing animals; DeJohn mentioned that colonists had their domesticated animals at least thirty miles away and even still, the animals found a way to eat the Indians crops. Did not know that Indians eventually started to practice some of the ways by competing in the meat markets of the colonies. From the video, Indians saw animals as spiritual beings; so seeing that they caved in to participate in the meat market is very interesting.

Also, Indians had to participate in English court if they were found killing their animals. I would think that the Indians were not treated fairly considering they were not English. From the website, historymatters.gmu.edu, "Easton recorded Philip's complaints, including the steady loss of Wampanoag land to the Europeans; the English colonists' growing herds of cattle and their destruction of Indian crops; and the unequal justice Indians received in the English courts". We can see why Indians were getting tired of English settlers which ended up in a revolt against them.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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

Re: Creatures of Empire



by Kyle Shrope - Monday, October 9, 2017, 11:01 PM

The main problem Anderson suggests in the audio clip is that the English perceived their livestock as property. The Indians viewed animals completely different than the colonist, which led to many conflicts between the two. "Native Americans' relationship with animals was largely reciprocal, reflecting the belief that many creatures possessed their own spiritual power or manitou" (Dr Matthew Ward). Growing up I have viewed animals as property rather than the way the Indians view animals. I have always seen animals as the settlers did, "animals were property over which they had a biblically ordained right to assert dominion; they were an economic resource to be manipulated and exploited" (Dr Mathew Ward). In the world today, majority of people view animals the same way I do, but more and more people each day start to lean towards the Indians view on them. Some people are starting to care for animals rather than look to harm them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Tuan Tran - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 3:00 AM

In the old times when Indians first encountered with Empire animals which settlers brought with them, they did not accept the existence of these species. Indians believe empire animals will be the main factors using by the settlers to push the Indians out of their lands. Moreover, these species did not relate to any Indian's faith in the spiritual religion. The settlers have the different perspectives from their neighbor Indians, they get used to these animals and consider them as the food production method. Until today, Indians and other ethnics are examined the true values of these animals- they're not the source of the settlers invasion and they are the accused reason of the settlers so animals are being protected and preserved nowadays.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



Re: religion always leads to an argument

by Jack Swisher - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 5:22 PM

The more I have thought about this topic throughout the week, the more I have learned and my opinion has slightly changed. At first my opinion on the biggest conflict had to be first encounters in the woods with domestic animals and the natives. Now my opinion has shifted to more of a religious view. Religion has always played a part in life since day one really. I went to history.ac.us and took a closer look at DeJohnson's book.

Native Americans Viewed themselves as part of, rather than distinct from in the natural world according to a summary from DeJohnson's book. In indian language, there were no words to distinguish animals, just words to separate species. English colonists had the opposite view. The english view was more directed toward economics. The animals were viewed as property and they were a resource to sell or be used for food. Being from a very religious area in Nevada, I know first hand that mixed opinions don't mix well. Fallon, Nevada is a small conservative town, and if you weren't christian or republican, people

sometimes could get a little salty. I would always give some liberal views to my friends and they did not agree just like the english and natives. Religion was just as big back in the colonial days, if not bigger. This religious difference caused a lot of tension in the new world.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Borders

by Jack Swisher - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 8:02 PM

Through some videos in class and information from lectures has showed me that population and expansion of territory for the colonists was needed. On page 81 in the Metacom's war section it states "The colonists growing settlement shrank the Indian's land base." The paragraph also states that "The settlers wanted clear pastures and fenced farms, while the Indians needed extensive forests for hunting." To me , this shows that the English were quite greedy people. Now, in class we talked about America being a greedy society in trying to better themselves, but this was not an ethical decision for the settlers. On page 81 it also states that the English offered and tried to convert the natives to their religion but this led to tension between the two. But the Natives continued to suffer the consequences of growing settlements. Fields and crops were destroyed as well as food for animals that natives hunted. Unfortunately this was a reason for the war but this could have been avoided.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



How do I Identify with the animals?

by Micah Phillips - Monday, October 9, 2017, 11:23 PM

I can relate to these people with the animals in the hard work it was to deal with them. In the second paragraph of the "Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America" article talking about part 2, 'Settling with Animals' is a very relatable task to me. I worked on a open range cattle ranch and that is very very hard work. This paragraph talked about many chores that had to be done to take care of a cow. With this idea of the "domestic" animals being let out to the wild and taken care of is a practice still done today across America.

This idea of letting them loose on the land really helps the people of the new colony get a feel for the land and "civilize" the land. The cow naturally finds feed and water and could be used to find great plantation locations for a new colony or extension of a town. a person can really get to know the land by following some cows through the land.

In turn, could really help in advantage in any battle or up rising with any unexpected "visitors" or "locals."

That being said, in that work you will lose a lot of livestock and they will become wild. Eventually, you could come across the cattle again, but the animal will be no more tame than a wild jack rabbit and will run off at the site of something unusual.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Differing Perspectives

by Kate Weiss - Tuesday, October 10, 2017, 12:32 PM

Historian Virginia DeJohn Anderson's book, *The Creatures of Empire*, examines the cultural and environmental history of the New World after the introduction of European animals. A major difference between the Indian and European cultures was their perspective toward animals. Indians didn't have a word in their vocabulary to associate with "animals" except for something close to "other than human persons" (Audio 2:26), and had a much deeper and spiritual relationship with these creatures. On the other side, Europeans clearly thought they had a right to keep animals as property and assert dominance over them, which was stated in the Bible (Article paragraph 3). Indians saw the free-range animals as a huntable food source, and the Englishman somehow had a price tag on every wild hog's head, making them an early commodity (Article paragraph 8). Indians had to pay for their actions in New England court, and were often driven from their own lands by the foreign animals who damaged and destroyed their crops. It should've been the other way around, Indians charging the Englishman for not securing their animals and allowing them to run free and multiply on Indian lands.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Differing Perspectives

by Tuan Tran - Friday, October 13, 2017, 7:50 PM

The Indians did the right things to kill the strange animals which ate all foods from the America natural animals. Without foods, America animals will leave the Indian tribes area to move into different territories so they could not hunt and bring the meats, skins back to their families. Moreover, these empire animals are considered to be the aggressive evils which caused the settlers to expand their regions by pushing the Indians out of their lands. On the other hand, Europeans wanted to have their domestical animals accompany them in the new area and they felt so frustrated and annoyed when their animal friends were being killed brutally by the hostile or friendly Indians. Both different perspectives led to the massive war to claim the territories from each other.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



'Other than human'

by Banyan Ryan - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 3:52 PM

According to both the review article and Anderson's interview with the American History Guys, the Indians seemed to be more respectful of animals than the English were. From the unheard-of idea that animals could be owned and sold as property to their belief that certain animals,

such as deer, had spiritual power and protectors. Even during the act of hunting they would show respect to them even in death by honoring and rewarding the animal's spirit.

However, during the conflict regarding the animals intruding on the Indian's land and destroying their crops, the Indians started killing any English livestock that they came across. Sometimes in very brutal ways I might add. As the reviewer explains in the final sentence of the fourteenth paragraph, "Indian raiders would mutilate an animal by cutting off its legs or cutting out its tongue, and letting the animal die a slow and painful death".

I personally found this odd as the very first conflict between the Natives and the colonists regarding animals stemmed from the colonists not showing the same level of respect that the Natives did. Anderson, in her interview, brought up the term "other than human person", which was a name given to the local animals by the Indians. Even if they were destroying their crops and eating the Native's food, why would they start killing the English animals in such brutal ways when they treated their own animals so differently? Did they see the English animals different from the animals that they already lived alongside? Did the English animals not have the same spiritual power? Or were they just running out of options and their annoyance with the English colonists forced them to repress their respectful view of animals in order to survive?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: 'Other than human'

by Alexxis Romo - Friday, October 13, 2017, 5:18 PM

I had the same confusion when I read that the Indians brutally killed the European animals. I think they did see these animals as different than the ones they considered "other than human person". I think they saw these animals almost as intruders, considering they've never seen anything like them.

I wonder if this might've been a way for them to get back at the colonists, and whether or not they even knew that these animals were brought by the colonists when they first encountered them. I think this could be a crucial fact in considering whether or not the Indians intentionally did this, and why they did it.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: 'Other than human'

by Banyan Ryan - Saturday, October 14, 2017, 9:23 PM

Anderson DID say in her interview that she suspects the Indians' first encounter with English animals most likely stemmed from finding them alone in the wilderness, away from the colonies. I just assumed that they didn't know that they were brought over and simply thought that they had found some new, undiscovered animal that inhabited the area. And if they saw the deer as having spiritual power, I have to assume that they'd believe the same of any other animal they came across. Especially since cows and deer are similar in the way that they're both hoofed quadrupeds.

But thinking about it for a while, I suppose it's possible that they knew, even just by finding them out by themselves, that these cows and pigs were brought over by the English. I mean, the Natives had lived there far longer, so they would have thoroughly

scoured the wilderness. They'd know if such a large animal lived nearby. And you mentioned them cutting out the animal's tongue as being a way to "get back at the colonists", I found it heavily implied that that's EXACTLY the reason. In the very same sentence, the reviewer says that it was an act that "the English owners would most likely witness". It's phrased in a way that almost implies that the Indians purposefully tortured the animals in front of the very people who brought them. Why do something so unnecessary unless specifically to spite them?

So yeah, maybe their opinion of these creatures was tainted as early as first contact. Maybe the knowledge that the English brought them over automatically made them less deserving of respect than the animals that they lived alongside. Very interesting to think about.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



How did religious differences between these two people play a role?

by Amber Leonard - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 8:41 PM

Native Americans saw animals as spiritual beings and therefore did not believe in ownership of animals. In professor Virginias audio interview around 2:20 she says, "Creatures being other than human persons that they were living beings sharing the earth who were different from human beings but not necesarrily inferior to them...Deer were thought to have spiritual power".

The Englishmen believed that god gave them a right to own animals. "English colonists, in contrast, animals were property over which they had biblically obtained the right to assert dominion". Creatures of the Empire article.

I dont identify with either of them. I believe that animals should be treated well and that you can own them, but I dont think that god gave us that right, I think that through domestication we eventually started owning animals.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: How did religious differences between these two people play a role?

by Daniel Brockett - Thursday, October 12, 2017, 4:06 PM

Even today there are hunters who try to use the whole animal, Or farmers. Maybe there is a happy medium for the two trains of thought?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: How did religious differences between these two people play a role?

by Tuan Tran - Friday, October 13, 2017, 7:58 PM

Both Indians and settlers have their own specific beliefs in the animals. They rarely tried to understand each other which caused a lot of aggressive conflicts. As I read from the Old Testament, animals and human are friends and we used to talk with each other so the animal taming is not quite right. The domestication is the creations of the human, they take

this method to have the legal rights to own animals as they do to slaves. Animals should be treated well as people but nowadays as I saw the video clip about the man killed the dog with his iron bacon then started to get the dog's heart, ate it alive, it is a disgusting and crazy behavior and the man is still the "innocent" for his government.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



How strongly do you agree or disagree with this concept "Creatures of Empire"? Why?

by Daniel Brockett - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 10:17 PM

Altho, it became an issue with the animals impeding the natives horticulture and hunting gathering lifestyle. the thing that is not mentioned is That when any population grows, you automatically have to switch to advance agriculture. Which, includes domestication the animals. According to what i learned in anthropology on how civilizations are formed. Everyone gives the europe a bad rap for bringing harsh farming customs to the americas. I feel they were just further down the inevitable evolution of civilization, that is involved as population grows. if america remained "undiscovered," i'd argue that many tribes would have to move from hunting gathering and primitive farming too advanced agriculture as their population rose. As seen everywhere throughout time. Therefore i'd argue against the concept due to its inevitability. I would, agree that the settlers and natives viewed animals very different but i would theorize that as their population grew the settlers and indians view on food and domestication would have become more similar "The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man.

George Bernard Shaw, Man and Superman (1903) Maxims for Revolutionists"

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: How strongly do you agree or disagree with this concept "Creatures of Empire"? Why?

by Tuan Tran - Friday, October 13, 2017, 8:08 PM

The term "population grows, you automatically have to switch to advance agriculture" are not exist in two conflict factions: settlers and the Indians. Moreover, settlers and Indians were hard to accept each other cultures, they just wanted to achieve their own benefits. The Indians used to hunt and gather foods not tame the animals, opposite to the settlers' method. The civilization evolution is the necessary features to change the world history and it is important to modern people reactions. The Europeans were not bad at all, they were the brave adventures who dared to conquest New World, formed their USA foundation career, helped the world's continents to connect each other and also the Indians who just protected and reserved their own ancestors' terrains.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Peyton Hobie - Friday, October 13, 2017, 3:01 PM

The main issue Anderson talks about regarding the relationship between natives and colonists is the colonists control of their animals and the way the native end up handling the situation if a non native animal becomes an "issue". As stated in the video if there was an animal such as a cow and that animal was causing issues with a native farming plot they will react to it in a way that they see the cow as a threat and kill end killing the cow. I feel as though that reaction is generated through natives mutual respect for the other creatures of the land and so if an animal trespasses on their territory they would treat it as a threat and take care of said animal. Since that animal though was considered property livestock by the English and killing that animal without the given permission from the owner it is like destruction of property and considered an offense among the colonists. With that viewpoint you can see the drastic cultural difference between these two societies, and these differences is what makes it difficult for the two to simply co exist on the same land. It's not part of the natives way to claim ownership to other animals they are treated as equals essentially, where on the opposite side of the spectrum the colonists claim full owner ship on cattle and livestock so any damage that comes upon their property will be treated as an offense and will be dealt with through the justice system. In my personal opinion I feel as though people should be able to co exist with other animals and not just raise animals to be killed and consumed, although its hard to make that argument because humans have evolved so much from hunting that raising animals to be consumed is just a smarter and more efficient way of doing it. It;s kind of the brutal truth but I don't think people should go back to strictly hunting animals only and that's how we would get our food, its just difficult to say I believe people should respect all creatures and not just raise them to be consumed when I know that in reality that is the most efficient way of sustaining a population and if we were to revert back from that if would be very detrimental to a lot of people. Personally I think the concept of "creatures of empire" is a very interesting concept and I do in fact agree with it because without a sustainable source of livestock people will not thrive, as in people who are coming over from Europe and developing new settlements, for example we have Jamestown, one of the original colonial settlements and because they didn't have that sustainable source of livestock they were basically just left to rot in their own settlement.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



A byproduct of European involvement with the Indians

by Alexis Romo - Friday, October 13, 2017, 4:26 PM

In my earlier post, I talked about how domestication of animals brought onto the Indians wasn't justified. In class on Thursday, a particular quote stood out to me. This quote stated, " European cloth, muskets, hatchets, knives, and pots appealed to Indians and spread far into the interior, and many Indians who used them gradually abandoned traditional skills and became increasingly dependent on European goods. They became consumers whose economies and societies depended on imported commodities" (p.80).

Not only did the domestication of animals throw off the Indian's natural way of being, but European commodities as a whole drastically changed the Indian way of life. They have now become dependent on the luxurious items brought by the Europeans, and are abandoning a big part of their culture. In addition to this, the Europeans brought a byproduct of trade, drunkenness. This created a lot of social conflict. In addition, they brought disease with them which was fatal to many societies (80).

Not only have the Europeans changed the Indian way of living, but even brought deadly disease with them, completely disrupting the Indian way of life.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



How strongly do you agree or disagree with this concept “Creatures of Empire”? Why?

by Kyle Shrope - Friday, October 13, 2017, 4:29 PM

I somewhat agree with the concept “Creatures of Empire”. Domesticated animals played a huge role in the colonist’s daily lives. And brought conflict between them and the Natives. As the Natives views towards animals were spiritual and traditional. Before the colonist’s arrived Native Americans would hunt wild animals for food. “Hunting provided an important source of food and calories for the Indian peoples of north-eastern America. Some villagers even moved on a seasonal basis to make the best advantage of the available resources”(Dr Ward). The Indians didn’t just see hunting as a resource for food, “Hunting was thus a reciprocal rather than an exploitative process, in which animal spirits were honoured and rewarded”(Dr Ward). Animals meant more to the Native than they did to the European colonists. With the European colonist population increasing and demand for meat increasing, production also increased for farmers. This lead to more conflicts with the Native Americans. As colonist couldn’t control their animals, many would roam into the woods and Indian territories. But the Indians were the ones forced to corral them if that would happen. Soon Indian’s took matter into their own hands and retaliated against the colonist and their animals. “By the late 1660s increasing numbers of Indians began to kill any English animal that they found in the woods. Such activities were not limited to New England, but could be found wherever English livestock had been established, from Long Island to the Eastern Shore of Maryland, from the James River in Virginia, to New Hampshire” (Dr Ward). As production increased more and more Native American land would be taken from them. “as agents of empire, livestock occupied land in advance of English settlers, forcing native peoples who stood in their way either to fend off the animals as best they could or else to move on” (p. 211). Anderson makes a strong point about how domestic animals were the reason the colonist took over, but i don’t think it’s the only reason. In class we talked about how diseases and cultural differences played a huge role in the colonist takeover of the Americas. The colonist weren’t accepting people and couldn’t understand the Native American’s culture. The colonist and the Natives had very different lifestyles and that is also a main reason why the colonist were able to take over. Domestication of Animals is an important reason on why the colonist were successful in America, but not the only reason.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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

◀ Puritanism & Islam

Creatures of Empire ▶

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 201 F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004)

