

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



Forum 1

Creatures of Empire

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Puritanism & Islam

Puritanism & Islam ▶

Display replies in nested form ▼

Move this discussion to ... ▼



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](#)



"Other than human Person"

by Gaige Parry - Friday, October 6, 2017, 12:51 PM

What I believe Dejohn Anderson is suggesting be the main problem was the constant tensions between the Natives and English settlers caused by the alain livestock they have never seen before. Such as when the animals would cause damage to Native crops, the fact the english settlers viewed these animals as property (1:50 Audio File) and not "other than human persons" (2:25) such as the Natives did, and the constant pressure put onto the Natives by the English to move away. As well as accidentally killing english livestock and being held accountable and viewed as a criminal. I myself view animals as property now too due to how

American's buy, sell, breed, and use them for everyday foods and materials. If someone tried to convince me my 3 year old pitbull didn't belong to me after spending hundreds of dollars for him, shots, vaccinations, food, etc. I would laugh in their face.

Through religious views Native's thought "major prey like deer had spiritual powers or to be spiritual protectors."(2:43) Never killing any of them unless absolutely needed for survival. Whereas English settlers buy and sell livestock so they label them as property. In my opinion viewing animals as equals will only lead to lower chances of survival. Stocking up on livestock, by buying, selling, breeding, and utilizing them for their resources such as clothing and food will ensure the safety and health of your village or settlement. There is a reason we're at the top of the food chain.

Vegans and Vegetarians are the 2017 Natives. Viewing animals as equals and choosing not to eat meat, or wear clothing made from slaughtered animals. As well as protesting those who do and those who may endanger these so called "spiritual animals."

I do agree with Dejohn Andersons "Creatures of Empire" concept to as why the tensions were so high between the natives and english settlers. Two completely different views on animals creating such problems then leading to the King Philips war. Maybe not entirely blamed on the alain animals but a strong factor. Indian men raiding villages and the "pressure to move 30 miles away" (6:25) not solving the issue.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: "Other than human Person"

by Kamron Low - Monday, October 9, 2017, 10:02 PM

I absolutely agree with your viewing of animal property. It was smart of the Europeans to take in livestock and to turn their ecological production into an economical gain for their societies, as our higher cognitive processing power (compared to animals) allows us to herd and them as we please.

However, the 13th paragraph of the article states, "Indians who killed livestock, even feral animals, in the woods were hauled before the courts and prosecuted, even though it was not always clear who owned the animals." And even if it was to protect their own land, if they harmed any kind of cattle they would be seen as criminals in the English court. Would you agree that this may have been somewhat unfair treatment to the Indians?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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

Re: "Other than human Person"



by Nickolas Frasier - Tuesday, October 10, 2017, 3:01 PM

Hey, one of the things i think you missed was how the domesticated livestock started eating things both the natives needed to sustain themselves, like shellfish on the coasts, and other vegetation that the animals the indians preyed on needed to eat to survive. I noticed you said something along the lines of the domesticated animals destroying native crops and trespassing, i just didn't notice you mentioning these facts. Good job by the way.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: "Other than human Person"

by Carly Kleefeld - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 7:29 PM

I also agree with Anderson's concept as to why the tensions were so high between the natives and the europeans. I like how you related the Natives and Europeans views on animals to Vegans and Vegetarians today. Although I don't believe that the main problem between the Natives and english settlers was caused by the alien livestock, I believe the main problem was that the Europeans saw the animals as their property even though they were wild animals, and were trying to force the natives away by not letting them hunt those animals. I like all of the points you made and how you related them to our current time. Good job!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The Hooves of Trade

by Kamron Low - Saturday, October 7, 2017, 3:26 PM

The biggest problem DeJohn pointed out in the article revolved around the treatment the Indians received involving territory and the English livestock. As the settlers allowed their livestock roam (due to a lack of work on fences and such) the animals trespassed on Indian property and destroyed their crops. The Indians in return harmed the animals but were seen by the English court for it. It's safe to say this was unfair treatment to the Indians.

And although the English and Indians had different views on wildlife and livestock, the English belief of animals as property played a significant role in the colonies economic prosperity in that all the consumables they produced like meat for food and manure for agriculture allowed for trade to expand throughout the late 16th century. As humans can act on consciousness (allowing us to make complex decisions) while animals only act mostly on instinct, the English technically had a slight societal edge with their beliefs that they were able to domesticate, herd, and even train animals versus the Indian beliefs of animal spirituality.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Creatures of Empire: The main problems of the European animals

by Nickolas Frasier - Monday, October 9, 2017, 9:03 AM

When the Europeans brought over their domesticated animals over to the New World, it caused many different problems for both the indians and the Europeans. For starters, the domestic animals brought over were the property of the europeans, which the indians didn't understand. All the animals that the indians hunted were, to a point, sacred and spiritual to their beliefs and belonged to no man. As the domesticated animals bred and expanded their terrain they began trespassing onto the indians land, destroying the crops, and eating the food that both the indians and their prey needed to sustain themselves. But again, one of the biggest problems was when an indian intentially hunted down and killed one of these animals, or one of them fell into an indian trap by accident and died, the indians were held accountable for killing and taking property that wasn't theirs, which led to many small conflicts between the settlers and the indians.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Isabella Amaral - Monday, October 9, 2017, 12:59 PM

The problem Professor DeJohn Anderson addresses in her book, "Creatures of Empire" is the difference of how the English colonist and the Indians treated animals in general. The colonists for example, treated animals like property, and an "economic resource" (Review of Creatures of Empire by Dr. Matthew Ward). The Indians, however, believed animals possessed their own spiritual power. (Review of Creatures of Empire by Dr. Matthew Ward).

To answer the question, "What were the attitudes of Native Americans towards animals." Al Carroll, a Historian at Northern VA Community College states, "Animals are considered relatives. You do not kill an animal lightly, only out of necessity." Another person, Kevin Maher, writes, "Every animal had a purpose either physically or spiritually and every animal was treated with respect."

So while I don't concur with taking a gander at looking at all animals in this spiritual light like the natives, I do agree with the way they were treated by them. (As shown in DeJohn Anderson's book)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Carly Kleefeld - Wednesday, October 11, 2017, 7:14 PM

I also agree with the way the natives treated the animals. I like how you phrased the way Anderson described the problem with the Europeans and Indians. Although one thing I think you missed is that the Europeans would torment the Natives with their free roaming animals, or "property". The Europeans viewed the wild animals as their property and the Natives weren't allowed to hunt them, which caused problems between them. Good job by the way!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by April Frost - Saturday, October 14, 2017, 5:49 PM

Great resource with the comment from a historian. I also find that the Native Americans had a very smart, and ethical approach regarding their resources. It appears logical for Native Americans to honor and respect the land and animals that they share it with, because many tribes honored the Great Spirit, which communicates by wind and land. While the Europeans had completely different views on animals, it doesn't make their reasoning any less logical, either. For them, it's clear that religion played a key role in categorizing species, leaving all animals inferior to the human. Based on what we know from Anderson's research, the Natives allowed a lot of practices from the Europeans that were foreign to them, and unfortunately, the English settlers did not share an open mind to the Native's way of life.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by David Garvin - Monday, October 9, 2017, 3:02 PM

The main issue concerning the animals the European settlers brought with them was the cultural differences between the Native population and the Europeans. In the audio file DeJohn Anderson talks about how the animals Europeans brought over were viewed as property of people and that the bible gave them a biblical right to dominate these animals. The Native population viewed animals as part of nature and didn't believe they had a right to dominate over animals. In the review article by Dr. Matthew Ward, he states the DeJohn wrote about the Native people not having a word like animals to distinguish themselves from humans. My point of view on animals is a mix of European and Native views. I view domesticated animals more as property that someone is raising to sell or for themselves as food. Wild animals are part of nature and still have their natural instincts to survive without human intervention.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Carly Kleefeld - Monday, October 9, 2017, 8:17 PM

After listening to the interview Professor Virginia DeJohn Anderson gave, she believes that the animals are more alien to the Indians than the Europeans because there had been some encounters before the first settlement. Anderson suggests that the main problem is all of the new ideas that the Europeans brought with them about their animals. Europeans believed that the animals were their property, whereas the Indians did not. The Indians believed that some animals held a spiritual power or protector, such as deer. To English Christians this was a very wrong idea, and view on animals. Indians rely on animals like deer but they would mostly use traps to capture their animals rather than bows and arrows. I believe that the Indians had a right to all animals on their land, wild animals should be anyone's property. Not just for the Europeans.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Delaney Mack - Monday, October 9, 2017, 8:52 PM

DeJohn Anderson says in the audio file shared with the class that the main problem the Native Americans had with the English settlers' animals was that the English viewed their livestock as property whereas Natives viewed animals as a part of nature that shouldn't be owned. Another reason she states is that animals are very spiritual creatures to the Native Americans. The Natives more spiritual aspect to the animals is strange for me to wrap my head around because some people view animals has solely purposeful to eat and for humans to own.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Religious and Spiritual views and their effects on animals as property.

by Garrett Caffee - Monday, October 9, 2017, 9:10 PM

The Europeans religious views and the Native Americans spiritual views absolutely played a part in the animosity towards between the two groups.

One one hand you have the Native Americans views that animals had "spiritual powers or spiritual protectors" (Creatures of Empire Interview, minute 2:45). One the other hand you have the Europeans who are predominantly Christian and to them the idea of these animals having anything to do with spirituality is heresy.

While the part of religion/spirituality may not have taken a front page to the animosity displayed by both groups over the topic of animals, I believe that it [religion/spirituality] definitely played a part and influenced how each group viewed animals.

Since the Europeans could not view the animals as being spiritual or having a spiritual guide they then had no issue with the concept of owning them and thus falling under their property laws; therefore when the Native Americans would trap or hunt Europeans animals they would prosecute them as if their property was assaulted, because to them [Europeans], it was.

Due to the Native Americans views that animals had spiritual powers or protectors and did not view animals as being beneath them (Creatures of Empire Interview, minute 2:30) they could not understand ownership of an animal. This view made it so they did not take the same precautions the Europeans or even ourselves [Americans] might take regarding other animals and hunting/trapping. The result was that Native Americans would be brought up on charges for something they [Native Americans] would not view as wrong.

These two groups probably did not argue about this topic in a religious/spiritual way but instead argued it in a way the was shaped by their respective religions or beliefs, thus creating a rift between the two.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Animals Or Property?

by Brogan Cornish - Monday, October 9, 2017, 11:18 PM

DeJohn Anderson makes a good point in his article about how animals were conceptualized. The main issue between the Natives and the Englishmen was if animals are owned or are they free range. Indians believed that if the animals were on their land then they were theirs to hunt, but the English settlers were convinced that they paid for these animals and they're our property. In part three of "Creatures Of Empire" DeJohn wrote, "seventeenth century, as English herds, and English colonies, expanded, conflicts with Indians increased. Initially, there was hope that some form of mutual accommodation could be reached, but as the number of English animals increased, so the instances of animals trespassing on Indian fields or of Indians killing feral hogs or cows increased. Indians and Englishmen began to clash over a wide range of issues from the marking of animals to compensation for the loss of animals or crops." As settlers moved to America the land in between the natives and them shrunk creating this issue on who's right. I agree that animals are property, but I also agree that animals were put on this earth just like us to serve a purpose and we should be treated as equals. Also in part three of the article the author wrote, "In towns, artisans would supplement their meagre wages by raising a hog or two, or keeping a cow, even in the centre of London. Animals were also central to the lives of Native Americans but in a slightly different way. 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. However, hunting was not a pure exploitation of animal resources, for in Indian culture animals possessed a spiritual power that was recognised by important rituals when hunting. Hunting was thus a reciprocal rather than an exploitative process, in which animal spirits were honoured and rewarded." The Indians simply viewed their food as a purpose and worshiped them, but for the Englishmen would just uses them for the extra money and not view them as having souls.

In the video the same argument occurs that should the animals have been viewed as property or as equals? near the one minute and forty second mark of this audio they talk about how could they know who's animals belonged to who. Religiously the natives viewed animals as a equal part of society and that they had spiritual powers and protectors. I agree with the natives that animals were put here just like us they deserve to be equal, but I do think they were put her for a reason and thats to be livestock.

Do you think that animals were put here for livestock? Why did the Indians think animals had spiritual protectors?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Re: Animals Or Property?

by Kamron Low - Friday, October 13, 2017, 10:51 AM

To answer your first question, yes I do mostly believe animals were meant to be livestock. The European ideology of using animals and what they produce for trade is a primary factor for the economic success of certain settlements. (That's not to say however that I also don't believe in preserving specific animals in their natural habitat.)

To answer your second question, I actually like to believe that the "spiritual protectors" the Indians believed animals have is like a metaphor for their survival instinct. To the Indians, their ability to sense danger and find food could've been like a spirit guiding them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by Landon Stevens - Monday, October 9, 2017, 11:25 PM

After listening to the 8 minute audio clip regarding the newcomers, both man and animal, to the Boston area, I immediately thought of a paper I wrote in high school. My paper was on veganism and why I don't exactly agree with the reasoning often associated with it. Basically, the argument in my paper, and also present at the time of the arrival for man and animals regarding this particular time period, was that animal life is not equal to human life. That is a lengthy argument, and one for another time, but for now I would like to pose a hypothetical scenario. Imagine being stranded on an island after a plane or ship wreck. You survive only from the rainwater and natural resources produced from the island itself. After a few years of dire living situations and poor health, you are certain that this is the island you will die on. Suppose one day, a ship approaches and sends longboats towards you. From them come men and their domesticated sabertooth tigers and woolly mammoths. You don't have to say which one you would be more shocked to see. Now, this was a rather lame and probably inaccurate comparison to the reality of the arrival of the English with their strange pets, but the fact that the Indians were more surprised by the animals than the men and their foreign technology is... not surprising. In the article reflecting the writings of Virginia DeJohn Anderson, Dr. Matthew Ward mentions the primary difference in point of view regarding animals for the Indians and the newcomers. The Native Americans, in short, respected and placed spiritual value in the animals, unlike the English. Similar to my point of view, albeit not exactly, they simply saw the animals in an early Christian and biblical manner, assuming that they were only on earth for our needs, wants and, ultimately, use.

(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> Date accessed: 10 October, 2017)

After voicing pretty clearly my personal views regarding animal domestication, I look forward to learning about everyone else's as well. Happy posting.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Animals: The Cultural Conflict between Native Americans and English Settlers

by April Frost - Monday, October 9, 2017, 11:29 PM

While the Native Americans and the Europeans had differing views on animals, the Europeans let their animals roam free, ultimately antagonizing the Native Americans' land, crops, and hunting practices. Anderson suggests that the treatment of Native Americans for defending their crops was unjustifiable, and had a large impact on their involvement with King Phillip's War, among others. I can absolutely see how the Europeans' "mixed" treatment of animals impacted the Native Americans in the plan to colonize them. However, I find that rather than firmly comparing the two different cultures and their beliefs on livestock, Anderson strongly chooses one side in the matter, by stating, "Putting a price on animals symbolized the conversion of creatures into commodities" (p. 68).

Overall, I think that "Creatures of Empire" is a fair concept. I could definitely sense a bias, and was prepared to oppose it, if necessary. But while attempting to view both the settlers and the Native Americans' side, I can see the clash of the cultures. In this case, the Europeans had more power, and neglected their responsibility of their livestock, by letting them destroy and interfere with the Native American's crops and lifestyle. While it is unsettling that the Native

Americans had to put up with this treatment, they did retaliate with strong actions by killing the settler's animals on sight, going as far as to "mutilate an animal by cutting off its leg or cutting out its tongue, and letting the animal die a slow and painful death" (Dr Matthew Ward, review of *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America*, (review no. 471)). Ultimately, when a group of people are constantly being pushed out of a society and forced to change the way they have always lived, with no assistance, loud retaliation is imminent.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Creatures of Empire!

by Isaac Anderson - Friday, October 13, 2017, 11:18 AM

In the Audio File, Dejohn Anderson explains that "the English perceived of their livestock as property whereas the Indians did not conceive of living animals as anyone property." "The Indians viewed animals as different than human beings but not necessarily inferior." (audio file, 1:54)

She claims this to be the most significant difference and a direct cause of a lot of problems between the two cultures. It is especially significant because of the Religious aspect of it. The Indians thought some of their animals to have "Spiritual powers", a notion that was considered to be heretical to the English Christians. (audio file 2:50). Even if these two cultures were trying to get along, their beliefs towards animals were so extremely different that I find it hard to even see middle ground where they could have met.

Being from a small hunting town in Idaho, I have personally experienced the affects that a free range cattle herd can have on hunting lands. I understand the problems that the Indians faced to a small extent. Obviously their experience was much more extreme as they relied entirely on their prey for survival. These days if we are unsuccessful on a hunt we just drive back to town and grab some beef-steaks from the grocery store and were just fine.

Its hard to say who I identify with the most. I think the idea of a hunter-gatherer lifestyle sounds great and I really appreciate their respect for animals and their surroundings. I also think that "owning" my own animals to feed my family would be great. This all seems possible to me because I don't have the religious restrictions that these two cultures struggled with.

(audio file)

http://media.lanecce.edu/users/escobarj/201/forums/1/8_domestic_animals_colonial_relations.n

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: Creatures of Empire!

by Garrett Caffee - Saturday, October 14, 2017, 8:32 AM

I agree that middle ground would be a very difficult aspect for them to find. At best the Europeans would have to fence in their cattle and not expand their grazing area; however we know that the Europeans wanted to expand and did not care who was in their way of doing so, and thus that agreement would never have worked.

You should expand on your experience with free range cattle and how they impacted any hunting you tried to do. Did the cattle scare off the deer? Did the cattle eat up most/all of the food thus forcing the deer to migrate to find food?

Your experience may be to a smaller extent than the Native Americans but regardless it is still similar and could give more insight on how exactly the spreading of free range cattle impacted the Native's hunting.

Great post, keep it up!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire!

by Isaac Anderson - Saturday, October 14, 2017, 10:24 AM

The main problem with cattle is they will stay in one spot until all of the available food and resources are used up before moving on, whereas deer and elk stay on the move *lightly* grazing an area, then moving on.

My dad and I used to hike to a water hole that was located in a little grassy area on top of a hill. This particular water hole was a real hotspot for elk to come and wallow. Until one fall morning when we arrived to the hole and came across at least 25 head of cattle drinking the water and eating the grass. At this point the landscape still looked the same as it did the year before. We knew that we didn't have much of a chance with all of the cattle around so we found a new spot for the season. The next year we decided to go back to the wallowing hole and see if we could re-claim our spot. Sure enough, the cattle were gone. So was the grass. The water hole wasn't much of a hole anymore; it was just a muddy mess. The ground was just dirt and mud with cow patties lying in every square foot.

This place was a high traffic area for deer and elk, but they did almost zero damage. Once the cows got involved it was game over.

This "overgrazing has been linked to soil erosion due to the loss of water retention and runoff reduction capacity of vegetation" (1, 3.2.1). If you ever see a hillside that has been heavily grazed by cattle you will see this in effect after it rains. The water easily carves itself into the grassless land and washes away the soils making it extremely difficult for the environment to replenish itself. Cattle also "add suspended solids and bacteria to water" (1, 3.2.1). These bacteria will turn fresh, drinkable water into a something potentially life threatening to us, and most certainly deadly for the Indians, and even the colonists for that matter.

Below is a link to an interesting report about cattle grazing on public lands.

(1)<http://www.thebeckoning.com/environment/cattle/grazing.html>

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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

◀ Puritanism & Islam

Puritanism & Islam ▶

 Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Log out](#))

HST 201 F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004)