

HST 201: History of United States F18 (Escobar Meta 20749 22611)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 F18 \(Escobar Meta 20749 22611\)](#) / [Week 3](#) / [Forum 1](#)
/ [Creatures of Empire](#)



Search forums

Forum 1 Creatures of Empire



[Subscribe](#)

◀ [Creatures of Empire](#)

[Puritanism & Islam](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form ▾

Move this discussion to ... ▾

Move

Pin



Creatures of Empire

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, October 5, 2018, 10:36 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 one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Creatures of Empire

Sum of ratings: -

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



Re: Creatures of Empire Habit or Greed

by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Sunday, October 7, 2018, 7:23 PM

DeJohn Anderson suggest the main problem was, concerning these new animals and their relation to the Indians (and Europeans) was the fact that when the new settlers where coming to this land. Along with some livestock which were being

placed on their land in advance of the English settlers and their need for seeking out areas for their herds to occupy to graze on. Forcing the native peoples who stood in their way either to fend off the animals as best they could or else move on.

How did religious differences between these two peoples play?

It was not until 1978, almost two hundred years after the Constitution was signed, that the American Indian Religious Freedom Act gave specific legal recognition to the integrity of Native American religions.

For the native individuals who had been converted by the missionaries. This complicated many divisions within tribes caused by the increasing numbers of “praying Indians”

Also, when Europeans arrived in the Americas most didn’t even consider that the people they encountered had any cultural and religious tradition that were different from their own; in fact, most believed the indigenous communities had no culture or religion at all.

Some missionaries did not recognize the customs of the native people as spiritual or religious traditions.

Attitudes towards the indigenous neighbors, was a lot from their own ignorance of tribal cultures and their religious beliefs, and desire for profit and land.

Professor Anderson’s argument that animals were more important as the “main actors” of early American history than the human leaders, such as John Smith or Jonathan Winthrop, who usually get the credit? Although I think animals were an important role, which played a part of this important time in the early stage. It usually people who get mentioned more in history and get the credit. Even when so many things could have been done differently to change the course in this time.

John Winthrop one of the leading figures in founding the Massachusetts Bay Colony, He led the first large groups of immigrants from England in 1630 and served as governor for 12 of the first 20 years

John Smith He was principally responsible for the survival of England’s first permanent colony in the New World. Yes, they both played an important role in shaping this time.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Christopher Bischoff](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 7:13 PM

What does DeJohn Anderson suggest the main problem was, concerning these new animals and their relation to the Indians (and Europeans) and do you look at animals that way?

Anderson suggests that the main problem between the Indians and Europeans regarding animals is that they view animals very differently. Europeans think of animals as inferior to humans and as property. Indians viewed them as a separate species but equal to humans as far as having a spirit or soul. Indians did not regard animals as property.

Around the 6:30 Anderson talks about how the Indians moved as far as thirty miles away to avoid the oncoming encroachment of European settlers, and even then their livestock would still wander onto and destroy their farms. Not only that, but the wandering farm animals would also eat things that the Indians and local fauna relied on for food. These new animals created an imbalance in the ecosystem that existed in America before Settlement. This undoubtedly caused problems between the two groups. The Indians complained that the Settlers should contain their animals to their land.

I look at animals more of like the Indians do. I see them as separate species with equal souls and varying levels of intelligence, in some ways a lot more intelligent than humans.

How did religious differences between these two peoples play a role, and to which spiritual/cultural view of animals do you more closely identify?

Indians thought animals had spiritual protectors. A thought that went against the teachings of the church and was foreign to the Europeans. Europeans considered animals property and as a part of their dominion. So if there were situations where an animal wandered onto a farm and destroyed crops, the Indians would've liked to deal with the animal in some way, but are restricted because that animals is someone else's property and are at risk of committing a crime if they do so. As a result, tensions rose between the Settlers and the Indians. I think that animals have spirits/ God watching over them, just as humans do.

Can you find or determine a connection between this discussion of animals (as property) and any societal or constitutional issues we face in our nation today?

The issue of factory farming and animal rights groups is similar to that of the Indians and Settlers. In factory farming, farmers look at their animals as property and profit. Some farmers look to maximize their profits at the cost of providing the best care for their animals. Animal rights groups will protest that the conditions are inhumane and that animals, like people, have inalienable rights. Even if the animals are being raised to become slaughtered. While Indians did not talk about the "inalienable" rights of animals,

they certainly believed animals deserved respect and treated them that way. Peter Singer, author of *Animal Liberation* believes that all animals are equal, and that all animals should have equal consideration for their well-being.

<http://www.crf-usa.org/bill-of-rights-in-action/bria-16-4-c.html>

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



The main problem with the new animals and the different way the Indians viewed them.

by [Erik Westfall](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 7:21 PM

Prof. Anderson believed that the Indians actually thought the animals that the English brought over to the new world were more alien than the Europeans themselves. One problem was the different views between the Indians and English when it came to these animals. The Indians didn't view animals as property, they viewed these creatures as if they shared this planet with them. The English viewed these animals as food and that they were more inferior than the animals. The biggest problem was that the English would let these animals wonder around and they would go into the Indians farms and eat their crops and destroy the fields, as well as eat the grass and herbs that the animals that the Indians hunted would eat. If an Indian killed one of these animals they could have been arrested and brought to court for killing someone's property. This was very different from what they were used to. The animals would also spring the Indians traps, the pigs would go to the coast and eat the shell fish that the Indians relied on. But if the Indians did anything to these English animals it would be them that would have to pay for it. The Indians even moved miles away and the animals would still tear their crops up, they especially thought that once the English bought land from them that they would keep these animals on their property but that was wrong. I found this topic quite interesting and if anyone has anything else to add I encourage you to reply because I'd love to hear it!

Sources: (Audio Tape from professor Anderson's interview.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Re: The main problem with the new animals and the different way the Indians viewed them.

by [Ben Crawford](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 9:21 PM

Erik, I find it very the point you made about Indians finding the European animals more foreign than the Europeans themselves very interesting. That goes to show you how different the animals must have been and looked compared to the ones the Indians had owned and hunted. Another interesting point is how the Indians could be brought to trial for killing a European's animal. That was not something I was aware of before reading this.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

**Re: The main problem with the new animals and the different way the Indians viewed them.**by [Amanda Francis](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 11:46 PM

I agree with you. Although I do think that initially the animals brought over by the Europeans were confusing to the natives, Anderson states in the audio clip (1:34) that "it wasn't so much dealing with the animals themselves as with the package of ideas the English settlers brought with them about their domestic animals." The concept of animals as property was foreign to the Indians, but even when they began to participate in this way of life, the response from the Europeans was very confusing. Dr. Matthew Ward talks about in his review of Creatures of Empire how the Indians became skilled at herding hogs and had a lot of success when they decided to sell butchered meat instead of live animals but this still displeased the colonists. At first it seemed to me like the colonists were bad teachers, but I don't think they ever actually wanted the natives to succeed.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Key, Not Major Actor**by [Lisa Schnabel](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 7:35 PM

As the colonists in North America multiplied, in the early 17th century, so did the demand for more land for farming and for grazing livestock. The English value of equity was demonstrated by trading goods, especially when it came to the ownership of cows, pigs, sheep, and domesticated animals. However, "their free-running hogs and cows," began to destroy many Indian cornfields creating heightened tensions in a variety of regions (textbook p. 81). Virginia DeJohn Anderson's book, "Creatures of Empire," highlights the real power these animals had in the aggressive expansion of the colonies in North America. In the review of Anderson's book by Dr. Matthew Ward, Ward mentions how "Native Americans' relationship with animals was largely reciprocal, reflecting the belief that many creatures possessed their own spiritual power or manitou" (<https://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/471>) and how the idea of these animals as property was a foreign concept in the Indian's world view. Anderson also said the Indians viewed animals as "other-than-humans" and who shared the earth and were not seen as inferior (podcast 2:26-2:48). Many religious Puritans saw Indian's attitudes about the animals as heretical and not at all Christian (podcast 2:57). The idea that animals have spirits is called animism and is still practiced today among different tribal religious believers.

"Anderson's final, and most important argument, is that the animals which colonists brought with them were the principal agents responsible for dispossessing the Indians of their homelands" (review 471) and 'livestock enabled the English to extend their dominion over the New World with remarkable speed and thoroughness' (Anderson, "Creatures of Empire," p. 242). After reading Ward's review, I tend to believe that livestock

played a key “accidental” role in the expansion of the colonies which would not have happened if John Smith and Jonathan Winthrop had not taken a “purposeful” decision to find freedom and integrate into the New World.

In conclusion, it is interesting that nothing was mentioned about the Spaniards or French colonies facing the same boundary experienced tensions due to domesticated animals. I tried finding some kind of information about the Spanish and French colonies and discovered that only pages eighty-one and eighty-eight, of the textbook, mentioned the Spaniards leaving horses behind. Later these horses fled into other Indian societies and were used by some tribes like the Apaches. If anyone happens to find any information concerning these imperial colonies, send me a line.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: Whose Property?

by [Gurpritam Sandhar](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 7:59 PM

After listening to the audio file, DeJohn Anderson in my opinion suggest that the main problem was not in the influx of new English animals being brought overseas, it was “In the package of ideas brought with them (Audio 1:31 minute mark).” She goes on to explain in greater detail about these “ideas” that the English settlers brought. One of the ideas that she explains is that the English, “Percieved their livestock as property (audio 1:50 minute mark).” The natives at the time never knew of such things to be cosidered as property when it came to animals. Of course when it came to land they knew what territories (farming land) belonged to who and what crops were theirs, but even though the english brought over domestic animals, the natives were brought up and trained to see animals as animals not as property that belonged to someone. DeAnderson explains that the natives did not go out of their way to go hunt these new animals, they only killed if they “encoutered problems with the animal” (audio 4:28 minute mark) and these problems that DeAnderson talks about would be when English animals such as pigs would come into native crops and eat or ruin their harvest by tearing up the ground (audio 3:20 minute mark). She ends one part of the audio discussion by saying that the english had no conrol over their animals, which in my opinion would cause the natives to react the way they did towards the english and their animals. On page 5 of DeJohn Anderson’s book *Creatures of Empire* she writes, “Animals not only produced changes in the land but also in the hearts and minds and behavior of the peoples who dealt with them.”

I look at animals as a huge part of nature that helps sustain our everyday living. Today, most people especially farmers and ranchers depend on their livestock for their income. These animals are considered property because they bring farmers and ranchers a paycheck every month. We understand the concept of “property” because we have been taught it, the natives on the other hand had no idea of this concept especially when it came to livestock and were punished for it by the english when they killed trespassing animals that came into their crops.
How do you guys feel about this?

Were the natives wrong for not knowing what "Property" is when it came to the English Animals?

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



Re: Whose Property?

by [Lisa Schnabel](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 1:02 PM

I concur with the idea that the Indians were treated unfairly by the settlers for not knowing the biblical view of how animals were seen as "property." Ironically, the settlers biblical view was distorted, and hypocritical. In the Bible the author of Jonah writes, how God not only took pity on the confused humans of Nineveh, but also of their animals, by not destroying them. This view of God caring for animals is also seen in Matthew 10:29-31, where it mentions how God values a mere small bird. The point is, if the settlers really cared for the animals as their Bible says, they would not let them roam freely where they could get caught in traps or mangled by other wild life. The settlers' double standard on the treatment of animals and punitive punishments for those who treated animals wrongly were unjustly carried out.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



Re: Whose Property?

by [Christopher Bischoff](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 1:00 PM

I feel that it was not necessarily wrong for the Indians to kill wandering English animals, since they had no concept of property. Although I cannot help but wonder how history would be different if early Indians had had the concept of property. I think that the idea of property promotes taking care of the possession, because you want to benefit from the possession for as long as you can, and you can pass the possession on to your descendants or friends to benefit from as well.

If Indians did believe in the concept of property, maybe they would have returned the wandering animal for a reward, or fine the owner of the animal for trespassing on their property and destroying their valuable crops.

Would early Indians still have hunted large game animals to extinction (pg. 5) if they had considered that the large herds belonged to them, and took care of the large animals for a source of food. And if they had domesticated larger animals than just llamas, turkeys and ducks; would there have been plagues spread over North and South America, similar to the way the smallpox and the bubonic plague spread through Europe and Asia via domesticated animals? Would these disease be similar to the ones in the Old World, and would it have prepared their immune systems for the incoming "invasion" from Europe?

Could the idea of property saved the Indians, had they adopted it sooner?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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

**Re: Whose Property?**by [Amanda Francis](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 2:33 PM

Christopher, I like your idea of Indians using the roaming animals to their advantage. Maybe the natives could have outsmarted the Europeans in their own game. Dr. Ward does state in his review of Creatures of Empire that "If Indians sought compensation in the colonial courts, as they could in theory, any compensation was assessed by the neighbors and friends of the farmers whose livestock had created the problem." So, unfortunately the whole system was seemingly rigged against the natives. The idea of Indians domesticating animals and spreading diseases like in Europe is also an interesting "what if" scenario.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**How should animals be viewed?**by [Justin Oljace](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 8:53 PM

DeJohn Anderson suggests that the main problem with the new livestock was the different relationships the Europeans and Native Americans had with animals. She says, "The English perceived of their livestock as property." She goes on to say, "Indians did not conceive of living animals as anyone's property." She talks about how the settlers brought a "package of ideas" with them, and I think this is a recurring theme in history of cultures colliding with new ideas and technology being brought together. In general I view animals as a free spirit and no one's property, but when it comes to livestock I perceive them more as property. I think those two culture's views helped form mine.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Inferior rather than, superior**by [Jakob Ramirez](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 9:38 PM

The main issue concerning the relation between natives and the animals was that the indians saw animals differently than the europeans did. Anderson states, "The english perceived of their livestock as property, whereas Indians did not conceive as animals as anyone's property" (audio 1:50 minute mark). The indians did not share the idea that someone could own an animal like the settlers did. Instead they saw animals as things that they coexisted with on Earth, as Anderson supports by stating, "The native view of animals consisted of these creatures being... other than human persons. They were living beings sharing the Earth, who were different from human beings but not necessarily inferior to them" (audio 2:19 minute mark). Indians saw animals as beings that were equal to them but did not share the same physical qualities with them, rather than the english which thought they were superior to the animals. Which I happen to personally agree with the native's thoughts on animals.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Native Americans and Modern Animal Rights Activists**by [Amanda Francis](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 10:52 PM

Virginia Dejohn Anderson says in her book Creatures of Empire that although there are many problematic areas to discuss when it comes to the relationship between colonists and natives, one major aspect that should not be overlooked is the role that animals played. Religion and spirituality have a lot to do with the difference in cultures. Native Americans saw themselves as a part of nature where the Europeans believed through the bible that animals were property. Is this still an issue in our nation today? I think absolutely yes.

Similar to Europeans, Native Americans were hunters and fishermen that heavily relied on animals for food. Europeans believed in domesticating animals for use and profit which differs majorly from Native Americans. As Ward explains, "in Indian culture, animals possessed a spiritual power that was recognized by important rituals when hunting." This alone shows us that natives didn't believe in ownership of the animals but a relationship in which "animal spirits were honored and rewarded." Today we have PETA, the animals' rights activist organization, that states "animals are not ours to eat, wear, experiment on, use for entertainment, or abuse in any way". Although this extreme viewpoint varies from that of Native Americans, I think it shows how issues with entitlement over the lives of animals still exists today.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**How Religion Impacted How Animals Were Viewed**by [Ben Crawford](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:11 PM

The Native Americans and Colonists viewed animals very differently and for good reason too. Natives were more spiritual and saw themselves as "one with the earth" while Colonists seemed to have more of a modern outlook on life which included being more pro-capitalism. Because of these differences, they tended to have disagreements. One of those was the treatment and domestication of animals. On page two of the synopsis of "Creatures of Empire", it states that the Indians viewed hunting as "a reciprocal rather than an exploitative process, in which animal spirits were honoured and rewarded". Meanwhile, page two also states that the Colonists "were prudent and well-organised, following rigorous daily and seasonal routines dictated by climate, habit, economic goals, and their livestock's needs". After reading this, you can infer that the Colonists were indeed more civilized and their attention was directed more towards their own well being and livelihood. Another example that backs this up is found again on page two of the synopsis as Anderson states "it was possible to put a price on every animal from a cow to a swan, from a deer to a hog". Instead of treating animals as spiritual beings like the Indians, Colonists viewed them as an essential commodity.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: How Religion Impacted How Animals Were Viewed**by [Gurpritam Sandhar](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 4:22 PM

Ben, I agree with you when you say that the natives and colonist viewed animals differently. I say this because i feel like that the natives knew what the meaning of respect was when it came to mother nature and its creatures. The points you make about how the natives had spiritual bonds with the earth and the colonist seemed to have more of a “modern outlook” on life was something that I felt DeJohn Anderson felt was also true. She says in the audio that the natives thought of animals as, “Living beings sharing the earth who were different from human beings but not necessarily inferior to them (2:17 minute mark).” On the other hand, the colonist in my opinion were bound to have a mind set of being “pro-capitalist” because no one out of their right mind would leave their mother country, and travel across the ocean to a foreign land just to make new friends.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Animal property issue management**by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Tuesday, October 9, 2018, 5:59 PM

Can you find or determine a connection between this discussion of animals (as property) and any societal or constitutional issues we face in our nation today?

The Animal Bill of Rights encourages representatives to pass legislation that protects animals and gives them rights they deserve. The Animal Welfare Act was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on August 24th, 1966. It is the only Federal law in the United States that regulates the treatment of animals in research, exhibition, transport, and by dealers.

Over 56 billion farmed animals are killed every year by people of different backgrounds, religion, beliefs, and views. This number does not even include fish and sea life whose deaths are so great they are only measured in tons.

Some people would say animals are not simply food products and not anyone's property, but are thinking, feeling individuals who want to enjoy their lives.

As children we are conditioned to view cows, pigs, chickens, sheep and fish as inferior being whose reason for existence is to provide us with meat, milk and eggs.

In the Bible there are some biblical principles that apply. In Genesis 1:26 God declares, “let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” As the highest order of created beings on earth, humanity has full authority. Which gives us dominion over the animals, which includes the right to kill animals for food. Which entails treating animals with dignity, respect, and mercy. Many people do not understand this balance and tend to over-protect or under protect animals.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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

**Different views on the role of animals**by [Owen McCoy](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 5:56 PM

One of the main reasons for conflict was that livestock couldn't be adequately contained and in many cases roamed free and consumed or otherwise damaged Indian food supplies. Another issue was that Indians used traps as a method of hunting, but livestock sometimes got trapped. The settlers held animals as property, the same way they owned land or a house. A key reason for dispute about animals was that the settlers and Indians held animals in very different regards. The settlers believed that God had created man to rule over animals, whereas the Indians viewed them with more respect. Professor Anderson makes the bold claim that animals had a greater impact on the Americas than humans did, but I am not entirely convinced. Animals did help clear land and provide transportation and spread diseases, but humans did all of those things as well. Humans also navigated an ocean, fought wars, depended on each other for survival, and later developed a system of self-government that has endured to this day.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Different views on the role of animals**by [Jakob Ramirez](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 7:52 PM

Owen, I couldn't agree with you more. Especially when Anderson states in the synopsis, "Although livestock could hardly be blamed for everything that happened in early America, they certainly helped to shape the course of events..." (pg 242). After reading this statement I was able to disagree with her bold claim of animals having greater impacts than humans, because she completely contradicts herself.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Different views on the role of animals**by [Amanda Francis](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 12:21 PM

When Anderson says the animals "could hardly be blamed for everything that happened in early America" I don't believe her intentions were to give the animals all the credit for human's advancements, but more that they aren't entirely responsible for the conflicts between the natives and Europeans. All wars weren't over animals. All diseases weren't spread through animals. I think Anderson brings an important perspective into the days of early colonies by showing us how the introduction of livestock did create a lot of problems between the two groups during this time, and I agree when she says they "helped shape the course of events", but I think there were other things going on at this time that played a greater role in shaping history; for better or worse.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Crossing the line**



by [Lisa Schnabel](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 8:17 PM

Today in class the statement from Mr. Escobar that, "GREED (or pursuit of self-interest) is insatiable and a predictable behavior" reminded me of the settlers' ideas about the ownership of land and their animals (lecture Thursday the 11th). As Anderson's asserts, "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). The predictable behavior of the English was being demonstrated by their colonial settlers' appetite for more land. I believe that the animals were not only seen as property but, in time were also used as pawns on a chess board with the winning player gaining land. The settlers knew they could count on a favorable outcome when faced with damaged property (animals). These examples were mentioned by Dr. Ward, "Massachusetts authorities ruled that Indians should build fences around their fields... were simply to seize and impound them, (animals). Such rulings hardly seemed fair to most Indians" and these rulings only led to more tensions between the settlers and Indians. While ambition to improve one's life can be good, the settlers crossed the line when their goals meant they were harming and banishing the Indians.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Crossing the line

by [Amanda Francis](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 12:55 PM

I agree with you about animals being "pawns on a chessboard." At first it seemed like the Europeans would be interested in co-inhabiting land with the natives as long as they took on the colonist view of animal husbandry, but then rules and laws were established that were set up for the natives to inevitably break such as the Europeans letting their animals roam free and prosecuting natives for trying to keep animals out of their fields. Anderson says in the video clip "even when the Indians move thirty miles away, they still can't keep their planting fields from livestock." (minute 6:24). The Europeans weren't interested in sharing the land in a way that made sense for both groups, they were interested in obtaining all of the land.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Crossing the line

by [Gurpritam Sandhar](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 4:52 PM

Lisa, I also thought that yesterdays slides on greed were interesting. I do believe and agree with Mr. Escobar that greed is something that is insatiable. I left class yesterday asking myself, why is it that we (people in general) don't know when to stop when it comes to being greedy. In history, early settlers were greedy for the native peoples land. Today, it seems as if everyone

is in a chase behind money which we can't seem to get enough of. In my opinion, I don't feel like we are born with greed inside of us, its something that we learn as we get older by observing the people around us, especially from our friends and family. In chapter 3 of our class textbook on page 109 the topic of Queen Anne's war and the Yamasee war comes up. In that section it brings up the greed that the Carolinas had for slaves, Murrin writes, "Carolina's greed for Indian slaves and other abuses finally alienated the colony's strongest Indian allies, the Yamasee." Being greedy doesn't lead you to anywhere good, in this case it led to war. The Yamasee war changed the southeast. Carolina split into two separate colonies with their own governments, but it didn't come cheap. People lost their lives not necessarily due to war, but to greed. And like you said at the end of your post, "While ambition to improve one's life can be good, the settlers crossed the line when their goals meant they were harming and banishing the Indians. I agree, people and their greed for more "crossed the line."

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Crossing the line**by [Owen McCoy](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 8:26 PM

That's a very good point, one that I hadn't considered. If you think of the livestock as "pawns on a chess board" then it gives the livestock a very important role in the shaping of early U.S. history. That analogy also makes me lose faith in the settlers' intentions. It's one thing if they're just not actively restraining their animals, but it's another thing entirely if they are deliberately using livestock as a device to accrue land out of greed. I agree that this constitutes "crossing the line," at least by today's standards.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**The significance of livestock**by [Justin Oljace](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 10:43 PM

I strongly agree with the "Creatures of Empire" concept. The significance of being surrounded by livestock as a food resource can't be overlooked. This allowed the settlers to have more time to build houses, form a government, or improve technology. Animals were crucial to the Indians and English settlers. In "Creatures of Empire" Virginia talks about how livestock helped convert Native Americans into herdsman. I realize that the livestock encroached on the Natives land but that also allowed them to farm hogs. In the eleventh paragraph of the article it says, "Soon many Indians were successfully raising hogs, perhaps of most concern to English settlers, successfully competing with them." Livestock were not only a great food resource, but also helped America economically.

When I first read Professor Anderson's statement that animals were more important than the early human leaders like John Smith and Jonathan Winthrop I thought that was pretty silly. After reading the article and listening to the audio I began to understand her argument and even agree with her. Animals helped bring these cultures together and made European colonization of America possible.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The significance of livestock**by [Ben Crawford](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 11:02 PM

The point you make about how the Indians hunting boar perhaps started a competition with the Colonists is something I believe to have really impacted America. All throughout the course of history, many things repeat themselves but in different fashions. One of those things is competition as a driving force behind expansion, growth, and development. Basic human nature feeds into competition and the desire to be the best or to win. Without the Indians there to help push the Colonists, who knows where we would be now or how our societies would have progressed.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Smith and Winthrop vs. Animals**by [Amanda Francis](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 12:05 PM

Do you agree with Professor Anderson's argument that animals were more important as the "main actors" of early American history than the human leaders, such as John Smith or Jonathan Winthrop, who usually get the credit?

I do think animals played an important and often unrecognized role, but I don't agree with Anderson that they were more important than John Smith or Johnathon Winthrop. Even though the Virginian colony of Jamestown is first described in our textbook as a "disaster" and "deathtrap" it states that "The survivors of Jamestown owed their good fortune to the resourcefulness of Captain John Smith." (p.51). Eventually Jamestown moved from surviving to succeeding when John Rolfe started growing tobacco, but none of that could have been achieved if it hadn't been for John Smith. Johnathon Winthrop was the leader of Puritans to Massachusetts Bay. Although the first winter was hard on the first group of New England colonists, the textbook says, "The colony began to prosper after 1650 when Boston merchants opened up West Indian markets for New England grain, lumber, and fish." (p.61). Smith and Winthrop led the way for the first two American colonies. Without them, we wouldn't even be having a conversation about the importance of animals in the colonies.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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

**Animal property issue's view**by [Scott Carpenter](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 6:28 PM

view of animals identifying with: I forgot to mention this in my last post. Indians saw animals as beings that were equal to them and they didn't share physical attributes with them, and then the English which thought they were superior to the animals and used them for their own gain. I think they probably could have learned a lot more from the Indians. If you read Genesis in the bible the story of Creation, both man and animals were vegetarian. It wasn't until God made a covenant with Noah after he came out of the Ark, he offered a sacrifice of clean animals, and God said that he and his family could eat them. Genesis 9:3 Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Lisa Schnabel](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 10:12 PM

Another area Anderson touches on is how English folklore had very similar views, like that of the Indians, concerning animal powers. She says, that in England, "Ladybirds and black cats were bringers of good luck, while in Lancashire magpies were viewed as bringers of such bad

luck" (review 471) and these beliefs even came with directions on what the English were supposed to do, to prevent such luck. These folkloric beliefs were challenged after the Protestant Reformation as to be "popish superstition" (471). And later Anderson states "in one of history's many ironies, religious developments in England encouraged greater disdain for non-Christian ways of viewing the world just at the point when English people encountered the inhabitants of the New World" (p. 57). I thought this to be very interesting piece of information about some of the settlers; however, I do not see it as an excuse for their ill treatment of the Indians.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Creatures of Empire - Importance**by [Maggie Larson](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 11:05 PM

Professor Dejohn Anderson suggests the animals she refers to in Creatures of Empire, may have been more important than the humans of this time period. Although I can agree they were important I just can't see how they could be more important than the settlers and Indians. When the colonizers arrived to their new land, Indians had already been living there and their view of animals was completely different than the colonizers view. Indians perceived the animals as "living beings sharing the earth." (2:35 podcast) They considered

them to be no less than human because they felt they were a natural part of the earth just like them. Colonizers had a different opinion, Professor Anderson also says "The English perceived their livestock as property." (1:56 podcast). These morals conflicted head on with one another resulting in death for many of the animals in the area. In my opinion, if anything the animals were just conflict they had to deal with and I don't see how that could make them more important than the humans who brought some of them there.

Maggie Larson

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Creatures of Empire - Importance

by [Justin Oljace](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 11:35 PM

I enjoyed reading your post and think you made some good points. I like that you described how the Europeans and Indians differed in the way they viewed animals. I personally agree more with DeJohn Anderson and the significance the animals played. When the first settlers made Jamestown 70% of them died from starvation among other things. When a livestock population was established it helped feed the English and Natives, turned some Native Americans into herdsman, and beef became a huge part of Americas economy which benefited everyone. In the eleventh paragraph of the article it says, "So successful were Indian herdsman that they soon attracted the colonial farmers who made it clear that owning livestock did not turn Indians into Englishmen." This shows how everyone benefited from livestock. War came around because people got greedy. Europeans wanted more beef and it got out of hand when the livestock got way into Indian territory. It's crazy to think that it could have been a lot more peaceful if people put up a few fences.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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

◀ [Creatures of Empire](#)

[Puritanism & Islam](#) ▶

◀ [Chapter 3 Quiz \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...



[CLICK HERE for Forum 1 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#) ▶

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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

[HST 201 F18 \(Escobar Meta 20749 22611\)](#)

? GET HELP

[SHED \(Student Help Desk\)](#)

[ATC \(Instructor Help Desk\)](#)

[How to use Moodle \(Basics for Students\)](#)

[IT Services](#)

[Computer Labs](#)

[Tutoring Services](#)

[Library](#)

[Get the mobile app](#)