

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](#)

[Creatures of Empire](#) ▶

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](#)



Main problem concerning relations between new animals and Natives

by [Tyler Weiss](#) - Saturday, October 6, 2018, 12:18 PM

In response to the question asking about what Virginia DeJohn Anderson suggests was the main problem, concerning the Natives first introduction to the strange, new animals that arrived with the early settlements, I will reference the audio clip of the interview she gave with [Backstory with the American History Guys](#). Early in the interview she states how the biggest problem for the Natives was struggling with how the English settlers viewed

their livestock as property that they exercised dominance over (Backstory, 1:50). This was difficult for them because they had never viewed animals as inferior to human beings. In the article reviewing DeJohn Anderson's book, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America*, Dr. Matthew Ward brings up the section where DeJohn Anderson states how in many Indian languages there isn't a word to distinguish "animals," in general, apart from humans. They just have different words for each individual species (Reviews in History, paragraph 3). This contrast in beliefs led to serious problems as Natives began to kill cattle that they would find in their traps, or pigs that were destroying their crop fields (Backstory, 3:20). To the Natives, having animals as property was not something they could conceive of, and so when they would be hauled into court and faced criminal charges, they were unlikely to adhere to the charges (Reviews in History, paragraph 5).

I find this contrast in viewpoints very interesting to look at, because even long before I ever learned about Native American culture and their relationship to animals, I had always had a very similar viewpoint myself. For me, it began with looking at cats and dogs, and the relationships that human beings currently have with each of them. It's not that I don't like dogs, I love them. However, I have always struggled with the obvious differences between having a dog as a pet versus having a cat. Having owned cats my whole life, I have always been fascinated with the level of independence that they can have for a domesticated animal. My sister owns a dog however, and I have had many friends who have owned dogs, and in almost every one of those cases that I have been able to witness, the dog not only depends much more on the company of the owner, or any human that is around for that matter, but in most cases, devotes almost all of its attention to them as well. I have always struggled with the question of how much do dogs get to think for themselves, or perceive the world around them through their own lens? It was these observations of domesticated cats and dogs that has caused me to look at the relationships between humans and animals differently. I try not to differentiate between animals and humans. Instead I try to see us as another species of animal sharing the same environment.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Tyler Anthony-Travers](#) - Saturday, October 6, 2018, 4:04 PM

Anderson suggests that the main problem between Native Americans and European Settlers is the different cultural views of the property rights of animals. Anderson says that Native Americans viewed animals as different living creatures that co-inhabited the world. The Native Americans hunted, domesticated, and subsisted on the animals in America, but didn't have a concept of ownership over them. This heavily conflicted with the European view that animals can be bought, sold, and traded, and that there were consequences for damaging one's property. In my world, I would like to say that I have the mentality that is closer to the Native Americans, but I have a hypocritical view of some animals having more rights than others. Cows, chickens, and fish are farmed in incredibly inhumane

ways, but I still support those companies by buying their food. However, if a company was treating dogs or some other animal more associated with being pets I would find it disgusting and would not support it anyway. So I lean closer towards the European mentality for some animals, and more towards the Native American mentality for others, and recognize the hypocrisy in that.

I think that the European view of animals shows their mentality on many different subjects, and one that has carried over into a lot of today's issues. As I mentioned earlier, the view of livestock as subhuman is why many are treated so poorly today. This could also have an impact on why slaves brought over to American colonies were treated as terribly as they were. The concept of ownership over an animal that a European viewed as less than them was transferred to people and they were just as cruel, if not moreso.

I also feel that Anderson is totally correct in her idea that conflict between early European settlers and Native American tribes was the cultural differences with animal and land ownership. Had Europeans kept their grazing livestock to the land they had claimed, and had the communication of ownership been more clear, maybe direct conflict could have been avoided between settlers and Native Americans.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Morgan Graham](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 11:18 PM

Hey Tyler! Really great post. It honestly got me thinking a lot. For one, I didn't even realize the hypocrisy in my views either. I claim that I'm this big animal lover, yet I buy meat products that support this horrible industry. I also have a dog and couldn't imagine anything like what happens in the meat/dairy industry happening to her. I think that if the English adopted more of the Indian ways we would live in a much different society in terms of how our animals are treated. One thing I disagree on, is where you said that: "conflict between European settlers and Native American tribes was the differences with animal and land ownership" and that maybe that could have been avoided had Europeans gone about it differently. Yes, I do believe maybe some conflict could have been avoided but I still think they would have tons of issues. The English came here wanting to own everything and be in charge of everything. I don't think they ever really wanted to live side by side with the Indians. The video we watched in class showed it all when the Pilgrim women had that look of disgust on her face when an Indian tried to help her. I do think that the differences in how they treated animals did create a big divide between them, I don't think it was the end all be all between them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: Animal vs. Human

by [Alivia Garcia-Irwin](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 9:53 PM

I completely agree with you on the question of animal rights in today's world and what puts one over the other as what is acceptable to eat and what is acceptable to have as a pet. I believe it comes down to the perceived intelligence of the animal, and I believe the Native Americans of course having the view that they are on the same level and are the same as the animal are not going to want dominance over the animals like the Europeans. Its interesting because this was a huge issue back then and still is today with Vegans vs non vegans and the question of morality for these animals. We as a society of course accept eating cows and chickens but when it comes to dogs and cats we could not imagine. We view animals as Native Americans would only when the animal has intelligence or can give us some sort of companionship much like another human. But put animals in the property and ownership level when we can benefit from them and make profit, fur, constant product (milk). Overall I still find the whole debate and topic very interesting how we still have the same moral questions as we did way back then.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Dylan Mecchi](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:55 AM

Professor DeJohn Anderson suggested that the animals were more strange than the European settlers, because the Indians have had previous encounters with foreign people before the settlers. "They encountered them when ship captains and fisherman had stopped off the coast so there had already been encounters with the Europeans, but not until European settlement occurred that they would see the animals the settlers brought over." said by DeJohn in the audio file. She suspected that the Indians would have seen the animals when they were not near a colonist. They probably saw the domesticated pigs or cattle in the forest and wondered "What is this? Why is it here? And What do I do with it?" said DeJohn. This makes a lot of sense because the Indians did not view animals as the Europeans did. The Indians did not see animals as personal property and that they were fair game to use for whatever purpose they wanted. This must have been a strange concept to them thinking that this animal was someone's property and they can just kill it for food. The problem was that the Indians could not perceive animals as property. The Indians did not have "The dominion that goes back to the bible and christian traditions that backs the idea of owning animals as personal property." said the interviewer. This idea must have been hard to wrap around the native people's heads and they saw that human beings were sharing the earth with other animals. They were different from human beings but not lesser than them. The Indians saw animals as spiritual protectors and this idea was "heretical to the English Christians". The problem was that the settlers didn't have full control over their livestock. These animals were trespassing on Indian planting fields and destroying crops, digging up the land and creating damage to the Indian foodstock. There's even evidence of English pigs going to the coast and digging up shellfish when the tides were low which the native people relied on for food. The English animals would eat the same bark, grass or plants that the animals the Indians would hunt for ate and that would hurt the population of deer and other animals that were hunted for. The Indians in the North also hunted with traps, instead of bow and arrow. If a Englishmans animal were

to walk into these traps and they were injured or killed they would be held liable for the damage of property. The Indian that is held liable for this damage of one's property would be held in court and be seen as a criminal. This whole idea was hard to grasp for the Indians and I totally agree that the Indians must have struggled with this idea much more than there being new settlers coming to the Americas.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Morgan Graham](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 11:28 PM

Hey Dylan,

I really liked how you included in your post that the Indians could be tried as criminal if an English persons livestock got killed in one of their traps. I had no idea that happened, and the whole idea seems ludicrous to me. This sort of changes my view a little on what I first initially thought. At first, I decided that the animals were not the main source of conflict between the settlers and native Americans but now, I'm starting to shift my view a little. If the settlers animal's were getting killed in Indians traps I could see how that is a problem to them. Their food source was already low enough as it was and for this to happen was probably a big deal. Although they definitely didn't need to charge the Indians as being criminals. With all that happening I can see exactly why they would start to be hostile towards each other. Although I still go back to thinking how land ownership was a bigger source of conflict. But maybe I think that because this is a new idea that I never thought of and whenever I would learn about Indians vs the pilgrims I just would hear about their conflict over land.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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



Religious influences on our view of animals

by [Abigail Gierut](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 8:15 PM

Professor DeJohn Anderson pointed out that the main problem was that the European settlers saw animals very differently than the Indians. She refers to the settlers view on animals as livestock as a package of ideas that the Indians had a very different view on. "The English perceived their livestock as property, whereas the Indians did not conceive of living animals as anyone's property" (Professor Anderson, interview 1:40). These differing viewpoints can be boiled down to their religious and spiritual beliefs. The English believed that they had a god given right to control over animals because they were taught from the very beginning of their religion that man had "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." (Genesis 1:26, KJV). On the other hand, the Indians saw themselves as no different from other animal predators and believed that animals had spiritual power. "Native Americans relationship with animals was largely reciprocal, reflecting their belief that many creatures possessed their own spiritual power or manitou" (Paragraph 3, Synopsis of Creatures of Empire). I can only imagine how disrespectful the English settlers seemed to treat their animals in the eyes of the Indians and also how the

settlers might have seen the Indians higher regards of animals as ridiculous or even sinful because it could have been seen as worship, which was very frowned upon in the christian religion. My personal view on this matter leans a little more towards the Indians point of view. I do believe that we aren't much different from the animals that we refer to as livestock and that animals should be treated with more respect since they're such an important aspect of our daily life and our own culture and they are animals like us just lower on the food chain. I don't share the belief that animals have spiritual powers but I do share the respect for animals in being a huge part of our survival and our luxuries.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

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



Domesticated animals in early America and how it affected Native Americans

by [Morgan Graham](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 10:27 PM

1. 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?:

Dejohn Anderson suggests that the main problem was concerning these animals and their relations was how differently the Indians and European settlers viewed them. The settlers viewed animals as property and the Indians just had no concept of that. In Anderson's book, "Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America" it states that: "The English were interested in taming and domesticating animals. Indeed, taming a wild animal gave a degree of ownership over the animal. Ownership of animals was a concept completely alien to Native Americans. North America's Indians had no important domesticated animals before contact with Europeans. 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. Englishmen and Native Americans both saw hunting as an enjoyable and worthy pursuit, although Native Americans would not have understood the concept of hunting merely for sport." I find that fascinating because what Indians thought about the animals the settlers brought over and the concept of domestication has never even crossed my mind. I guess I just assumed Indians had domesticated animals as well.

2. 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?: Obviously the human leaders, such as John Smith or Jonathan Winthrop usually get credit for early American history. And in my opinion, rightfully so. I think this whole creature of the empire thing and animals being the "main actors" is extremely interesting and something I have never thought of. But I just think that the humans had a little bit more to do with the colonization and history of early America. Of course I think animals had to do so much with how everything turned out but I wouldn't go as far to say that they were the main actors.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**A Slight Disagreement on the Role of Animals in Shaping Early American History**by [Tyler Anthony-Travers](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 7:41 PM

Hey Morgan,

While I can see where you're coming from with your second point, I disagree with your point that John Adams, John Winthrop, or other "main actors" were more important to shaping the relationship between European settlers and Native Americans than their animals were. Anderson's research and interview seem to suggest that the European livestock exacerbated early conflict between both groups.

Now, of course I'm not claiming that any individual pig or deer was more important than colonial or indigenous leader, but the conflicts created by the ideological views of animals were a clear dividing factor in the relationships between Native American tribes and new European settlements. Anderson stated in her interview that the most significant difference was the idea of property rights over animals and the idea that they had sovereignty or dominion over them; while Native Americans viewed them as "other than human creatures" that inhabited the world with them. So while Europeans and Native Americans had wildly different views on any number of subjects, this problem was right in front of them all the time. Breeding and raising livestock was as integral to sustaining European settlements as hunting was to feeding Native American tribes.

Anderson states that conflict was created by livestock trespassing and infringing on Native American food sources. This lead not to some great ideological or theological conflict between different cultures, but to case by case conflicts over one group claiming destruction of property and another claiming to be hunting.

Overall, I feel that the cultural views of animals created many of the early conflicts that later were exacerbated by leaders of the different groups. I find that this leads to the question, which is more to blame for a fire, the spark, or the fuel?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: A Slight Disagreement on the Role of Animals in Shaping Early American History**by [Morgan Graham](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 10:57 PM

Hey Tyler,

The more and more I am reading other people's posts and reading your comment to mine, I am starting to kind of lean towards the side that maybe animals did have a bigger part then I am giving them credit for. At first, I just couldn't see how the differences in how they treat their animals could have made such a large impact, but I'm starting to sort of understand why. But also, if the Indians and English settlers had the same view of animals from the beginning do you think that everyone could have lived in harmony with each other? Or at least been more nice towards each other?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**European Vs. Native American views of livestock and importance**by [Alivia Garcia-Irwin](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:45 PM

European vs Native American views on livestock and their importance

Alivia Garcia-Irwin

1. One of the key points DeJohn Anderson made was that the problem with these new encounters with animals was that the Native Americans and Europeans had drastically different views on these livestock animals. The Europeans believed that the livestock was their property and was a sense of great importance to them in relation of what the animal could give to the Europeans ex: Food, milk, etc. The Native Americans however had a much different view of these animals and thought of them as DeJohn states in the podcast "living beings sharing the earth". (Audio 2:32) They even believed some of the other larger animals were spiritual protectors. The way I view animals is aligned with the Native Americans mostly I believe they are important to this earth and should be treated with respect but I also know meat and farming animals as property is essential to America today.
2. The religious aspect was also essential. The Native Americans believed in spirits and other things Christians would view as ungodly. It would be wrong for them to believe in things like spiritual protectors if it did not align with their religious practices and beliefs on god. I can't say I necessarily believe animals are spiritual protectors but I can agree with the idea that animals are sacred in their own way.
3. In our Nation today we can relate to this property ownership topic in many different ways. Such as social class and the way we think about how we are living in society. Having a group of people say one group or race is more inferior than the other. It might be a stretch but I think it relates to how Native Americans saw all living beings the same and no being was really inferior in a sense.
4. I agree with the "Creatures of empire" concept and how important and what a key role these animals played in the lives of Europeans and Native Americans. It affected their relationship in negative ways mainly. An example from the Text (pg.81 Ch.3) states "

violence erupted between Indians and English.... Free running hogs and cows ruined Indian's cornfields." showing how the animals played a role in the relationship between the two.

5. I don't know that i necessarily agree these animals were more important than John smith or other important people in this part of history. But I can fully agree that without these animals played a key part in the relationship between Native Americans and Europeans and more or less added even more tension.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Kyle Schmidt](#) - Tuesday, October 9, 2018, 6:42 PM

I personally don't think that the Native Americans had any problems with the animals themselves. I find it hard to believe that finding a stray pig in the forest was all that distressing. Sure it was probably off putting to see a strange creature they had never seen before in the land that they knew like the back of their hands. However, these animals did not cause any problems. There's no way a pig or cow would attack a Native and even if they did its a lot less threatening than a bear or wolf. Even if the tribes were scared of these animals at first the really scary part was when they started being viewed as criminals and were charged with poaching. The real problem was a difference in beliefs, the natives didn't understand the concept of owning animals in the first place. Once the confusion wore off the natives had a lot bigger problems than the animals, the colonists had yet another reason to hate them. The native americans see animals as equal and free, they even honored them as a part of their spirituality. They believe humans should live in harmony with the earth and that included flora and fauna. At least as far as my understanding goes I will do more reaserch for future posts and look forward to the comments I get.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Morgan Graham](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 11:24 PM

Hey Kyle! Really great post, I definitely lean towards your opinion a lot. When I first read the article and listened to the podcast these were kind of my initial thoughts as well. I think the Indians and English had much bigger problems between them then the concept of owning animals. To my understanding, even if they did see an animal on their land that they didn't recognize, I don't think they would be angry. I think the settlers were more mad at the natives for other things then how they treated their animals. Their main conflicts I think stem more from ownership of land and things like that.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Kyle Schmidt](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 6:15 PM

Hi! Im really glad you responded to my post because the whole week I forgot about how ownership of land probably played an even larger role than the domestication of animals. Sure the Native americans had territories among tribes but that was very far off from the land being your legal property and the destruction of land being a punishable crime.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Abigail Gierut](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 9:36 PM

Kyle, I actually disagree with your statement that "these animals did not cause any problems" aside from the Indians and the settlers different views on owning animals. The animals caused many problems between the European settlers and the natives, not because these new animals were physically threatening predators or even entirely because of the different beliefs. The conflict between the two was mainly because the settlers didn't contain their animals on their own land. "The English did not have full control over their animals behavior" (Professor Anderson, interview 3:10). "The high cost and chronic shortage of manual labor meant that colonists were forced to allow their animals to roam free in the woods, rather than penning them into enclosed fields." (Paragraph 4, Synopsis of Creatures of Empire) Because of their lack of control over the animals, they were left to roam and cause damage to Indian crops and caused conflict between the settlers and natives in other ways. "English animals trespassing on Indian planting fields and destroying crops and digging up the land and so on; creating real damage to the Indians subsistence practices. Bringing in animals from a completely different continent also messed with the ecosystem already in place in the Americas.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Dylan Mecchi](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 9:05 PM

The differences between the settler's and the Indian's culture greatly explains why the Indians had trouble with the "property" the English settlers brought over. In the article that summarizes Professor DeJohn's book "Creatures of Empire" there is a piece that talks about the Indian language, " In Indian languages, for instance, there was no word to distinguish 'animals' in general from humans, simply words to identify separate species." This shows that the Indians had believed that they were no more important than animals and they saw themselves as just another species. The English on the other hand saw themselves as a higher power than the animals they co-inhabited the world with. These two cultural differences played a huge role in why the settlement for the English was so

difficult. Since these two peoples had such a different view on what animals were to them it made living with one another very much harder. I personally am split on these ideas. On one hand I do believe that us humans only co-exist with other species and we should be treating them as we would ourselves. I believe when we make decisions that is to alter the environment, that we should be deciding to do so based on how it may affect the animals living around us. The issue with the idea of humans being seen as higher than any other species is that we are treating some animals very horribly and using them for our own good as we please. On the other hand I do partially understand why the idea that humans are higher than other species because I see many animals as property and to be used for a purpose. Take cattle for instance, I believe that using cattle to graze property and use them for harvestation is ok, but treating the cattle in terrible ways is not right. I do support these acts by using products that do indeed treat these animals in harmful ways which makes me split on these two ideas

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Kyle Schmidt](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 1:55 PM

In our Country today we often run into similar issues that plagued the colonists hundreds of years ago. Property of land and animals is often times a gray area in our society and history. For example if a dog kills someones sheep you cant exactly charge the dog itself because it dosn't know any better. If it is a wild dog usually it is just killed but if it is a domesticated animal the owner can be pinned with the expenses. This is just one example of an issue we face today that directly relates to the relationship between the Native americans and early colonists. The Natives did not know that creatures could even belong to people in the first place. They believe they are one in the same as the animals and didnt even have a word to distinguish humans only to seperate species. (Creatures of Empire synopsis) This is also scientifically true considering that humans are also mammals. I digress because this was before a time of science when according to the bible man had dominion over the earth and the animals that inhabited it. Here we see the problem and one of the many reasons the native americans and the colonists could never quite trust one another or agree on just about anything. Their core beliefs differed in just about every way possible. The Indians thought that hunting and killing animals was part of the natural system as animals do this in the wild. In addition to this they even honored the animals for giving them food and shelter and used every piece of the animal even the bones and tendons as a way of remembering the beasts in their spirituality. However in christianity the colonists believed it was their god ordained right to breed, own and kill animals. The part of this that I find darkly humorous and left out in my first post is that the native americans realized this eventually. After years of being pinned with charges for killing livestock and having to find ways to compensate farmers without any for of currency the native americans realized the beliefs of the colonists. The funny part is once they learned this they started killing even more livestock and even destroying crops of the colonists. It seems to me like something a child would do as soon as they realized something they could do that would not only anger the colonists but the king himself they began doing it as much as they possibly could. Needless to say this only deterirorated

relationships further and led to more direct conflicts between the colonists and natives. Personally I do not agree with the author of the book *Creatures of Empire* that the animals caused more problems than the humans themselves because while the animals may have sparked a large amount of conflict, there was already plenty of that to go around. Since the start the native Americans and settlers were extremely hostile and distrustful towards one another. While the animals were a topic of argument and violence this was more due to their difference in beliefs and spirituality than about the animals themselves.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2


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


Is this One Instance of a Larger Phenomena?

 by [Zane Hiam](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 1:39 PM

I found this audio clip very fascinating. In history classes before, I've learned about many aspects of early colonial conflict. The settlements, the wars, the diseases. But I must admit, learning about the animals the colonists brought with them is a first for me.

I suppose it's a good representation of a larger dichotomy, that being the traditional hunter/gatherer lifestyle of the Native Americans and the more agrarian culture the colonists brought with them. Throughout history, almost every society has had to make this transition. While the agricultural revolution happened too early in Europe's history for us to get a good idea of what happened, the way Native Americans dealt with the arrival of domestic animals might give us some idea as to the conflicts that must have happened throughout the world as various cultures underwent the same transition.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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


Re: Is this One Instance of a Larger Phenomena?

 by [Kyle Schmidt](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 6:22 PM

I liked your post because I strongly agree that this specific problem between the natives and colonists highlighted much larger social and spiritual differences between the two peoples. I tend to think that the animals may not have been the source of the problem. Perhaps the poaching and destruction of crops were not due to the strangeness of the situation or confusion. I believe the natives were angered by the ownership of land and animals. As if relations weren't bad enough between the two groups already these events brought light to their differences in religion which probably also greatly bothered the Quakers and Puritans. Whether the Natives were acting out of malice or retaliation or even fear of the unknown makes hardly any difference. Like you said the differences go much deeper than that.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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


Are Animals Considered Property?

 by [Nathan Edwards](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 2:26 PM

I think Anderson's main problem concerning the animals and the relation to the Indians was that the Indians didn't consider animals to be property as the Europeans had thought (audio at 1:48). The Indians knew that animals were living creatures and therefore couldn't be considered as property. "In Indian languages, for instance, there was no word to distinguish 'animals' in general from humans, simply words to identify separate species." (paragraph 3 of article). So the Indians knew the animals weren't human but couldn't communicate it to the Europeans. To the Europeans though, "they were an economic resource to be manipulated and exploited" (paragraph 3 of article). I don't believe animals should be used simply for economic gain. Animals should be tended to and taken care of as we are supposed to do. They are more than just property and the Indians realized that.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Are Animals Considered Property?

by [Tyler Anthony-Travers](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 8:02 PM

Hey Nathan,

While I agree that the main issue between European and Native Americans were the property rights of animals, I disagree with the idea that the lack of communication was the problem that developed between them. The audio clip explains that the European view of dominion and sovereignty over animals and property created enough conflict with Native Americans that it eventually led to King Philip's War. Very early in the war, John Easton meets with Metacom to discuss the reason for the war, and Metacom cites grievances about moving 30 miles beyond European borders, but still couldn't keep European livestock off of their land. He also voiced his belief that when European settlers bought land that meant that they would keep their livestock on their own land. If they weren't going to keep their livestock on their own land, and couldn't keep their livestock within 30 miles of their own land, but still felt it was within their right to punish Native Americans for damaging their property, the problem doesn't lie in the communication the problem lies in the way Europeans viewed the Native American tribes.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Religious differences between the English & Native Americans

by [Morgan Graham](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 11:52 PM

This post is in response to the question, "How did religious differences between these two peoples play a role, and to which spiritual/cultural view of animals do you more closely identify?" I think that religious differences played a large role in the way that the English and Native Americans treated animals. To my understanding, the Indians didn't really have a "religion." They probably didn't even know what that meant. But of course, they were

extremely spiritual. In the *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* book DeJohn Anderson says, "Native Americans viewed themselves as part of, rather than distinct from, the natural world. In Indian languages, for instance, there was no word to distinguish 'animals' in general from humans, simply words to identify separate species. Native Americans' relationship with animals was largely reciprocal, reflecting the belief that many creatures possessed their own spiritual power or manitou." To me, this means that Native Americans believed that they were equal to animals. They didn't own the right to them, but they could hunt them out in the wild because it helped them stay alive. DeJohn Anderson also goes on to say that, "For English colonists, in contrast, animals were property over which they had a biblically ordained right to assert dominion; they were an economic resource to be manipulated and exploited." This quote interested me, so I wanted to find a verse from the Bible that implied that humans had a right to be dominant over animals. What I found was a verse from Genesis 1:26-28. The very end of the verse says, "And God said to them, 'be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on earth.'" I think that could be taken in a couple different ways. Maybe it meant that man were suppose to protect all living things. I think humans really went to the extreme, especially now a days where in our dairy and meat industry the animals are treated just terrible. These two quotes from the book and the Bible show how drastically different their views on animals were. I think this definitely drove a divide between them. Especially because food is kind of the center of everyone's life so a conflict stemming from a way to get food makes sense that it would cause a divide between them. In my personal opinion, I would identify more with the Indians view of animals. Although I am a hypocrite because I consume meat and dairy products, in my perfect world it wouldn't be that way.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2


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

Re: Religious differences between the English & Native Americans

 by [Nathan Edwards](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 3:02 PM

I'm sure the Indians had some sort of religion even if they don't elaborate on it. From what I've learned, Indians worshiped all types of gods such as the sun and moon god. But I agree that men are called to take care of the earth and every creature that inhabits it. Just as Morgan mentioned, we're supposed to "protect all living things." Although, I also believe God has given us the privilege to eat meat because he has deemed it holy. God has given us the earth so I think that puts us above animals as far as superiority goes. I think we should protect the animals but I still think it's ok to eat from them as well.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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

Re: The bible and food

 by [Alivia Garcia-Irwin](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 11:26 PM

I thought it was super interesting how you brought up the quote from the bible and kind of how it could be interpreted in a different way. I think we as humans like you said have the tendency to take things to the extreme most of the time. Either one side or the other. I especially agree with you on the Food and Meat industry and how we go about that today. The awful and inhumane way we treat these animals and what we feed them. This debate on animals has obviously been going on for a long time but I liked the way you put it as food being basically a part of enter of our lives it is something essential to us. It just comes to show how our way of thinking about animals hasn't really changed since the Europeans. We are still okay with the ownership and productions of animals. Its conflicting because in many ways we are like a mix of the Native American view on animals and the European today. We are aware of how our animals are processed and treated and the majority of us feel bad about it but continue to eat it. But also we understand that we cant just have millions of animals free roaming all the time. But I really liked how in this post the bible was brought up and a verse to help explain the extreme kind of thinking that was going on regarding animals and creatures of the earth.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Dylan Mecchi](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 9:21 PM

I strongly agree with the concept of "Creatures of the Empire" because it makes complete sense. If I were in the Indians' shoes I would be a lot more confused with what to do with these new animals the settlers brought over since they are considered "property". Putting myself into they're shoes I feel like the struggle of trying to learn the concept of these people owning animals as personal property would be much more difficult than seeing new people come and start settlements on the land. Such as in the article "Creature of the Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America", it states, "When English settlers arrived they saw an untamed wilderness waiting to be civilised. Central to this 'civilisation' was the introduction of European agricultural practices, in particular the introduction of livestock. The cow more than any other animal, requiring constant attention and care, providing meat, milk and manure, symbolised English agricultural superiority. Not only would the landscape become civilised, but most settlers believed that by converting Indians into herdsman of cattle they would quickly become settled and civilised", would be hard to grasp quickly and create conflict with each other. If this concept of owning animals as property was brought out to the Indians was eased into the conversion/understanding to this practice would have gone a lot more smoothly. The English should have been more understanding to the fact that the Indians lived their lives much differently than them and certain cultural aspects of the Englishmen would have been seen as alien to the Indians. "Ownership of animals was a concept completely alien to Native Americans. North America's Indians had no important domesticated animals before contact with Europeans". I strongly agree with this concept but on the other hand I understand that the ideas the English people practiced was more sustainable than using hunting tactics to rely on for food.

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

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[◀ Creatures of Empire](#)[Creatures of Empire ▶](#)[◀ Chapter 3 Quiz \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

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