

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](#)



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [James Carr](#) - Sunday, October 7, 2018, 2:37 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?

It sounds like she was getting at the fact that they were invasive to their way of life. They were eating their foods, disrupting vegetation and other animals that the natives used for hunting. I suppose I see animals in this way, but I also see humans in this way. Any living organism in a large population affects everything around them and foreign animals introduced to a new region will certainly disrupt that ecosystem.

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

The natives view animals as equals (to some extent) whereas the Europeans had the dominion mindset like most people have today. Personally, I don't believe in a soul or assigning any special value to something just because it's an animal or a human. I assign values based on personal experience, investments, and emotion. I could care less whether a living thing over in Russia that gets hit by a train is a human or a horse, but if that was my horse or a relative of mine, it would matter a great deal. I love my own dog over the life of a stranger, simply because I have no value placed on them and I don't have any doctrine to tell me what value to place on things. Just don't look at me as someone with no moral compass- it's not that simple.

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?

Are we talking about slavery? I don't see any domestication of humans outside of the BDSM community now days.

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?

It certainly is worthy of discussion. I absolutely think animals played a huge role in American history but I don't think much would have changed in the long run. Settlement would have been delayed but as society, technology, and population progressed and grew, it would be inevitable that this nation would be colonized by people other than natives.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Creatures of Empire: Reply

by [Annie Taylor](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 8:09 PM

I see where you may have gotten your answer but the answer is more within the connection of the issues you implied. Yes there was a big problem of the Europeans livestock eating away at native crops and such, but I see the problem more as the European's taking there animals as property. Once the Indians had seen these creatures in there territory they didn't know how to deal with them, so they took care the animals in any other way they would to an native animal that would causes problems which would be too kill or get ride of the animal. Since the animals were property the Europeans would take the native who was responsible for the killing or damage of the animal to court with a crime case.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


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

Creatures of Empire: The main problem for the Indians and Europeans A.T

 by [Annie Taylor](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 12:53 AM

Dejohn Anderson suggested during a podcast series *"Backstory with the American history guys"* a reason for a possibility main problem that the Indians and Europeans had once the Europeans settled in Americas in the 1600's. That problem was highly the livestock the Europeans brought with them, because the livestock was know to be property. As mentioned by Anderson during the podcast that Indians had already come across a range of different European explores way before settlement started to occur. For the Indians seeing the European Settlers wouldn't have been a big shock since they already have had encounters with others but when the settlers brought over there livestock lead to a range of many different difficult problems (*"The Beast Within BackStory 2016."*). The problems presented by Anderson were ideas such as pigs and cattle eating away at fields and harvest crops grown by the Indians and also eating way food sources in hunting fields, along with if a European settlers livestock gets injured or killed that Indian could be sent to court for the destruction of property (*"The Beast Within BackStory 2016"*).

Within todays society livestock can be owned as property mainly by farmers but under the limits of restricting Stock to only roam in owned land. As I had grown up I had knowledge that many animals were free and unowned by anyone but yet livestock animals were owned everywhere, I agree that I do look at livestock to be owned as property based off of how our society today strives to live. We don't possess the need to hunt for survival if we have livestock be one of todays main sources of food.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2


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

Creatures of Empire: Religous Differences A.T

 by [Annie Taylor](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 8:35 AM

As the settlers livestock intertwined with the native animals to the land there was a grasp that the Europeans and Indians held different views towards animals. In DeJohns Andersons review of her book *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* she claims that "Native Americans viewed themselves as part of, rather than distance from, the natural world... Native Americans relationship with animals was largely reciprocal, reflecting the belief that many creatures possessed their own spiritual power or manitou" (Anderson Par3). while the Indians Viewed the animals in a more spiritual and more humanly way Anderson stated that animals to the settlers where mainly just an economic resource " animals where property over which they had a biblically ordained right to assert dominion; they were an economic resource to be manipulated and exploited" (Anderson Par3).

Myself I am more closely identify towards animals as an economic resource but don't get me wrong I also view that animals are a living natural creature that should be respected on all levels. Just as resource animals provide many people the world provision services rather than a spiritual outlook.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Emma Powell](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 12:07 PM

DeJohn Anderson suggests the main problem is the english bringing animals to America for the settlers there. The Native Americans had never seen animals like these before, they had previously encountered animals like deer and the wild prey they hunted but when these new animals showed up they were surprised, had never dealt with these new creatures.

Native Americans were hunters, therefore they would set traps to catch and injury deer or other things for their tribes, when these new animals arrived and got caught in their traps they didn't know what to do, these animals were property to the english settlers. Not only was there a dispute over animals in traps and roaming freely but the animals were destroying native american crop fields and farm lands, they didn't know any better and at this time the native americans had no reason to be protecting their crops and the settlers did what they thought was right, these issues would eventually spark issue and be one of many causes for war between the two. This isn't something I would've expected to happen around those times, at this point in history the settlers seemed pretty set on keeping their animals to themselves, they didn't have he best relationship with native americans so it would've made sense if they had kept the animals contained to keep those animals just for themselves.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Bryce Moore](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 11:17 PM

I like how you reiterated that natives were hunters and used the animals for their prey. It gives us another look on how these animals helped out the culture of the natives. While also bringing in a new culture to the English whom they've never seen before. They use to kill these animals but now they realize these animals are more affective helping them. Great job

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

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



Concerning the Animals

by [Reed Battaglia](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 3:38 PM

After listening to DeJohn Andersons on the audio I think the biggest problem, concerning these animals was that the animals where "more alien" (audio 1:08) to the Indians than anything. Also, the animals would trespass onto the Indians land where the natives would be growing crops and eat their crops which the they would rely on for food. Looking from a point of view now is kind of a hard thing to do, but if there was someone else's animal going through my field and eating the food I was growing and relied on, then yes I would view them as the same way Indians did.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



Creatures of Empire: connections to society A.T

by [Annie Taylor](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 7:56 PM

How does a situation back in the 1600's relate or connect to situations in todays society? Well the answer can be very bored and very hard to see or understand. I believe there is many connections but I am caught on the idea of the population and the effect it takes on animals not so much animals being known as property. We however have taken over the "property" or land of animals and this caught my attention more. As new settlers were arriving could have brought some conflict between animals and there home land. The more and more our society expands the more dangerous it becomes for free undomesticated animals . As industries expand and the population grows catching the attention for more living space we have come to the over taking of natural habitats from animals to make room for our own human society, bring along a destruction of food sources and hunting grounds for many animals. Back in 1600's the over taking of European settlers would be the moving impact or start of a flow of more and more settlement within the land and overtaking it from the native animals that had lived there.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



Re: Creatures of Empire: connections to society A.T

by [Emma Powell](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 11:30 AM

Annie, interesting point. When I saw this question I wasn't sure how I could relate it to our current world. Your point about how as humans we are taking over the habitat of animals is so true I think it reflects on the part of the settlers taking over the land of the indians not only with their own lives and families but their newfound livestock. It's devastating to think as people not only our personal land but commercial land, pollution and more we are taking over the land of animals, I can only empathize with them and

relating it to the how the indians must've felt with their homes, and land, even their food source. Thank you for helping bring this to light.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Creatures of Empire: connections to society A.T

by [Donald Laskey](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 11:13 PM

I think that you are right about how the settlers took over the Indians food source, homes, and land. It was devastating how the settlers treated the Indians after they helped us adapt to this new environment. and I do believe that people today treat the environment bad with their trash. The pollution is bad in some places too and I think that they should try to help the environment by trying to produce a cleaner emissions. what I disagree on is that there are environmentalists out there that are taking it to far and taking the jobs from our fellow Americans, like for example logging. My hometown used to be booming with mills and logging companies then the environmentalists came over and put too high of regulations because they are trying to protect a bird. with that it slowly closed down all three mills and a lot of the logging companies. Then town slowly turned to nothing and the middle school closed down do to all of the people moving away. I wish that my home town could become the same as it used to be, but I don't know yet. thank you.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Creatures of Empire: connections to society A.T

by [Logan Habib](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 9:13 PM

I agree with Annie that the expansion of industry and population threatens the natural land that animals live on. I also would like to bring up that the main societal issue regarding animals today, in my opinion, is the treatment of animals in testing environments. For example, animals are treated very inhumanely in cosmetic testing and I feel as if it a highly unnecessary process. But I highly agree that our expansion is also a threat to animal life today

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Creatures of Empire: Agreement with the concept and Andersons arugment.

by [Annie Taylor](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 9:14 PM

Do I agree with Creatures of Empire:

There is since where I think that Anderson's *Creatures of Empire* has a lot of truthfully well though out and agreeable stand points. She made statements on why livestock had been such a big problem and impact on the Indians and there habitat which could create a dominate issue. One issue was when the Europeans didn't have a grate grasp or control over there brought over domestic animals and India's had encountered them without any knowledge to where they had come from or what to do with them which would be a frustrating concept for them ("*The Beast within Backstory 2016*"). To me the Livestock changed and altered the course

of history though almost accidentally dominance which possibly help the Europeans settlers settle on more and more land. So I do agree that the creatures the Europeans brought over had expanded the settlement creating a new "empire" in away.

Do I agree that animals are more important than early American historical figures?:

I personally believe that Animals had a role in changing the course of history but its not as important then historical changes due to physical communications between some of history's most well known historical leaders, battles and trades. I have knowledge that the migration of these historical livestock changed the new worlds forever but growing up I had learned why more about technologies advancements and wars that seem to have a bigger impact on lot more people altering history not only for America but other country's as well.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Anderson & Animals

by [Donald Laskey](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 9:55 PM

-I think the main problem DeJohn Anderson suggest that the Indians could not comprehend that the Europeans treated the animals as property, where as the Indians would treat more as living beings sharing the land with them. Another reason how the Indians were confused is that the Europeans would let them roam around freely and if they get caught in the traps the Indians would set up the Indians would be liable. I do not see animals in the way the Indians would.

-I do think Anderson was right about how the animals were the main characters of early American history. I think this is because the Native Americans had never seen any animal like the ones early settlers brought with them. Animals brought over by settlers have influenced the way we live today, through both eating and living.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Bryce Moore](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 10:34 PM

The one thing that caught my eye was when they said, "animals were central to the lives of Englishman and natives." That's a big thing in today's worlds cultures. Almost every culture is different and many do not have similarities. But back then there were major similarities and animals were big parts of those. The natives viewed the animals as their own individuals. Their own spirits that had been put back on earth. The Englishmen viewed them as companions and such. Like when they hunt they will go with them, or just be used as a pet.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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

**The different views of animals between Indian and English culture**by [Logan Habib](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:08 PM

DeJohn Anderson examines many core problems regarding the relations between Indians and Europeans and animals in her book *Creatures of Empire*. Of the many issues she discusses, the main problem she emphasizes the most is the role of animals in both Indian and European culture and society. Animals used in English towns were appreciated for their many agricultural and economical benefits. Animals provided coin for Englishmen that sold them and provided manure for their fields (information provided from synopsis). The relationship between animals and Indians was different in many ways. Indians hunted animals for their food and fur, but also for spiritual reasons or ceremonies. Hunting was a reciprocal process, in which animal spirits were honored and rewarded.

These two different views resulted in a different view on the importance of animals in Indian and English culture. The English wanted to domesticate animals and use them for their economical benefits and the Indians had a lack of interest in domesticating animals, being that one of the only animal they domesticated was the wolf. I am curious as to why the Indians did not try to use animals around them for advantageous reasons.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The main problem with the domesticated animals the english brought and how they differed from indian animals**by [Selina Scott](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:17 PM

After listening to the interview I was surprised when Professor Virginia stated that the English animal were probably more alien then the Europeans themselves (:40). Mainly because the Indians had prior contact with European fisherman, and the animals didn't come until the settlement. But I still thought that the Indians wouldn't be that surprised by the English animals, I thought they would just see food and treat them as they do there own animals, however the difference comes when the Indians learn how there views and the Europeans differ when it came to animal. (1:50) The English's idea of animals were that they were property something to be owned and treated however they saw fit whereas the Indians held "there" animals to a higher level, a spiritual one, they were not inferior (2:17). If your going to claim to own something shouldn't you be able to control it, and if an animal wonders into your trap by accident are you aloud to claim that animal and kill it or do the rights to "ownership" apply that far from there designated area? (3:14) Now if the animals were owned by the English why weren't barriers put up to keep them from wondering off and wouldn't animals damaging Indian land and crops be an invasion of sorts? After the first time i see the Indians not being very happy but when food and resources are damaged or destroyed by these foreign animals tensions get too high and i think the Indians had no choice but to not put up with it any more.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The main problem with the domesticated animals the english brought and how they differed from indian animals**by [Tyler Antich](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 9:25 PM

I think you have some very good points here, however, I don't believe the thing causing the problem was the natives getting fed up. My interpretation was that the natives would kill the animals to prevent destruction of their crops without knowing how the settlers thought of the animals. I think it is more the European's fault for just expecting the natives to have the same view about animals as them, without ever explaining to the natives the norms of European society. And on top of this, they sentenced the unaware natives for the destruction of their property as mentioned in the interview.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Invasive Animals to America: Why It's Important to Learn About Other Cultures**by [Tyler Antich](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:31 PM

Tyler Antich

History 201

Creatures of Empire

In this podcast, Dejohn Anderson states that the main problem with the animals was most likely not the animals themselves, but instead, the Europeans' ideas associated with the animals. Religious differences were the main ingredient in this confusion because the settlers thought of the animals as property and as lesser beings than humans. The natives believed that animals were not property, but were "other than human persons" as Dejohn Anderson says. This means that they don't think of them as anyone's property, but instead as equal organisms to humans which are just different than humans. The indigenous people of America also believed that animals can have spiritual powers. Sometimes a European's pigs would run free and accidentally destroy a native tribe's crops. Since Indians didn't fully understand how the settlers thought of animals (which was as property) they would kill the invading animal to solve the issue. This would result in punishment for some natives because they had just destroyed someone else's property and would have to go to court.

I personally believe in this theory of "Creatures of Empire", however, I don't believe it played a more important role than the human leaders who contributed to the conflicts as well. It did play a bigger part than our textbook seemed to suggest though, because the authors of our book only briefly explained that the settlers animals would run free. This podcast explains the reasoning of these conflicts much deeper than our textbook and also helped me look at the two civilizations' cultural and religious beliefs from a more detailed and unbiased perspective.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Religious Differences**by [Reed Battaglia](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 5:51 PM

When talking about religious difference between the two I think that it is pretty simple for example the Indians viewed the animals a food and would hunt them. Unlike the settlers that brought animals over and kept them as “pets” so to speak. For me I don’t identify animals as equal. When it comes to my personal animals of course I will care about them more than I do about someone else’s. The reason is that I have raised that animal and put time and emotion into it. It’s pretty complicated and I think that it does need further discussion.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Religious Differences**by [James Carr](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 6:30 PM

I agree with Reed. That is what I was getting at. I think the native Americans valued the lives of animals more and only took life for the good of survival.

However, what about the early migration of the natives through Beringia? We learned in class that the natives slaughtered EVERYTHING. Surely it wasn't all being eaten or used for clothing?

Did the original natives change their beliefs in America or do they value animal life only when convenient?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Religious Differences**by [Logan Habib](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 7:44 PM

I also personally agree that the Native Americans hunted animals in a more reciprocal fashion. They valued the lives of the animals they took and used any part of the animals left over after consumption for future survival, such as bones for weapons, fur for clothing etc. Englishmen were less religiously and spiritually involved with nature and the animals in it and this greatly affected their view on animals and their impact. They took advantage of how animals were used for trade, coin, and companions and only sought the benefits that they provided. This acquisitiveness shown by the Englishmen impacted the relationship between both the Native Americans and animals.

This perspective on how animals should be used has affected generations of human beings. The domestication of animals started hundreds of years ago and today most households in the US have some type of pet, mostly dogs. I wonder when the Englishmen initially realized the benefits of trading animals for their furs and meat.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Religious Differences

by [Tyler Antich](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 8:48 PM

Logan made a very good point in the second to last sentence of his first paragraph. This also reminded me of how France eventually used the natives to spread their fur trade around the great lakes as well (mentioned in our textbook). This shows that some natives eventually adopted some European views after years and years of European occupation in America. If only the Europeans could have adopted the native's empathy or respect for others.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Religious Differences: reply

by [Annie Taylor](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 8:28 PM

Interesting point you made, I personally have thought of the religious differences as spiritual and economic. The Indians held the animals as more humanly and saw them with a more spiritual connection and the Europeans saw their livestock as property used to economic resource.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0



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



How Religion played a role.

by [Selina Scott](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 7:52 PM

The different views by Indians and the English in which live stock was viewed as property but viewed in a more spiritual way for the Indians. In Anderson's synopsis of her book (paragraph 9) she talked of the Christians and the protestants and how their views and the Indians weren't entirely opposite, in fact the protestants viewed some animals to be good luck such as ladybirds and black cats were good luck and magpies were extremely bad luck.

I think today we still do little things because of superstition, at least I do, everyone's heard when you spill salt you have to throw it behind you or you get bad luck, or you break a mirror its seven years bad luck. However I don't think today's priest would denounce the superstition of bad luck and animals as paganism. (paragraph 10)

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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

**Re: How Reliigion played a role.**by [Emma Powell](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 9:20 AM

Selina, this is so interesting. You're reference to (paragraph 9) in the synopsis and how animals were viewed as tokens of goodluck or badluck. I didn't think much about how this might relate to today's society but in the way that people still see black cats as badluck, and how people awe when they see a cute puppy we might not notice but that sure does relate to how the protestants viewed some of their own animals.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: How Reliigion played a role.**by [Logan Habib](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 9:21 PM

I also found this interesting because I don't often associate bad luck with animals or even know many other people who are superstitious, but I also saw how the protestant beliefs regarding animals can be associated with the view of animals as tokens of good or bad. The protestants often thought that animals had "souls beyond the sensitive"(quote from textbook).

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Bryce Moore](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 11:14 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 agree with the argument that animals were a main actors but I don't think they were the main actors only. Obviously they had a big influence on the culture around them and were involved in many different ways. Now were they more important than human leaders? That's debatable. Human leaders were obviously capable of more things that they could do. However animals affected the culture around them and their peers.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)[◀ Creatures of Empire](#)[Creatures of Empire ▶](#)[◀ Chapter 3 Quiz \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

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

[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](#)