

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](#)

◀ [Puritanism & Islam](#)

[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](#)



Differences of opinion.

by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 6:47 PM

I believe that Mathison thought that the biggest problem with the Indians and Europeans was in how they thought of animals. While the Europeans thought of animals as inferior to them and only property to control. The Indians thought of them as equals even protective spiritual forces. The Europeans saw this as heretical. (Audio 3:05) The way the Europeans saw animals as property caused problems with the Indian's when it came to the Indians

hunting practices. I personally grew up in the Native American faith, I view animals as equal to us and probably would have experienced the same conflicts with the Europeans as the Natives did.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



"Main problem"

by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 11:07 PM

I think one of the biggest problem was the livestock and how animals change it. According to Anderson, European's animals causes problems to Indians by eating their crops and destroying it. When the Indians felt threatened by these new creatures they decided to kill them and thus preserve their food. However, this act was not liked by the Europeans since the animals were their property. I agree that each one thought different about animal, especially when the Indians believed that the animals have spirits forces to protect them.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: "Main problem"

by [Gerardo Morales-Martinez](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 7:16 PM

Hi Maria! I like how the audio discusses the conflict of views between the Indians and Europeans. The two distinct points of views really shine a light on their beliefs when it comes down to animals. On one hand, we have the Indians, who like you said believe they are nobody's property. Compared to the Europeans who believe animals are property. I also like how you added that the Indians believe that the animals have spirit forces that protect them.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1



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



Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Chelsea Real](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 6:59 PM

DeJohn Anderson states "pigs, cattle, sheep and goats" were not only livestock that the English brought to the New World, they also were the main source of frustration and the tensions that culminated to help create the King Phillip war in 1675. The new animals trampled crops, were liabilities for Indians and also dug up precious resources. As well as diseases and vegetables, they were the main resources the Settlers brought from Europe to the Americas during the Colombian Exchange we discussed in class on 10/2. Not only did the animals create large disruptions in the Indians natural order, the actual relationship with these animals was a cultural difference as well. The English thought of animals as property and the Indians viewed them as "other than human" persons. In my opinion, the Indians are in the right. Animals are not our property just like people aren't. They are living beings just like us. This topic reminds me of the ways the law has viewed living beings as property; such as slaves and wives essentially in the 19th century pertaining to the enactment of Coverture. Present day, it reminds me of the ways in which the meat, dairy

and cosmetic industries view their animals as ways of justification for their heinous acts. In many ways, this is a lesson Americans still have yet to learn from Native Americans.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Not "Main Actors"

by [Kenzie Hodges](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 7:02 PM

I don't agree that European animals had an equal or greater role to North American history as the people. I think that looking at the European and Native ideology towards animals is incredibly interesting, but it wasn't the animals themselves that had the effect. One of the main things that Professor Anderson mentions as causing tension is that the livestock Europeans brought over are interfering in Native lives. The pigs are wandering into the crops and tearing up harvests, cows getting caught in the traps laid for deer. This shouldn't have surprised the Europeans, animals wander and eat. That is why in the video reenactment of Jamestown it showed large fences around the tobacco. The settlers had the ability to contain their animals, but why should they 'waste' the effort. The ideologies of ownership play a role in this not just with the animals. Why should the Europeans try and contain their animals when the Natives admit they don't "own" the land themselves. So while the livestock running amok certainly added tension to the clashing cultures, I don't think it can count as a major factor itself. It's more of a symptom than a cause.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



Animals role

by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 10:50 PM

I agree that people should have a huge role in North America history. However, this part of the history explain the role that animals play in the livestock in the early America. Animals were a factor to help dispossession of Indian's homeland. Indians felt their style life in dangerous for this new "creatures". New creatures start to eat their food, so they decided to take action on their on hand by killing them. When Indians were killing they also affected the European's life, creating a tension between them.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0



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



Are the European's and Indian's Views on Animals All That Different?

by [Lauren Rogers](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 7:28 PM

When beginning to read the synopsis of the book "Creatures of Empire" by DeJohn Anderson, it seems as though the Europeans and Indians viewed animals much differently. Upon reaching the end of the synopsis, it seems as though this is no longer the case.

The Europeans saw animals as property that should be domesticated. Pigs and cows each had their own price, and they were thought to be a commodity(2). The Indians on the other hand, saw animals as they saw themselves, a part of the "natural world"(1). They believed that animals had spiritual beings looking after them just as the Indians believed they had

spiritual beings looking after them. They viewed hunting as an honoring of the animals. Yet, when the Europeans come to their land, the Europeans view on animals seems to have spread to the Indians.

The Indians are first curious of these new animals because they'd never seen them before. Cows and hogs were much different than the deer, and even the dogs, they had grown accustomed to. The Indians begin to see these animals as property much like the Europeans. The Indians begin to sell the meat of butchered hogs they raised. This isn't the only instance of the Indians similarity to the European view of animals. As the Indians notice the cows ruin their crops, they begin to kill these animals. This doesn't seem to be out of line with the Indian's views on animals, but as the Europeans punish the Indians for these doings the Indian's fall to other tactics. They start to cut limbs off, and even tongues out of the cows, causing the cows to have slow and painful deaths(3). DeJohn even mentions that the Indians have a "hatred for European animals"(3). It becomes apparent that the Indians don't seem to be honoring and appreciating the animals, like it once seemed.

Was this because the Indians thought that these animals were not within the same honor as the deer they hunt, much like how we put the worth of our pets over the worth of cows? Or is it because these animals were tied to the Europeans that they grew to despise? Did the Indians ever truly honor the lives of the animals or is that just what everyone has learned to believe?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: Are the European's and Indian's Views on Animals All That Different?

by [Kenzie Hodges](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 7:48 PM

I think that there hatred of the European animals was probably more from continued frustration. I really like birds but if a woodpecker was destroying my house and keeping me awake I wouldn't like woodpeckers very much. However frustration certainly can lead to showing an ugly side of people, and the cruelty exhibited is ugly. But I don't think that invalidates the idea that the Native people honored animals. These events are outliers, and the result of almost a generation of rising tension.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Animals' Roles and Early Conflict

by [Devin Brown](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 9:56 PM

The Europeans saw their domesticated animals as property, while the Indians--probably due to their lack of domesticating animals--mainly saw them as a hunting source for food. Overall, I side with the European's viewpoint supporting the ownership of animals, but I also agree with the Indians, in that they only hunt what they need. I'm likely siding with the Europeans because that's how we're raised in today's culture, where ownership of animals is commonplace, and wild animals are usually considered as "dangerous" animals.

In Professor Anderson's interview with *Backstory with the American History Guys* podcast, she mentioned that the main reason Indians and Settlers were fighting over issues involving the settlers' animals, were because they "didn't have full control over them," in that most of their farm animals were free-range, and many could've been considered at least partly wild. Due to the animals being free-range, many trespassed onto Indian fields and such digging up crops, destroying fields, and disrupting their hunting methods.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2


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


The biggest problem of european animals

 by [Brayden Lane](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 10:11 PM

The domesticated animals brought from Europe seemingly are a huge deal that I never heard or thought of when it comes to native American and early European conflict. To me the main problem she suggests is the fact that these animals were coming over and making Indian lives and traditions harder, such as hunting and gathering. In the podcast Anderson states the English did not have full control of the animals. This resulted in the animals trespassing on to Indian planting fields and them destroying and eating the crop. This is what seems to be the main problem between the two groups and the fact that the Europeans couldn't control them. One of the examples she gave were pigs going to the coast at low tide and eating shellfish the Indians relied on in harvesting. Along with not having control over the animals when the Indians set traps used for prey such as deer, if a domestic animal such as a cow trespassed and was caught in a trap the European's, the native American's would be liable for the damages. To me that seemed like the biggest problem though there were many.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1


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


Europe Animals

 by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 10:29 PM

I agree that animal play a huge role between Americans and Europeans. Anderson suggest that the animal made changes in Indians lifestyle. However, it also seem that the animals has a different purpose for each side. Indians does not seem animals inferior to them and they used to share the earth with them. When Indians saw their crops destroyed, they took action in order to protect they way of living. The biggest problem was the way to use the animals and what actually the animals represents of each one.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0


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


Invasive Species

 by [Jeffrey South](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 10:36 PM

As Professor Anderson explains it, the Indians had already had interactions with Europeans on the coast before the colonies arrived (:35-:55, Audio File with Professor Anderson). Although there isn't much evidence to support the idea, Professor Anderson believes that the first time most Indians saw the livestock brought from Europe was when

the livestock wasn't anywhere near a colony. So in that instance, an Indian would find whatever creature it came upon to be completely alien, asking themselves what it was, why was it there, and what to do with it (1:00-1:22, Audio File with Professor Anderson). When the Colonists' brought the animals over to the western hemisphere, they had the idea of converting Natives to herdsmen, which they believed would have made them civilized. But that idea quickly diminished when the Natives started to kill the livestock that invaded their territory and ruin their crops (Synopsis of Creatures of Empire, Page 1). Since Colonists' saw their livestock as property (1:49-1:59, Audio File with Professor Anderson), the killing of one was considered a crime and the Natives needed to be tried in the court of law. But, with the Natives not agreeing with the practices and handling of animals from the Colonists', they were less inclined to accept the rulings of colonial courts. (Synopsis of Creatures of Empire, Page 2). That caused a violent escalation resulting in the Natives being forced from their land and even becoming involved in King Philip's War and Bacon's Rebellion. Being born in 21st century America, I've always believed and will always believe that animals are a second-tier species to humans and should be used as a resource for our enjoyment and nutritional needs. Contrary to my beliefs of the current age, I do agree with the Natives in the idea that if the Colonists' had to treat their animals a certain way, to at least keep them penned up and on their own territory. I also agree that if an invasive species is destroying your crops and causing damage to the native species of the land that you rely on for food and furs, that immediate action should be taken to protect your way of life.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire and the main problems of European and Indian relations to animals**by [Brenden Nesbitt](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 10:38 PM

Virginia DeJohn Anderson seem to identify the Indians of living their lives in more of a collectivist culture, focusing on the land and animals as apart of themselves. As Europeans arrived to the new world the "hunt" for success was an overwhelmingly large factor in the early dismissal of Native culture. Page 2 of Dr. Matthew Ward's review of Creatures of Empire " The English were interested in taming and domesticating animals." This concept was not a norm of the Native Americans who valued the land and animals as they did themselves. The holistic views of Native Americans clashed greatly with the Europeans plans of domestication, creating results that were very confrontational. The English's individualistic views and determination for wealth and prosperity created hostile environments in portions of North America due greatly to a lack of mutual understanding of how to handle land and the "ownership" of animals. On Page 3 of Dr. Wards review he references when " Indians resorted to war and descended on King Philips war and Bacon's Rebellion."

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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

**Social and Cultural differences**by [Gerardo Morales-Martinez](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 10:43 PM

When the Europeans arrived to Indian land, with them they had brought over animals that the Natives have never seen. The only time the Indians would have seen those animals, was if it had wandered away from the camp. In the audio file, DeJohn Anderson explains how the animals were seen as more strange since the Indians had made some contact with the europeans (Audio Video 1:15). This was something new to the Indians, The way the europeans would view animals was the complete opposite of how they viewed it. The europeans viewed them as property and the Indians did not see them as anyone's property (1:52-1:59). I believe because of the culture we live in nowadays, it can go both ways. Animals can either be seen as someone's property like a dog or cattle, and deer can be seen as nobody's property. Yet, culturally we view some animals as household animals who should not be eaten, but in another culture it can be viewed differently. Some social differences we have for example, is that in our society, eating cow is seen as fine. Although, in some religions like Hinduism, the cow is sacred.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Differences between their interactions with animals**by [Mateo Morales](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:20 PM

The difference between the English use of animals and Native Americans view on animals is very interesting. Typically, we view Native Americans as peace loving and animal loving people, which turns out to be true. The English perceive animals and/or livestock at property, while Native Americans do not view any animals as property. There is a little bit of confrontation of them, the ENGLISH animals will destroy and walk all over the Native Americans crops and if the Native were to kill the animal, they would be killing that persons property. It raises an interesting question; perhaps they would have been closer united if they had the same view of animals? It would have also been interesting to see if the roles were flipped and see if anything would be different.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Differences between their interactions with animals**by [Kenzie Hodges](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 7:56 PM

When you say the roles were flipped to what extent do you mean? If the Europeans didn't have a deep belief in humanities superiority over the rest of the animal kingdom and the Natives did. If so then would the Europeans have actually brought livestock with them as usually livestock is something individually owned. Now this would have made the Europeans more dependant on hunting they would have had to encroach on more land to feed themselves perhaps causing conflict sooner.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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

**hierarchy then, hierarchy today**by [Stevie Escobedo](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:39 PM

DeJon Anderson believed that the sole cause of the intolerance that lead to war between the Natives and Europeans were the animals back then and both of their opposing views. The Natives believed that humans and animals both roamed the earth equally and shared its resources they even would refer to the animals as other than human persons, that alone shows the amount of respect these natives had for the animals. They also didn't believe in ownership of the animals and domesticating animals to feed off of and especially didn't believe in putting a price on animals and selling them as property. Both were things the europeans lived by. Because their view were very different a lot of conflict arose like natives killing the europeans animals and being taken to court as well as the europeans domesticated animals stealing natives food and destroying their crops. I do believe that this probably caused a lot of tension between the two I do not believe this was the main reason behind the fighting between natives and europeans. i think that the pushing of religion and trying to make them change their ways of living such as migration and the way the got food had more to do with their divide. I unfortunately connect more with the europeans view towards animals due to the time a society i was raised in. Living in America today would be extremely difficult to share native views towards animals and I'm not gonna lie and say I don't love the convenience of driving through a McDonalds and getting a burger that some beef rancher sold to them from the life stock they raised, hell, my grandpa raises cattle for beef production I'd be broke if i didn't support. A way that these views correspond with society today sort of is kind of the individualistic part of European views in their culture people were responsible for their families instead of the whole group and used currency when they wanted something from someone where the native worked together and made sure everyone was taken care of. Therefore the europeans had hierarchies and some members that did much better than others the natives did have roles but even the chief who was their leader gained respect by giving to others. You see this very heavily today in America one area where this is very obvious is our education system. Many people cannot further their education after high school because they cannot afford it and have to continue providing for their families once they have finished even if they got perfect grades and a full ride their family will simply struggle too much without their support financially. But the boy on the other side of town who did okay in school but dad has some good connection will go to a nice college and thrive without any damage to his family or wallet.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Leander Peterson](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:54 PM***Creatures of Empire****By Leander Peterson. Monday, October 8th 2018.*

Professor Virginia DeJohn Anderson opens up a discussion on how Native Americans are alienated to the animals the European settlers have brought in the 1600's to what is now known as, New England. There are many ties to this topic; on why it was a problem, how it changed the lifestyle of the human society, and how it opened up an opportunity on what we may call "development". As many know, there are MANY cultural differences between the European settlers and the Native Americans, and their view on animals is one of them. Anderson opened up on the most significant difference is that the English perceived their livestock as property, where as Natives didn't conceive animals as anyone's property (Audio File, 1:47). There is cultural ties to that opinion, and I couldn't agree any more. Being a Native American, there are beliefs that animal life is sacrificed to us so we can be taken care of. The hunt for deer was essential to many, but Natives took pride in that and didn't look at it is a trophy or a game. There is even ceremonies celebrating the kill of a first deer, and Anderson even states that Deer has spiritual power or spiritual protectors to Native Americans (Audio File, 2:47). Although the beliefs is no problem, settlers that brought different kinds of animals from overseas did cause problems. The animals ruined crops and resources Natives depended on, and it made them furious because the alien animals weren't being taken controlled of fully in a respectful manner. Since Natives didn't look at animals as property, they didn't expect to have controversial issues to solving the problem by killing the animals the settlers call property. Them killing the animals opened up the idea to the colonizers that they are criminals and committed an offense to the English (Audio file, 4:30). All these encounters eventually turned to a larger conflict down the road, meaning war.

Different animals also changed the lifestyle of the human society in many ways. The English culture rubbed off on the Natives and they started domesticating animals (PDF File, page 2 paragraph 3). The life style made animals essential as a commodity purpose for the opportunity of trades. It was a cultural shock to Natives, because that lifestyle was very essential during the colonization. Although life has tremendously changed from then to now, do you see how it was a problem and how it colonized life? do you still see practices of cultural beliefs in animals to this date?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



English vs Indians

by [Maria Cecilia Contreras Sanchez](#) - Monday, October 8, 2018, 11:59 PM

According to John Anderson, the main problem was not having control over the behavior of the animals. With the animals out of control and free, the Indians suffered the consequences of seeing the animals invading their lands. According to the teacher, the animals came to eat the grass and some seeds of the Indians creating a conflict between the English and the Indians. She also tells us that the Indians used many traps as they did before. In Anderson's article, she explains the reason why the Indians began to hate English animals. "As the war spread, the Indians specifically expressed their hatred of English animals, particularly the despicable cow" (p.3). The article mentions two wars, in particular the War of King Philip in New England, and the Bacon Rebellion in Virginia. Even

so, at first, the Indians believed that animals had their own protective spirits, which the English did not believe. Since the first civilizations were nomads, they dedicated themselves to hunting and living in a certain way with wild animals. According to the book, it is mentioned that few animals were domesticated in the United States. "There was no comparable process in the America, where few animals could be domed." Anderson claims that the animal game to govern livestock in the early culture of the United States. The concept that Anderson uses "Creatures of the Empire" is partly correct. Animals were an important factor in dismissing the Indians from their lands

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Gehrig Van Tol](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 9:30 AM

In her talk Professor Anderson focused mainly on the area of New England for her discussion of the European domesticated animals being the "Creatures of Empire", however she also mentioned that this was not a strictly New England area problem, referencing the same animal, European settler, Indian interactions and issues that she discussed occurred in the Chesapeake and continued to spread as the settlers moved west. This made think about the more southern colonies and Indian tribes near Texas, which I read about in chapter 3. Though the stereotypical idea of Indians is of them always living in teepees and riding horses around, I recalled from chapter 1 it was mentioned that Europeans actually introduced the Indians to the horse, which among other things, had "made European colonialism possible" (35) . However, this is very different then the later description we have from page 81 in chapter 3 where it notes that "in the Great Plains the Apache's developed a dynamic culture of horseback hunting and warfare". From this we can see that European domesticated animals had a very important and significant impact on the Indian culture and lifestyle, not only in the sense of their interactions with the Europeans and the building the tensions that led to conflict, but also in the building of "Powerful equestrian Indians", so powerful in fact that the book notes on the same page 81 that the during the late 1600's "future of Spanish colonial ventures [in Texas and New Mexico] seemed far from certain". It is clear from this that these animals were just as significant to the history of the early Americas as any historical figure. Simply looking at the impact of horses, in this limited context, you could argue that they alone are more significant than many historical figures, as they literally allowed the creation of new Native lifestyles and cultures.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The Role of Animals Between the Europeans and the Native Americans**by [Lauren Rogers](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 6:56 PM

I do agree with DeJohn Anderson when she suggests that the animals played a major role in the relationship between the Europeans and the Native Americans in her book "Creatures of Empire".

The Europeans thought it was pathetic that the Native Americans couldn't even fully domesticate the dogs that roamed their villages, yet the Europeans learned that domesticating animals in the new land was hard for them as well. The Europeans' animals had become feral due to the lack of laborers they had in the new lands ("Creatures of Empire" page 1). The Europeans didn't seem to find this to be the same, and even placed the responsibility of their "domesticated" animals on the Native Americans.

I think that a lot of the tensions could have been solved if the Europeans took responsibility for their animals. If these animals are property of the Europeans, the Native Americans shouldn't have been responsible for making fences to keep them out of their fields or "herd the animals several miles to the nearest provincial pound" if the animals were found to be on their land ("Creatures of Empire" page 3). The Europeans should have been responsible for keeping their animals on their own property. This is a law in many places today. If your cow goes out into the road and gets hit by a car, the owner of the cow is responsible for the damages to the car because the owner should have kept the cow on their own property.

If the Europeans were required to do these tasks, it is likely that these conflicts would have never occurred. The Native Americans wouldn't have found these animals as annoying, and the Europeans would have kept better track of their animals because I'm sure they didn't want to be the ones herding their animals back to their own property time and time again.

I doubt that even if these issues had been resolved, that the Native Americans and the Europeans would have been best friends, but at least it would have been one less thing for them to disagree on.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2



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



spiritual / cultural view

by [Brayden Lane](#) - Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 11:40 PM

I see the way that each of the two different cultures play a role in how they view the animals separately. The Native American's viewed them as "other than human persons" (Audio 2:20). while the early American's viewed them as property. (audio file 1:50) They viewed them as different beings in habiting the earth but weren't inferior to them. The Early Americans viewed them as a way of living and a normal everyday thing. Being in society like today it is hard for me to have a view of domesticated animals similar to that of Native American's at that time. Living in a time like today it makes it easy to see and associate these domesticated animals as a way of living and them being domesticated and human property rather than similar and not inferior to us. Trying to see an animal that we domesticate such as a cow or pig as similar to us or as a "other than human persons" is not something I'm able to do because of the different views society has now.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Different Viewpoint**by [Devin Brown](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 8:58 PM

I completely agree with you that it's hard to view animals as equals to us in today's society, but I want to go a bit further than just because of society. Even if we took society's influence out of the picture, would we still view animals on equal footing as us? It might sound a bit high-and-mighty, or cold-hearted, but biologically speaking, we are superior to animals, hence why we have towering civilizations, complex speech, different cultures, and seek out more than what will help us survive. In this way, it makes a bit more sense why the Europeans viewed animals as "lower beings," and counted them as property and if anything else, it's strange that the Indians didn't.

I may be wrong in my statement, but to my knowledge, almost every other civilization in Europe, and Asia viewed animals as lower beings to be domesticated, etc. (whether or not they were treated with respect and what-not). Sure the idea of living off of what you needed, and not killing for sport was still out there, but that didn't mean those people saw animals as equal beings, it just meant at the very least that they didn't want to waste them as a resource, in my opinion.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Animals were as important as the "main actors" in early American history**by [Levi Savage](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 7:54 PM

Do I agree with professor anderson that animals were the "main actors" of early American History. Kind of when we look at early American history we see a complex mixing bot that is beginning to boil over. These animals were more like the match that lit the fire.

"Anderson argues that '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)." (Review in History synopsis). Here Anderson describes the animals as laying the groundwork for what would be future problems. If the Indians kill the European animals they get taken to court and have to pay a fine or they can move further inland. It's a no win situation either way, problems will occur not just for the Indians but also for the Europeans. In the end were the animals the "main actors" no but without them American history would have turned out very differently.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Animals were as important as the "main actors" in early American history**by [Kimberly Wong](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 11:41 AM

I agree that the animals were not the main actors. I see them as the catalyst in this situation. The Natives and the Europeans were already reacting negatively to each other. But by putting the animals into the equation it acted just like any catalyst does in a chemical reaction, it sped the process up. So I would not say that the animals were the match that lit the fire but more like the gasoline they threw on it after it was already lit.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1


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

Re: Animals were as important as the "main actors" in early American history

 by [Brenden Nesbitt](#) - Friday, October 12, 2018, 9:01 PM

I really agree with the direction of this post. I believe that the Natives felt a sense of disrespect and the Europeans and sense of entitlement when it came down to how they handled their disagreements and the situation regarding their views of animals. The two cultures already had conflict and the animals seem to be only a piece of the puzzle, when we speak of confrontation. On Thursday in class we spoke about "greed", and I certainly believe that greed plays a large role in the mistreatment of Natives and their culture. So although I do believe animals played a role, I cannot label them "main actors". I believe the greed and entitlement of Europeans played a much larger role than animals in the obstruction and destruction of native culture.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2


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

Re: Animals were as important as the "main actors" in early American history

 by [Lauren Rogers](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 12:04 PM

I agree with the idea that the animals had an important impact on the relationship between the Native Americans and the Europeans, but that the animals weren't the "main actors". I also agree with the idea that this was just one of the sources of issues between them.

DeJohn Anderson makes great claims of the impact of animals and the strain it had on the relationship between the natives and the settlers in her book "Creatures of Empire", but as we saw in Bacon's Rebellion, animals were not the only source of tension.

The army that Bacon created, all had strong feelings against the natives, and it can't all be blamed on the animals. The main strain on their relationship was in the uncomfortable uncertainty of each other as mentioned and displayed in the video "Pilgrims and Massasoit". The video showed how the settlers were not very approving of the native woman and how these feelings led to an uneasy feeling for everyone (Pilgrims and Massasoit 8:56). This tension and distaste came from a group that explored each other's cultures and lifestyles. Imagine the uneasiness between groups that didn't even try to experiment with each other's cultures or beliefs. Sure the animals were viewed differently, but so were each other's religion, looks, cultures, foods, and nearly every other thing that exists in their lives.

The Native Americans and Europeans weren't in conflict due to one difference, it was because of all the differences added up. These problems were not stemming from animals, they were stemming from fear and uncertainty.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Animals were as important as the "main actors" in early American history**by [Brayden Lane](#) - Saturday, October 13, 2018, 9:45 PM

I think its very interesting and overall true when you say the animals weren't the entire problem but that they were the match that lit the fire. I also strongly agree with the fact that they were in a "no win situation". As you said it seems like no matter what they did it was a fight they were never gonna win. I believe Anderson is wrong as well when she says that animals were main actors, they may have been part of the problem but they weren't the main problem.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Gehrig Van Tol](#) - Thursday, October 11, 2018, 11:42 PM

I found the discussion regarding the societal issues that the domesticated animals of the Europeans caused very interesting due to the fact that I could not help but draw comparisons to issues that the mass domestication of animals, and more specifically livestock, is causing today. Professor Anderson touched on the issue of the land required for the animals in the audio clip, how even when the settlers bought the land from the Indians specifically for their livestock, the livestock still managed to damage the surrounding environment. Whether it was the Indians crops being eaten or trampled of the animals trespassing in their hunting grounds. Throughout the third chapter of the book we have read about the settlers, whether in New England or in Virginia gradually begin to settle and expand. In today's class lecture (October 11th) we discussed how during Bacon's rebellion, Bacon completely cleared Virginia of Indians. From previous knowledge I know this is a process that will continue, with settlers clearing out indians and claiming their land for crops, as well cattle. This would only increase the tension we see Andersen touch on in this interview. But because of the settlers views on animals as property and their reliance on them, this issue was unavoidable. This is also a prevalent issue today, with increasing attention spent looking at the effects of the mass amount of domesticated animals around the world. Not only do they take up large amounts of space that some argue could be used to grow crops that could feed more people, but also the negative environmental effects they have. Beyond the greenhouse gasses they produce, mass amounts of domesticated animals and cattle in particular have been known to pollute surrounding water sources and land. To me this simply seems like the issues faced by the Indians and the settlers in regard to their domesticated animals, only on a much larger scale.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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

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