

HST 201: US History F19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 F19 \(Escobar Meta 20635 22256\)](#) / [Week 3 October 13 - October 19](#) / [Forum 1](#)
/ [Creatures of Empire](#)



Search forums

Forum 1 Creatures of Empire

[Subscribe](#)

◀ [Puritanism & Islam](#)

[Puritanism & Islam](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Creatures of Empire

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Saturday, October 12, 2019, 12:50 PM

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, which clearly describes the source and questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Creatures of Empire

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#)

[Edit](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



I was unaware of the way European animals affected European expansion in America

by [Gavin Zammiello](#) - Sunday, October 13, 2019, 9:19 PM

The thought of Europeans livestock affecting the expansion of European settlers into America never crossed my mind. I guess that I had always thought that European livestock and animals just adjusted to America's climate and geographic's with no backlash. The actuality is much different. Just like the European settlers, livestock brought over from Europe were malnourished, weak and susceptible to diseases when they arrived in America. "The North American environment did not replicate the lush meadows of England. American grasses were not as nutritious for animals." (Creatures of Empire. Reviews in History pg 2). Along with the natural predators found in and around the Chesapeake and New England area, it took multiple decades for

European livestock to become self reliant and sustaining. It was also never occurred to me that Europeans and Native Americans viewed animals quite differently. While the Europeans viewed animals and livestock as property to be used and exploited, Natives viewed animals and themselves as the same or one with nature. While Europeans ate and exploited their animals, Natives often celebrated and honored their prey when hunted, as it was necessary for Native survival. With English animals running rampant in Native homelands, tensions increased. "... the English did not have full control of their animals behavior, so we find a lot of instances of English animals trespassing on Indian planting fields" (Backstory with the American History Guys, 3:11). English animals destroyed Native crops, often forcing them to move away from colonists, as killing or hurting English animals was considered a crime that would lead to prosecution. I enjoyed learning about this new information, and will probably end up looking at animals differently as they can change history drastically.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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

Re: I was unaware of the way European animals affected European expansion in America

by [Eric Runes](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 5:37 PM

I also noticed and found your point about animals brought over from England being weak and malnourished, and having a difficult time thriving for generations very interesting and relevant. Most times when examining how an invasive species disturbs the natural order of an environment, it is because the conditions are ideal for that species to flourish. In the case of the English settlers, and Indians it seems the exact opposite is true. The text points out The English believed that by converting Indians into herdsman of cattle, and practicing their methods of domesticating animals, it would lead to the Indians becoming more civilized, and that a livestock farmer "typified the English ideal of a civilized man" (summary pg.2). However, for those first decades their practices, and the environment prohibited the livestock from thriving. In an attempt to "civilize" the Indians, the English were trying to enforce methods far less effective, and sustainable.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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

The economics of livestock

by [Eric Runes](#) - Sunday, October 13, 2019, 9:36 PM

In the audio file, and accompanying synopsis of DeJohn Andersons "Creatures of Empire" a major emphasis is placed on the conflicting religious and spiritual views on animals between the English settlers, and the Native Americans. One of the major points raised is Europeans concepts of ownership of animals as property was in direct conflict of the Indian view that animals were no ones personal property (audio file around 1:30). However in the synopsis it is elaborated that the English were able to put a price and value on any animal, symbolizing the conversion of a creature into a commodity...something the Indians absolutely could not understand (synopsis pg.2). The synopsis then goes on to point out that Indians had a remarkable way of navigating colonial markets. Indians were cutting out the process of selling livestock, and instead directly selling the meat, often at peak times and for peak profit (synopsis pg. 3). The final point on this is made that Indians were in fact so successful it likely cut into English farmers profits, and they declared that owning livestock did not make Indians Englishman (synopsis pg.3). I believe the fact that not only did the Indians not understand or go along with the settlers view and methods of raising livestock, but they may have demonstrated a more profitable way of raising their own made a tense situation far worse. In modern times

when the argument surrounding ethical treatment of animals raised for food gets brought up it often turns into a battle over what is morally right vs. what the owner of the livestock believes is their right to do in order to generate the most profits. I believe this to be similar to the conflicts between the English, and the Indians. The English believed that the livestock was their property, had a set method for raising said livestock, and in turn had established systems to profit off their animals. The Indians turned this system completely on its head. They had a drastically different view of animals seeing them as different species but still equal to humans not as property. When Indians did raise livestock it was with completely different methods than the English. Then finally when Indians sold their animals meat directly it was a new and unestablished concept that cut into English profits, and angered farmers. In class last Thursday professor Escobar mentioned something to the affect of following money was often a good way of understanding the context of a historical situation.... I believe in this case it wasn't just spiritual and religious differences but also the economic ones that exacerbated conflicts between English settlers, and Indians when it came to animals.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Tuyen Thanh Diep](#) - Sunday, October 13, 2019, 11:04 PM

It is known that the Indians tended to believe the animals possessed a spiritual power. Why do Indians have to select which animals they should raise? Are there any effects related to their beliefs and culture? (Creatures of Empires p.2)

Sum of ratings: 0 (1) 0[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Isabella Welch](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 5:16 PM

In the podcast attached to the Creatures of Empire, Virginia DeJohn Anderson states that, "Trespassing animals is this, sort of, phenomenally irritating aspect." (Audio 6:46 Minute mark) Most animals, unless trained otherwise, will wander off and do their own thing. By the Native American standpoint, it would agree that these animals do become a nuisance to them. However, The Native Americans and English have different religious views on animals and how they should be kept. English settlers thought about their animals in a more property kind of way, "The English perceived of their livestock as property whereas Indians did not conceive of living animals as anyone's property." (Audio 1:49 Minute Mark) If you're looking at it from a property standpoint then yes, I agree that the animals should be fenced in, however they should also have room to roam around and feed as they please. You can also look at this from a nuisance perspective as well. If you don't want your livestock to wander off and destroy someone else's property and be liable, then the fix would also be fences.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Tuyen Thanh Diep](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 8:14 PM

I could totally agree with your point of view. Indeed, every country has its own way of viewing, evaluating, and raising animals that related to its culture. The struggles between Caucasian and Indian, between cattle and bison, and between two strikingly dissimilar ways of life remain alive and strong today. According to (Audio 1:49 Minute Mark) Native Americans can easily raise animals, which do not endanger as pets. On the other hand, Indians, they are believed animals have spiritual power, especially bison worship still exists in this country, the truth is animals are no property to them.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Are animals property?**by [Ryan Peel](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 5:33 PM

First off, I do not believe animals are property. The problem with that mindset is that you could be more prone to mistreating them. Listening to Professor DeJohn Anderson's podcast, I found that Native Americans and settlers had very different outlooks on animals. When the settlers first arrived, they only had livestock which they perceived as their property because of their core purpose as livestock, to feed a family. That's their food, essentially. The Native Americans didn't really perceive animals as property, they live in harmony, they are sharing the earth with these animals, in an example, deer. The English didn't have full control over how their animals behaved, this posed a problem when it may have ended up in a Native American trap if it wandered too far. The Native American was now liable for damages when he or she hadn't done anything. This doesn't seem right. My core belief is that animals are your friend, while I am a meat-eater, I love steak and pork, I have my pets, my cats and my dog. They're my friends, I don't see them as property. They are here to help me feel better after a long day, or a short day of work, or school. Why should animals like deer or horses be treated differently? Why are they treated differently in the wild? I don't understand.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Are animals property?**by [Eric Runes](#) - Tuesday, October 15, 2019, 3:30 PM

As a fellow animal lover and pet owner I see and agree with your point of view. I found it interesting that the podcast pointed out the Native view was that animals were equal to humans and in some cases had spiritual protectors (Podcast 2:30). The podcast points out that even though the Indians did eat their animals as both you and I do, they're hunting practices were never based around sport, and great reverence was paid to the spiritual power of the animal before and after the hunt (pg. 2. synopsis). When it came to "pet ownership" I noticed the text pointed out how the English saw the Indians relationships with dogs as an inability to domesticate animals because of their similarity to wolves (pg.2). In my opinion the way the relationship was described was very similar to the way any pet owner with multiple dogs and a big yard might see things... which is to say a large pack running around doing they're thing while still maintaining a loyalty and affection for their owner.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)

**Re: Are animals property?**by [Bryce Turney](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 9:18 PM

I think of some animals as my friends as well, mainly my dogs which definitely bring me joy but as far as the European animals they seem more like property to me. Even though the Native Americans considered animals like deer to be equal to them they still set traps to kill them for food and survival (audio 4:05). I do agree with you on how unfair it is for the Native Americans to be liable for killing the European animals. The English settlers should have watched over their animals more and not put the unnecessary blame on the Native Americans.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Isabella Welch](#) - Thursday, October 17, 2019, 12:28 PM

I do agree that it doesn't seem right when settlers livestock would wonder into Indian traps which caused them to be liable to "property damages." I also agreed that I do not see all animals as probably however in the settlers case, they didn't know how to hunt like the Indians and the livestock were they're source of food. Also I don't necessarily agree with your second sentence stating, "The problem with that mindset is that you could be more prone to mistreating them." When you own something, like a car or house, don't you want to treat it right and make sure it's not damaged in anyway? At least it's that way for me. I see animals as property but not in a negative way like my dog is mine but I still see her as a friend and treat her as so.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Are animals property?**by [Gabe Waisanen](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 8:39 PM

I agree with your statement above, that animals shouldn't be treated as property. When listening to DeJohn Anderson, it really changed my view on whether animals are property or not when she said "The English did not have control over their own animals behavior" (Audio Clip 3:14-3:19). This gave me a sudden realization that animals being sought as property, could not be controlled by their own people, but were treated as animals going into other's land, and being killed in the process. As an owner of a dog, it would be impossible to control my owns dogs behavior all the time. When you try and treat animals as property, by controlling their behavior all the time, it gets rid of the love and affection you seek in animals.

I really enjoyed reading your response Ryan! 😊

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Animals: A Big Problem for the Indians in the New World**by [Mark Alexander](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 6:06 PM

As Professor Anderson states in the podcast the animals the English brought over to the colonies caused many problems for the Indians. This concept is something I've never really paid much thought to. The thought that these animals were alien to the Indians also surprises me. I was also interested to learn how much of a nightmare these English animals were to the Indians. As stated in the podcast these livestock would often go loose on to Indian farms and destroy them. Indians would then proceed to kill the animals not realizing the concept of animals as property. Also the animals would even stumble into Indian traps, ruining them and causing problems. These animals caused so much trouble that they were even a contributing factor to King Philip's War against the colonists. Years later the livestock were still causing trouble in the 19th century when Americans were settling westward, with livestock causing havoc on the Indian way of life, destroying crops and farms. Reflecting on what Professor Anderson has said I think the animals the English brought with them were certainly more of a problem for the Indians as well as their relationship with the English than many realize. Interesting!

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Animals: A Big Problem for the Indians in the New World**by [Gavin Zammiello](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 10:02 PM

I agree with you on the fact that European livestock was probably more alien than the Europeans themselves to the Natives. Now couple that with the livestock destroying precious farmland and fundamentally altering the land scape, along with the treatment of these livestock animals by the Europeans, it's easy to see why tensions grew quickly. It gives us a new perspective on how life was back then.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**What of the other side? The damages caused by the colonists?**by [Ryan Peel](#) - Thursday, October 17, 2019, 5:38 PM

It doesn't feel right that the Indians were held responsible for something that was, for all intents and purposes, out of their control. If something were to wander onto my front yard and start destroying our garden and yard, I'd be very unhappy, and the fact that the colonists were unwilling to keep a closer eye on their livestock and went right to accusations of destruction of property, bringing them into court and holding trials, what of the damages the animals caused to the Natives' crops, their farms, their property? The colonists weren't held liable for any of that. Feels pretty one-sided to me. How about you guys?

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: What of the other side? The damages caused by the colonists?**by [Eric Runes](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 4:41 PM

The same thing crossed my mind. Throughout the entire podcast and article, one of the main points that kept being brought up was the "punishment" and repercussions the Indians kept facing for things completely out of their control. Repeatedly the colonists were taking actions that impeded the Indians way of life, trying to impose their own, and sanctioning the Indians when they didn't cooperate. The

author makes reference to an incident in Rhode Island where at the beginning of King Philip's war in a meeting, King Philip himself broke down exasperated and unloaded his complaints many of which involved the English animals (podcast 6:30). With so many examples of the Europeans continually causing frustrations, and taking little to no accountability, it is pretty obvious how relations broke down so fast.

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

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


Re: What of the other side? The damages caused by the colonists?

by [Bryce Turney](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 6:19 PM

Yeah it is very one-sided especially considering the fact that the Native Americans were here before the English settlers. It's not the Native Americans fault for the European animals wandering into traps that were already set up. The English settlers didn't look after their animals and should of reimbursed the Native Americans if anything for messing up their traps and invading their settlements. Also the European animals ate things that the animals of the Native Americans relied on, so their food source was being depleted.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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


Re: What of the other side? The damages caused by the colonists?

by [Mark Alexander](#) - Saturday, October 19, 2019, 4:50 PM

It does seem very one sided to me, but you have to take into consideration that we were invading their land. If I could go back in time to this period I would want to tell the Indians that killing these animals will cause tension between themselves and the English. I find it fascinating how during this time period simple everyday livestock for the British caused unexpected problems for them in the New World.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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


Creatures of Empire: Main problem concerning the European animals relation to the Indians and how did the religious differences play a role between these two groups of people along with which group I most identify with from DeJohn Anderson.

by [Bryce Turney](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 8:24 PM

DeJohn Anderson says the problem between the Europeans and Indians and the relationship with animals stemmed from how they viewed the animal's roles in their settlements (video 2:48). The English settlers viewed the animals as property whereas the Indians viewed them as a spiritual living being (video 1:50). I don't view animals as spiritual living being like the Indians and would see them more as property like the how the English settlers do with a more biblical perspective. I did find it intriguing when Anderson talked about how the Indians viewed animals like a deer to possess spiritual powers or even have a spiritual protector (video 2:47). This really just shows that the Indians were more in tune with nature and were very spiritual. The English settlers would just let their animals run wild and would even end up in the settlements of the Indians destroying their crops causing conflict (video 3:24). On top of that the European animals

would eat the bark and grasses that the animals of the Indians relied on and were later killed for hunting (video 3:50). Also, the Indians would have traps set up to capture their animals but would sometimes end up getting a cow from the English settlement which then makes the Indians responsible for the damages to their property. There was a lot of conflict between the Europeans and Indians and It was unfair that the Indians had to deal with all this. The English didn't really look after their animals, so for the Indians to be held accountable for accidentally killing the European animals is unjust.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)

Old Animals in the New World

by [Jackson Such](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 8:49 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?

In response to this question, I took a minute to listen to the eight minutes a few times over. About three or four. Now, around the 3 minute mark (3:19:54 to be exact), Anderson goes on to say "We find a lot of instances of English animals trespassing on Indian planting fields- just destroying crops, digging up the land and so on." Which, if I'm being entirely honest, doesn't sound so great on an Indian perspective. Especially not in the European side either. Before the quote listed above, she says how the European settlers had no control over the behavior of the animals, and based on the follow-up statement, its pretty evident that animals were **exceptionally** taxing for both sides. Where pigs and cows (for example by Anderson) eat the bark and other plants that the indigenous animals eat, which, if you remember, those animals are crucial to the Indian lifestyle. They need deer, elk, rabbit and other indigenous animals for food and leathers. The newer European animals are getting stuck/injured/killed by traps laid out by the Indians, eating bait and natural sources of food that bring less game to the Indian people; and in the off-chance an Indian trap **kills** a European animal, it's game over and he (or she) could potentially be prosecuted for unlawfully killing a European's property. Not only is that terrifying because I doubt an Indian man could find himself a decent **lawyer** in this time of strife, disease and chaos, but the concept of animals being property were rather new and it puzzled these people. Furthermore, the bond between Indians and Europeans was a very thing sheet of glass, and any incident could **shatter** that truce and reduce the two populations/colonies into a warring status. All because some cow decided to put its stupid hoof in a trap meant for a deer.

To actually answer the question, she suggests that the problem, is the lack of control the Europeans had on the animals, as well as the animals themselves. I mentioned above how she said the animals would wander into Indian territory and obliterate their property as well as eat their game's food source which lowered the amount of natural indigenous animals in the area (I'm assuming), and that has a very negative impact on the Indian peoples experiencing these newfound animals. When it comes to the European side of this parasitical relationship, they had the potential of losing their livestock to traps and Indians who put the animal down for being a nuisance, such were the ways. Anderson said it better, and I'm paraphrasing very, very poorly, to which I apologize. Though, where I feel the European side is a little unfair, is the moment when an Englishman prosecutes an Indian for damages against his property, where in all of those cases, (again I'm assuming), the indian man lost and had to forfeit some amount of Wompum or some form of currency or trade to make up for the loss of livestock. Hardly fair; and that all goes back to something I said in the last chunk of blurb: *All because some cow decided to put its stupid hoof in a trap meant for a deer.*

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)



New animals, new problems

by [Max Birch](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 9:32 PM

Virginia DeJohn Anderson explains that the main problem was that the "English perceived of their livestock as property" (video 1:57 minute mark). Where as the Indians didn't consider any living animals as anyone's property. I see where both sides are coming from on this issue. Some animals such as dogs and cats are specifically someone's personal property and are paid for with money to own. Same with animals on farms that provide food. Although this may seem inhumane this is how we survive as humans. I do also understand where the Indians are coming from. Random animals roaming through the wild are nobody's property and should be able to live without humans interacting with them. Anderson states that the Indians thought of animals as equal living beings who were not inferior to humans but on the same level. She explains that the Indians thought many animals were spiritual and had spiritual protectors which "is heretical to the English Christians" (video 3:00 minute mark).

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Similarities / Differences Between Students, Concerned about the findings?

by [McKenna Wilson](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 11:11 PM

McKenna Wilson

HST 201

October 15, 2019

Forum Post

After listening to the interview of Professor Scott Casper by the Journal of American History I would not say I am concerned with the finding of the difference between the two sets of students but I am more aware of the difference in living and learning in America versus places like the middle east. After listening to Professor Casper and hearing him speak about the article that Professor Mason wrote I am more aware. The difference between the two sets of students I feel was best explained when in the video Professor Casper said in the article they brought up the case of Reynolds vs. US. This supreme court case was deciding if a law banning polygamy was unconstitutional. Casper says that students in the US at Notre Dame had all nearly agreed polygamy was unconstitutional while students in Cairo believed it was constitutional and part of the Mormons religious concepts. (Soundlink evidence). "In addition, lines between religion and state are often blurry." (Professor Scott Casper, Interview). I believe this also shows how the two groups of students differentiate. Here in the US that line is not blurred while places like Egypt it is. Middle eastern countries have different religious concepts and have a different look on things like Puritanism similar to that of the 1700's New England settlers.

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

[Permalink](#)

[Show parent](#)

[Edit](#)

[Split](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)



Views of Wildlife between Natives and Europeans

by [Carter Ranck](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 11:13 PM

Listening to the eight-minute interview with the professor from University of Colorado Boulder I learned some very interesting things and personally found the differing views between Native Americans and Europeans very interesting. Native Americans believed that animals and wildlife, in general, was somewhat like a person in itself. Wildlife and animals should not be owned by anyone and can be utilized by whomever, hence not being owned by anyone.

The Europeans believed that the animals were property. The European could own sheep, goats, and other animals that were exclusive to those who had paid for them. This view did pose some problems because if a European's livestock wandered off and was on Native American land and killed, then the individual who killed the animal could be tried in the court of law because the animal is personal property to a European. The Europeans had trouble containing their livestock and they tore up Native American crops and there were instances where Native peoples were in trouble for killing the lives of the animals.

The European views were more normal to me when I read them. Typically in today's society that's how it works for the majority. Farmers fence off their land and milk their cows or shave their sheep. Families purchase a dog or cat and therefore it belongs to them. For the majority of my life and many others, I'd say the European view is the most familiar and our definition of normal.

Overall, I found this topic very interesting. Especially when learning about how Native peoples and European people's views clashed and what affected these views in the first place. It was a great topic and I learned lots!

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

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


Why weren't the Native American perspectives on life and animals adopted into new colonisation

by [Luke Edwards](#) - Tuesday, October 15, 2019, 12:00 AM

An issue that both the Native Americans and the early colonies dealt with, was hunting and livestock keeping. The Native Americans kept very few livestock animals. They hunted for their meat, tracking and meticulously planning which game they would bring home. European settlers did the opposite, they kept a lot of livestock and were unable to hunt successfully enough for their own lifestyles. This quickly became an issue for the early colonies, as their manpower was unable to sustain the labor and keeping of these animals. Why were Native practices and their perspectives on animal treatment immediately viewed as non-viable options for a sustainable lifestyle?

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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


Re: Why weren't the Native American perspectives on life and animals adopted into new colonisation

by [Max Birch](#) - Thursday, October 17, 2019, 3:23 PM

To answer your question I think the Native American practices and perspectives were viewed as non-viable option for a sustainable lifestyle to the English because the English were not able to hunt or track like the Native Americans. They didn't have the option to go out and hunt all different types of animals to

provide for themselves because they did not know how to. I'm sure if they did, or learned how to from the Native Americans, they would've accepted those practices and possibly taken them on for themselves.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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


How we treat animals

by [Max Birch](#) - Tuesday, October 15, 2019, 5:29 PM

This issue with the way we treat animals is still a common topic of discussion today. Videos are constantly surfacing of the cruel ways that animals are treated in farms. A lot of nature and wildlife is being destroyed to build more farms which will continue to treat animals horribly. Many people have gone vegan recently and it is becoming much more popular to do so. The Indians were way ahead of their time in the sense that they treated animals with respect, and thought of them to be on an equal level with themselves. People today are just now realizing that that is how we should have been treating animals all along. I believe the way that the Indians treated their animals is much more humane and respectful, but I do understand why the English treated animals the way that they did. They had to eat, and owning livestock was, and still is, a very easy way to do so. I believe there is a common ground that can satisfy both sides. If farms treat animals more humanely and give them better living conditions, then people will be satisfied that animals are being treated better. People will still be able to own livestock and provide food or income for themselves by doing this, the animals will just be treated more like equals.

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

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


Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Grant Winters](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 10:34 AM

question - if your misbehaved animal is killed for ruining someones lively-hood what give you the right to persecute this person.

English settlers were at that point looking for any possible leg up they could get in the world driven by hatred for anyone who would not conform to their religious view points and persecuted anyone who stood in their way.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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


Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Ryan Peel](#) - Saturday, October 19, 2019, 5:17 PM

Wasn't any alliance between the Natives and Colonists delicate enough already? I see that the animal problem, as you say was a way for them to "get a leg up." I've stated before that it felt one-sided the colonists persecuting the Natives for something that was out of their control. Why do something that might shatter this fragile bridge? The Natives, as far as I can tell, didn't really do anything when it came to the damages caused by the colonists.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) 0[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Invasive Species in N. America**by [Nathan Mattox](#) - Thursday, October 17, 2019, 7:27 PM

Having studied the ancient roots of civilization to some extent, I can say that I completely agree with Dr. Anderson's 'creatures of empire' theory, which states that the domestication of animals, as well as the role of domesticated animals within society after that point, played a larger part in our history than has been previously acknowledged, and was particularly central in the discovery and colonization of the Americas by Europeans. Today, we are familiar with the term "invasive species," and we know the havoc that can be wrought upon an ecosystem by them. The European explorers, conquerors, and settlers had little to no awareness of the incredible impact that their animals, both their own herds and the stowaways they brought over aboard their ships, would have on the native landscape, from the very soil, to the plants and animals, and to the people who lived there.

One result of differences in philosophy concerning animals between Europeans and Native Americans that wasn't directly mentioned in the podcast was that, even though both European settlers and Native peoples had domesticated animals, Native tribes bred and kept relatively few animals, whereas Europeans had massive flocks and herds. I can imagine that to Native American eyes, this would have been quite shocking, since the very idea of animals as 'livestock' was a foreign concept to them. To many Native American peoples, all life was sacred to some degree, including the animals that they killed for food and the enemies they met in battle. Europeans, by contrast, saw their animals and the landscape around them as resources. It is lamentable, but unsurprising that misunderstanding and conflict arose out of these vastly divergent paradigms of human habitation.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) 2[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: How Domesticated Animals from English Colonists Sparked Controversy with the Indians**by [Gabe Waisanen](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 7:39 PM

In the book "Creatures of Empire", DeJohn Anderson, proposes the main issue of domesticated animals from English settlers invading Indian territory during the seventeenth century. The author supported this claim when she wrote, "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).

English settlers sought after Indian land, because it was land suited for their herds to graze on, and would cause these settlers to overrun their livestock into Indian territory during the mid-1630's. Indians viewed English livestock as invaders, mainly because these animals would eat, and trample over their supply of plants and would kill any of these animals that trespassed into their land. As the amount of livestock being pushed into Indian territory increased, these Indians would get tired of having to relocate to new land, or

fight off the animals, that by the late-1960's, Indian's would go to war with the English colonists, leading to the King Phillip's war in New England, and Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia. These events provoked me to believe that the English Settler's cattle was what spawned the war between the English colonists and the Indians.

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

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


Animals, Spiritual Beings or Property

by [Sara Montiel](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 8:25 PM

What I got out of hearing the podcast is that the main issue is that firstly, their views, Europeans and Native Americans, were very different. The Europeans perceived animals as property but the Native Americans saw animals on more of a spiritual scale, not property. Secondly, "the English did not have full control over their animal behavior. We find a lot of instances of English animals trespassing on Indian planting fields, destroying crops, digging up the land and so on" (Podcast). The main issue all came down to their difference in beliefs.

Based on what I believe in, I would have to say I most closely identify with the view and belief of the Indians. "As far as we can tell the native view of animals consisted in a view of these creatures being "other than human persons," that they were living beings share the earth who were different from human beings but not necessarily inferior to them and a lot of different kinds of animals, particularly a lot of the prey animals, like deer, were thought to have spiritual power or spiritual protectors" (Podcast). I do see animals as not necessarily being inferior to us, in the sense that they are not our property but rather should be treated with love and respect and fairness, but where it says "...a lot of the prey animals, like deer, were thought to have spiritual power or spiritual protectors" I can't say that I agree with this belief.

There is actually a very big connection to an issue occurring in our society today. The issue with Animal rights, more specifically animal testing. The idea that animals are ours to test on, wear, use for entertainment, or abuse in any way is an issue that many people are either for or fighting against it.

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

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


Treatment of animals

by [Natalie Haffner](#) - Saturday, October 19, 2019, 8:39 PM

I thought this topic was very interesting because I also never thought about how the native Americans had seen Europeans before the settlers, but never interacted with the animals. I knew people had visited America before, but I never thought about the insolvent of the animals. After the settlers showed up and the natives began to see the new animals and how they were treated they couldn't figure it out. The English had domestic animals and "the English perceived of their livestock as property, whereas Indians did not conceive of living animals as anyones property," (audio file, 1:45). The native Americans saw the animals as protectors and each animal had their own spirit. I have a middle ground point of view on this issue. I love having domestic animals and think pets are a great thing, but if we are going to have domestic animals they need to be treated right. I see animals as free and that's how it should be even though they may be domesticated.

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

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

**Re: Treatment of animals**by [Gabe Waisanen](#) - Saturday, October 19, 2019, 9:50 PM

I totally agree with what you are saying. I believe too that owning pets are a great things, but having domestic animals require that you treat them well. A very simple, but important sentence I read in the Creatures of Empire article, that not only changed how I viewed the importance of these animals, but their effect on American history was when the article states, "Animals played such an important role in the colonists' lives that converting Indians into husbandmen, into livestock herders, was seen as an essential part of the English mission of civilising them." (Page 2). This sentence has a very important meaning to me, because the animals weren't just used as a food source, they were used as a way of comfort and protection, and were seen as essential to colonists. Thus, showing that animals back then, and today, have similar meaning.

I enjoyed reading your response Natalie! Let me know if you have any questions of my reply! 😊

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)[◀ Puritanism & Islam](#)[Puritanism & Islam ▶](#)[◀ Chapter 3 Quiz \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

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

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 201 F19 (Escobar Meta 20635 22256)

[Get the mobile app](#)[Policies](#)