

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](#) ►

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](#)



Re: Creatures in the Settling of the New World

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 4:47 PM

The issue at hand is how Indians viewed animals as sacred, not inferior, sharing the earth with humans and were spiritual with no dominion. They were living beings sharing the earth who are different from human beings, but not necessarily inferior to them. (2:30 video timestamp) English settlers, however, also had no dominion over them, and their livestock that was brought over essentially reigned havoc on the indigenous natives' crops, land, livelihood and so forth. I cannot necessarily say I look at animals the same way as the natives, but I do believe they have a purpose. The Indians viewed animals as sacred beings with spirits due to their own religion and philosophy, however, the settlers did not find it to be that way. I don't really lean to

one side more than the other, so I'd have to say I'm somewhere in between. The Indians did not believe animals were property, whereas the English did. This made it where Indians were held responsible if they were to kill livestock, or if they were to be accidentally injured/killed by a trap that was not meant for them. They would be viewed as criminals in a court, according to Anderson at 4:48 in the video. In terms of connecting the issues as animals as property to a constitutional/societal issue we face today, the 2nd amendment and gun-control comes to mind. For instance, how gun owners that are pro 2nd amendment view the guns as their property and are a force to not be reckoned with, whereas those who are against it are not in agreement with that, and wish to take it. One who comes to mind would be Democratic candidate, Beto O'Rourke, who wishes to take citizens' assault rifles via a government buyback program. Anderson's book, titled "Creatures of Empire" does make sense, and I would have to agree with the concept, simply because the name is a clever reference to how the livestock did indeed shape the new world in pushing away Indians, English settlements, etc..., making them truly creatures of the empire, the empire being the English settlers. As of now, the audio provided of the interview with Virginia DeJohn Anderson, along with some Amazon reviews from her book, do support my decision in agreeing with her title. I cannot say that I think the animals were more important as the "main actors", simply because settlers such as John Smith, for example, actually established the colony at Jamestown, and led explorations along the rivers of Chesapeake Bay and Virginia. I do agree that the animals were very important characters in the whole ordeal in shaping the new world, but not more important than figures such as John Smith or John Winthrope.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Audio Clip/Writing What was the main problem concerning the animals and the Indians.**by [Emillia Carpenter](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 6:18 PM

I personally have never thought about this before. DeJohn Anderson suggests that the main problem between the groups concerning their animals was just the different understandings of what an animal meant to them. as stated in the synopsis and half way through the audio clip, the Indians saw animals as possessing a spiritual power and saw them as another mysterious creature who SHARED the earth with them, and they never considered them any less than a person, however the Europeans did. They saw animals as property, there for they were not free and also they were seen as something that could be owned and was much less of a person. This was so foreign and not understandable to the Indians that it caused a lot of conflict. The Indians didn't understand that you could own something like property let a lone a living animal, so if they were to accidentally trap one in their traps and kill one of a Europeans it would cause so much conflict. Some Europeans would even break down the fences that the Indians had protecting their fields to let the animals go eat their their produce they were growing, it would eventually push some to move away. I personally believe animals are very intelligent and are very human like. However the concept of owning a pet doesnt shock me because I grew up with it. I just find it amazing how many problems this caused between the two groups and I never have learned or known about it.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Livestock in Early America**by [Robert Whitney](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 10:59 PM

Throughout our learning in class, I had never thought that much about the impacts of new animals brought by the Europeans to America. After listening to Prof. Anderson speak, she raises some good points. Native Americans and Europeans had entirely different views on animals, and when European livestock wandered into Native territory, that could lead to confrontation and issues. A Native American who kills a stray cow, in the Europeans eyes, be liable to pay for the cow he killed. Because the Indians didn't believe in ownership of animals, however, could protest to the charges, which would cause arguments and tension between the two parties. She mentions that Native Americans viewed animals as "other than human persons" whereas Europeans viewed them as property. She also mentions that the Native people believed certain animals, such as deer, had special spiritual powers, while Christian Europeans viewed them only as animals or a food source. It seems as though the Indians were more in touch with the Earth and its inhabitants, and the Europeans were more of a commanding force that believed, consciously or not, that they were on top.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Conflicts with the foreign animals**by [Melissa Kimp](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 11:42 PM

Professor Virginia DeJohn Anderson suggests that a major issue with the settlers and the Native Americans were the animals that were brought over from England. She mentions that the Native Americans didn't view animals as property while the settlers did. The animals would wander into traps set by the Native Americans. This, among other things, created a great amount of conflict (DeJohn Anderson audio 3:59). The settler's animals had roamed freely on the land where the Tainos tribe resided. The animals had eaten or destroyed a lot of the Tainos' food supply. They became malnourished and the settlers did not care and made the Tainos work for them (textbook pg23).

This topic really surprised me, personally. When I think of what caused conflict between the Indians and settlers, animals did not previously come to mind. I now do agree that they were an issue, but I do not they were the main source of the conflict. There was a lot more going at the time. From the Native Americans' perspective, these strange people were invading their lives and their land. The settlers changed the way the Native Americans' way of life. The Indians were enslaved by the settlers in many places. I think there were a number of conflicts between the two groups. I can now see how animals played a part in creating tensions

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Conflicts with the foreign animals**by [Caleb Willis](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 3:26 PM

I agree with your post about this. The animals did indeed play a decent role in tensions between the Natives and the Europeans, but weren't the main source of conflict. To add to this, in the video at the 5:00 mark, Anderson talks about Philips war and how young Indian men raiding a village in English settlement, but expands into a larger conflict (Metacom's War). Anderson says how the war was the culmination of tensions between the settlers and Natives over time. Anyways I just wanted to throw that out there to add to the agreement that the animals were a crucial part of the conflict, but mainly it was the tension between the Natives and settlers themselves.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Colonies Built on Meats**by [Abraham Millan](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 11:50 PM

When Professor Anderson presents the case of the livestock being foreign on the Americas I was dismissive. I was biased because of my own preset of ideals and little known knowledge I had from family history with ranches. However Professor Anderson's clear distinction on it created problems. It's only natural for animals to wander out in their own environment and live off the land. Which can cause the problem of not being on your owner's land or being in the wild (audio video). Wild animals used for livestock and two parties with different ideals of land are a recipe for disaster.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Jason Stratis](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 11:52 PM

Beginning with the fact that Englishman settlers believe that animals were property already set an offset belief system already established in Native American and early Settler lifestyles. Some native Americans believed that there was spiritual power in animals. Just imagine if something you saw as holy treated literally as an animal. I could imagine this made the natives uneasy about these settlers immediately. So I agree with that fact that animals had a lot to do with the conflict between natives and colonists. Along with other issues of natives "taking care of" the settlers' property such as cows that natives just treat as normal wild animals.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire**by [Abraham Millan](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 6:03 PM

I would I really think the issue at hand here is ideology. The English came to the new world with a new idea of property and it would be maintained. In the video professor Anderson explains how Native Americans understood property as a community. It would be resources not for personal gain but to contribute to the family and community. In basic principle the English worried about personal property or ownership of it when Native Americans shared everything.

Also let's not forget also in the video, professor Anderson explains how some of these animals were new to the continent. Explaining how cattle, pigs, goats and sheep were new animals exploring a new area of land. Native Americans meet these animals as foreign beast and barely had an idea what to do with the animal.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Creatures of Empire - Why Animal Ownership Led to Conflict Between Colonists and Indians, and the Importance of Livestock in Early American History**by [Benjamin Blythe](#) - Monday, October 14, 2019, 11:53 PM

Professor Anderson argues that the colonists' method of keeping livestock was a driving force behind colonist-Indian conflict in English settlements. This was a result of differing cultural and spiritual views on animal ownership. Anderson claims "The problem is not so much dealing with the animals themselves as with the package of ideas English settlers brought with them...", (podcast 1:35). Specifically, the English idea of animals as property was at odds with the Indians' belief that nobody owned animals - they were their own beings.

Instead of keeping livestock in pastures, the English often let them roam free. Anderson describes "instances of English animals trespassing on Indian planting fields, destroying crops, digging up the land...", (podcast 3:20). Any attempt by the Indians to retaliate often led to unjust rulings in the colonial courts. This issue caused tensions to rise and was likely a big factor in several conflicts, including King Philip's war.

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

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


Re: Creatures of Empire - Why Animal Ownership Led to Conflict Between Colonists and Indians, and the Importance of Livestock in Early American History

by [Emilia Carpenter](#) - Tuesday, October 15, 2019, 10:45 PM

I am interested in the fact that the English broke down fences to let their animals feed on the Indians land as well. I am curious as to why they did that, and if they did that with the intent of driving the Indians away, which was the result. I am also interested in this line from Professor Anderson's book synopsis "As war spread Indians especially made clear their hatred for English animals, in particular the despicable cow. Rather than killing the animals directly, Indian raiders would mutilate an animal by cutting off its leg or cutting out its tongue, and letting the animal die a slow and painful death, a death that their English owners would most likely witness." This sounds to me like a very brutal and horrible thing to witness being done to your domesticated animals, have it be your cow or a dog I think it would be pretty traumatic. I think that how everything went down was pretty bad on both sides. Personally if someone was doing that to my animals I wouldn't intentionally send them onto their land.

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

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


Religion as the maker of an empire

by [Glorianna Whiteman-Reyes](#) - Tuesday, October 15, 2019, 5:46 PM

While I agree that we should not be so dismissive of the importance of animals in native and colonial tensions, there are so many different factors that lead to Metacom's war that it's hard for me to give so much value to this one topic. After reading the synopsis and the textbook I can't help but feel it was more cultural/religious differences and a perceived lack of respect from both sides that really made the pot boil over. In short, it was an issue of human behavior.

For years building up to this conflict, Europeans had made every effort to convert nearby tribes to Christianity and showed little to no interest in the spiritual beliefs and referred to them as childlike savages. Puritans set up praying towns in an effort towards conversion and is cited as a major point of friction

between the two societies in the textbook (PG 73). Among the religious differences, of course, was the treatment of animals. Native beliefs saw animals and people as equal inhabitants of the earth, while the bible stated that animals were to be owned. And while this was a point of contention, religion also caused friction in aspects of marriage, sexuality, land rights, and many more (Textbook GR. 73). In general the diversifying of life was stressful and more often than not, unsuccessful for a myriad of reasons beyond havoc brought on by loose hogs and cows. (Pilgrims and Massasoit 8:27)

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

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


Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Clay Noteboom](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 3:25 PM

Virginia DeJohn Anderson writes about the relationship between the animals colonists domesticated in America and the Native Americans living here at the time. The raising of livestock took up space and resources; the Indians were expected to give these up without a fight. Another conflict between the two groups as they viewed animals: the settlers saw them as something to own, something to conquer and control. Native Americans, on the other hand, saw them as part of the whole earth, not as something that belonged exclusively to any one person. DeJohn Anderson writes about this conflict in her book *Creatures of Empire*, published in 2002.

I agree that the raising of livestock added an extra burden to the Native American experience, but I cannot credit them with the majority of the harm inflicted by American settlers. Using up land and resources is not as impactful as spreading disease and murdering.

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

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


Re: Creatures of Empire

by [Emillia Carpenter](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 7:32 PM

I agree that the animals were not the number one problem that the Indians faced, however I think it was a major divider between the two groups. It was also something that is a little different than disease, since they didn't mean to infect the Natives with small pox, it just happened. However they did mean to break down the Natives fences so their animals could go and graze in their fields filled with their produce they were growing, and the Natives would mutilate the Europeans animals right in front of them like cutting off their legs and their tongues and letting it die a slow and painful death so that the Europeans had to see it and could not help them. This had caused more tension and hatred for one another. Eventually causing the Natives to retreat. So I agree I do not think it was the worst thing to happen to the group, but I do think that it was a big source of conflict and helped shape the way the two groups viewed each other.

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

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


Animals as the "main actors" of early american history

by [Benjamin Blythe](#) - Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 7:57 PM

Anderson suggests that animals had a bigger impact than many humans that get much of the credit. To me this takes the argument a little too far, but I would agree that animals deserve more recognition as an important factor in colonial/Indian conflicts of the time. I hadn't learned of animals' importance in the colonies before listening to the podcast, and Anderson convinced me that their influence is undervalued.

Though the animals played an important part, I'd argue that the human impact was greater. The issue of animals might have served as a catalyst only to escalate preexisting tensions. It is stated in the Creatures of Empire book review that "...colonists even actively sought to provoke disputes by breaking down Indian fences and refusing to allow Indians to brand or mark their own animals" (pg 4). The colonist wanted more land and resources and they saw the Indians as an obstacle. Had animals not provided a convenient excuse, conflict would still have occurred for one reason or another.

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

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


Re: Animals as the "main actors" of early american history

by [Clay Noteboom](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 9:39 AM

I agree, Benjamin, that the role of animals has been underrepresented.

After listening to the podcast, I think I see a parallel between some of the ideas DeJohn Anderson was discussing, and contemporary conditions of Native Americans.

Disclaimer: I am Native American, Chippewa tribe, Turtle Band, from North Dakota. I was raised "white", but my family has always been aware of the conditions on the reservations. My mother grew up very close to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in SD. I and my siblings go to Warm Spring IHS for our healthcare.

DeJohn Anderson discusses the idea that Indians did not see animals as "property," in contrast to the English settlers. They saw animals, wild or livestock, as property of everyone and no one. This mentality was also reflected in their religion: they saw "God" in all things, the bushes, the creatures, the sky, the earth.

When the federal government "allowed" tribes to live on reservations for free, they used this thinking against them. Modern day Native Americans cannot own the land on reservations; it is completely owned by the federal government, not the BIA. It's hard to build wealth when you cannot buy property, and even harder when the land you are allowed to live on is barren and difficult to nurture (5 of the 9 reservations in SD represent the worst counties for quality of life in the US). Knowing that Indians don't share the same property ownership mentality, they have been effectively denied the American Dream. The conflict between the two ways of thinking about property, described by Anderson, continues to hurt Native Americans.

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

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


MY animals

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Thursday, October 17, 2019, 5:07 PM

DeJohn Anderson suggests that the main problem was not with the new animals the English brought, but how the English viewed their animals. (1:51 DeJohn Anderson Audio File) "the English perceived of their livestock as property whereas Indians did not conceive of animals as anyone's property." So the English viewed their livestock as just theirs, they bought it so therefore they own the creature. The Indians disagreed with the concept of "owning" an animal. I partly disagree with both. I have several pets, and I love all of them dearly. I do have to pay for them to consider them mine. I think it is necessary to buy animals but I do not "own" them, I am not their master. I view my pets as friends that I had to purchase. Animals have personalities, and things that they want or don't want to do, just like me. Animals should be loved, and taken care of because they are a life. Just because they can't speak English to defend themselves does not mean they should be mistreated. "A person's a person, no matter how small" (Horton Hears A Who). I think this statement is correct, and that it applies to animals as well.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1) 0[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: MY animals**by [Robert Whitney](#) - Saturday, October 19, 2019, 9:28 PM

I largely agree with what you said. The vastly different views on the treatment of animals and the perception of an animal's life's worth. I feel as though the audio clip paints both the Native American views and the European views as fairly black and white. I'd be interested to know if there was any disparity in a person's views. I would have to say that in general in our society, we possess bits of both ideologies when it comes to animals. When it comes to pets, we tend to have a kinder view, but when it comes to animals for meat or invasive species, we think differently.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Human Causes**by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Thursday, October 17, 2019, 9:03 PM

I disagree that the colonists animals were the main actors of early American history. The humans had much more of an impact. Wars were not started because of animals, they were started by people. The introduction of the new animals helped cause situations, but they were not key players. DeJohn Anderson believes that animals are the main players in history. (7:30 DeJohn Anderson Audio File) "in the Chesapeake.. the same kind of problems appear". This historian means events in the Chesapeake and other wars were caused by animals. This may be true but it is the people that make the actions that eventually lead to war. The animals were just a factor. For example in Metacom's War, Metacom gave a list of complaints to the Englishman. Animals were on that list but there was more to it. The settlers didn't fix the issues. War broke out. "After the war the English beheaded Metacom as a sign to other Indians to not go against them." (Notes from Thursday's class lecture). The animals did not cause this mutilation. Terrible human behavior did. The colonists and Indians were the main actors in this part of history.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Animals then and now**by [alex Henshen](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 5:20 PM

We live in a society that is obsessed with the idea of property and owning things. Whether its land, animals, or objects people use them to make profits and measure wealth. We don't like it when our "stuff" is messed with and causes a majority of conflicts. Like now the English domesticated and claimed animals as property

within the colonies. According to DeJohn Anderson interview, the Indians at this time did not understand nor like the introduction of these new animals to their land. These animals caused problems and extra tension between Indians and the English.

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

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


Re: Animals then and now

by [Caleb Willis](#) - Saturday, October 19, 2019, 5:22 PM

We absolutely do live in such a society like that. The animals caused much tension between the two parties, and was a decently sized factor in the uprising tensions that led up to King Philip's War (Metacom's War). The Indians hated how the animals would just roam and mess with their livelihood, and even worse, were punished when they tried to suppress the issue by trapping/killing the animals, according to Anderson's podcast.

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

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


Animals lives changed

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, October 18, 2019, 8:20 PM

If more people viewed animals as property then we would have a serious issue. There are so many laws to protect animals nowadays. Fun fact "Every 28 hours a person with a vehicle full of animals must stop and let the creatures out" (Laws that protect animals- Animal Legal Defense Fund). The settlers would not have accepted this. They owned it therefore they would decide if their livestock got fresh air or food that day. Animals lives have changed for the better. I am so glad that animals are treated better. My life has improved since I got my dog, she brightens my day everyday. If our laws had not changed then I would not be able to have that relationship with any animal.

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

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


Changing My Thinking

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Saturday, October 19, 2019, 9:42 PM

I have been thinking about this issue a lot. When I first started reading the material for this forum I was completely one sided in my thinking. Of course animals were not key in this point of history. That is what I've thought. For some reason though I keep looking at certain things and wondering "what if this was foreign to me? How would I react?". Just like Escobar said on Thursday "you don't know how you'd react, you can think you know but you don't". The Indians did not think of animals as being properly, this was said in the DeJohn Anderson video. If I saw a strange creature ambling towards me, I think i'd be scared and possibly curious because that's how I was raised. I would not stop to wonder if anyone out there share my opinion in how to react to this thing. If I feel that way, then I understand why the Indians reacted by killing the animal. That is what they did to survive, and it is what they've been taught to do. So who could blame them? The English could To them that was their property. They reacted by wanting money back for their animal. They both reacted how any one person in their culture would. They were not good at compromising. That led to war. So animals, I think, did play a major role in history. I still don't think they are the main actors though.

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

1

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)[Puritanism & Islam](#) ►◀ [Chapter 3 Quiz \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

[CLICK HERE for Forum 1 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#) ► Moodle Docs for this pageYou are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Log out](#))[HST 201 F19 \(Escobar Meta 20635 22256\)](#)[Get the mobile app](#)[Policies](#)