

# CAS 101H: Reacting to the Past

## Winter 2017

---

<b>Instructor:</b>	Kevin D. Hatfield	<b>Classroom:</b>	LLCN 125
<b>Office:</b>	120 Living Learning Center	<b>Meeting Time:</b>	MW 2:00-3:50
<b>Phone:</b>	541-346-1977	<b>Class Website:</b>	canvas.uoregon.edu
<b>E-Mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:kevhat@uoregon.edu">kevhat@uoregon.edu</a>	<b>CRN:</b>	21363
<b>Preceptor:</b>	Sarah Henry <a href="mailto:shenry3@uoregon.edu">shenry3@uoregon.edu</a>	<b>Office Hours:</b>	U 4:00-5:30pm or by appt.
<b>Preceptor:</b>	Claren Walker <a href="mailto:clarenw@uoregon.edu">clarenw@uoregon.edu</a>	<b>Visiting Instructor:</b>	Jennifer O'Neal
<b>Reserved Faction Meeting Locations:</b> LLC 116 M, 2:00-3:50pm; LLC 120 MW 2:00-3:50			

---

### I. Course Description

This term we will play two Reacting to the Past games: *Forest Diplomacy: War, Peace, and Land on the Colonial Frontier, 1756-1757*, and *Red Clay, 1835: Cherokee Removal and the Meaning of Sovereignty*. During the debrief sessions of the past three courses that have played *Red Clay* singularly, the students agreed that they would have preferred to play two game. The coupling of *Forest Diplomacy* and *Red Clay* offer several benefits for students as both learners of history and game players. Both games center on treaty councils between Native Americans and settler-colonizer Euroamericans separated by eighty years. *Forest Diplomacy* occurs during the late colonial period in British North America on the Pennsylvania frontier, while *Red Clay* takes place in the antebellum United States during the administration of Andrew Jackson. The fundamental themes of settler colonialism, indigenous sovereignty, cultural intermediaries, intercultural contact/conflict, forms of captivity/slavery, conventions of negotiation, assimilation/acculturation, and contested notions of race, land, and identity underpin both games. The primary sources informing game action and character development allow students to explore change-over-time within these themes.

*Red Clay, 1835* takes place at a critical juncture in the life of the Cherokee Nation and its relations with the United States. Georgia had been clamoring for the federal government to remove the Cherokee from its state ever since the 1802 Compact. In recent years, their demands have become more urgent, especially after the discovery of gold in the Cherokee Nation in 1829. The focus of the game is the Cherokee National Council meeting at Red Clay, Tennessee in October 1835, at which United States commissioners formally presented the Cherokee with terms for a removal treaty. –Jace Weaver, Game Author

*Forest Diplomacy* begins with Pennsylvania and the Delaware Indians (or Lenâpé) engaged in a vicious and destructive war. The focus of the game is a treaty council, which seeks to end the conflict. At the outset, instructors use traditional methods to help players familiarize themselves with the historical context, previous treaties, firsthand accounts of the war, controversies over Quaker pacifism, and various Iroquois and Lenâpé cultural texts. Then the game begins. –Nicolas Proctor, Game Author

## II. Reacting to the Past Pedagogy

In many respects, the Reacting to the Past (RTTP) curriculum might be understood as the historical analog to language immersion learning environments. Originally innovated by historian Mark Carnes (Barnard College), this inquiry based curriculum invites learners of history to inhabit the role of a specific historical actor or fictional composite figure. Students engage their reconstruction of the past through the lens and perspective of their role, and immerse themselves into the primary sources created by their historical character. The RTTP games re-invest a sense of contingency, complexity, and conditionality into historical study by situating students within liminal or boundary spaces lying between cultures, ideologies, motivations, and behaviors. This positioning places historical decision making back into the hands of the students.

The RTTP games are constructed around liminal times—trials, wars, revolutions, removals—when individuals, communities and societies are facing unstable periods of “becoming,” transition, or transformation. The Red Clay game aspires to humanize the history of “racial identity, United States expansionism, sovereignty and nationhood, cultural change and dislocations, how one deals with social problems, and the sectional divisions that eventually lead to the American Civil War.” The Game challenges players to recover the voices of historical actors traditionally marginalized from our narratives of national history through the interrogation and critical reading of primary sources. The roles enacted by students are not didactic simulations, but instead a chance for students to participate actively in historical processes within a plausible context underpinned by authentic documents and contextual knowledge. Ultimately, the goal is to create a history laboratory of sorts that allows students to practice the historian’s craft and wrestle with key historical concepts (e.g. causation, agency) and hone their critical thinking and interpretive skills.

Carnes describes RTTP games as “**Subversive Playworlds**” defined by four characteristics:

- 1) **Competition:** Every role has individual “victory objectives” that are also framed by the role’s membership within a particular faction or “indeterminate” persona navigating between factions. Reacting games are structured to have winners and losers because conflict is embedded in the most significant historical moments. Some ideas prevail, and some do not; some groups (factions, social classes, nations) win, some lose.
- 2) **Pretend/Make-Believe:** Students take on identities and remain “in-character” throughout the game. The drama and tension of the games, the oddness of the historical settings, the inversion of status, and the emotional intensity—all of these combine to create a psychological dynamic known as liminality: a transitional state characterized by the effacement of one identity and its replacement with something else. A student’s normal self is set aside and a new, and imaginatively more powerful, one, replaces it.
- 3) **Subversion of Authority:** The games deliberately undermine the traditional “direct instruction” dichotomy between teacher (transmitter of authorized knowledge) and student (passive receiver of information). The Game Master’s (formerly known as the instructor) role becomes one of offering the guided autonomy to students to play the game.
- 4) **Absurdity— Fun!** During the game unusual and unexpected things happen. For this reason Reacting classes often take on an unusual emotional tenor: laughter, confusion, tension, discomfort, unpredictability, and weirdness. All of these are evidence of liminality. Sometimes liminality is unsettling, but nearly always it is interesting.

### III. Course Learning Objectives

The principal learning objective of the course is to create the intellectual and constructivist space where “learners” become producers of knowledge and ideas rather than passive consumers of information. In contrast to lecture-based, content-coverage surveys, the RTTP curriculum is structured for students to demonstrate learning through their practice of critical thinking, questioning, researching, writing, arguing, and debating. Students completing this RTTP Course will:

- Improve historical inquiry and thinking skills
- Become accustomed to reading and interpreting primary source materials, drawing their own conclusions about them, and using them to construct arguments
- Perform academic writing as a process of disciplinary thinking
- Critically engage essential questions, issues and themes of antebellum American history
- Develop fluency with historical concepts (e.g. causation, agency, contingency, continuity, change) and reasoning (e.g. empirical, inferential, inductive)
- Reconstruct and assign meaning to the past through individual and collaborative written interpretations and oral arguments
- Understand the methodological, historiographical and epistemological challenges facing historians when attempting to reconstruct the past—particularly the pitfalls of “presentism” and the nature of the past as “the Irreducible Other”—an “island in time” the historian can never reach.

### IV. A Note on “Playing Indian”

*Red Clay* game creator Jace Weaver, is Professor of Native American Studies and Religion at the University of Georgia, and as a citizen of the Cherokee Nation has dedicated his research and scholarship to community-driven research for the Cherokee Nation and the Cherokee National Historical Society. Dr. Weaver shares some thoughtful caveats about role playing across racial, gender, and cultural boundaries that I believe bear repeating here:

“Limnality is at the essence of Reacting games. By entering into characters of a different time and place as fully as possible, students step outside themselves when in character and attempt to understand what someone in that position faced. Students often get into character by dressing up as their character. This is encouraged. On the other hand, there is a long tradition in America of “playing Indian,” that is to say dressing up as stereotypical Indians (See, Philip Deloria, *Playing Indian*). This should be discouraged and disallowed.”

In *Red Clay*, there are two opportunities for “playing Indian.” Costume is obviously another potential area for difficulty. Students must not come to class in feathers and face paint. In the 1830s, traditional Cherokee men dressed much like their White frontier counterparts with some exceptions. They might wear medallions or gorgets around their neck. They might wear a colorful sash. Traditional male headwear was a turban. Examples of this apparel can be found in the illustrations of Sequoyah and George Lowrey in Thurman Wilkins’s *Cherokee Tragedy*. More “civilized” or acculturated Cherokees dressed like affluent White Americans in stock-collared shirts or collar

and ties and cutaways or tails. Again, examples can be found in the illustrations in the Wilkins, and students should be encouraged to research in the library or on the web.

We have not found the other pitfall to be a problem, but we can envision it becoming one. This is the use of the “ugh/um” construction for stereotypical “Indian” speech. The Cherokees prized oratorical skill. Some of those depicted in the game are highly educated for the time. Others are not. But whether they are schooled or not and whether they would be speaking in English or Cherokee (the National Council operated bilingually), they were highly articulate. Metaphor was highly prized, and students should be encouraged to explore extended metaphors and similes. If anyone breaks into broken English, you should intervene and stop it.”

Ultimately, students will inhabit and perform their roles “intellectually,” and with full respect and dignity. Students will not change their speech patterns or accents to “mimic” historical characters, nor will they perform theatrically (costumes, body gesture) that perpetuate stereotypical or prejudiced constructs of race, gender, religion or other expressions of identity.

## V. Required Reading

Perdue, Theda and Michael D. Green. *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*. Viking, 2007. Available at the UO Bookstore.

Proctor, Nicolas. “Forest Diplomacy: War, Peace, and Land on the Colonial Frontier, 1756-57.” Available digitally in the Course Files section of the course Canvas Site. The instructor will also distribute bound, hard-copies to students on the first day of class.

Weaver, Jace and Laura Adams Weaver. “Red Clay, 1835: Cherokee Removal and the Meaning of Sovereignty.” *Game Book with Primary Sources*, 2015. Available digitally in the Course Files section of the course Canvas Site. The instructor will also distribute bound, hardcopies to students on the first day of class.

## VI. Supplementary Readings Available by Instructor

The following texts are available from the instructor as need by individual students or factions/groups. This body of scholarship will prove invaluable for students developing their roles, preparing for debate and negotiations, and bolstering their oral arguments and written reports. The Game Creators’ annotations below will assist you with identifying the most relevant materials for your role and faction.

### For Forest Diplomacy:

**Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years’ War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (Vintage: New York, 2000).** See chapters 1-14. (Background on Seven Years’ War).

**Stuart Banner, *How the Indians Lost Their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier* (Belknap Press: Cambridge and London, 2005).** (Indians and western expansion in general)

**James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (W. W. Norton: New York & London, 1999).** See chapters 5-7. (Cultural collisions and interactions)

**James Lemmon, *Best Poor Man’s Country: Early Southeastern Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).** (On the settlement of Pennsylvania)

**Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).** (On Indian culture and perceptions of Europeans)

**Timothy J. Shannon, *Iroquois Diplomacy on the Early American Frontier* (Viking Adult: New York, 2008).** (Indian Diplomacy)

**Allan Tully, *Forming American Politics: Ideals, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).** (On Pennsylvania's internal politics)

#### **For Red Clay:**

**William L. Anderson, ed., *Cherokee Removal: Before and After* (University of Georgia Press, 1991).** An interdisciplinary collection of essays, dealing with a number of topics important for constructing arguments, including Cherokee government, land-use patterns, and class structure.

**Tim Alan Garrison, *The Legal Ideology of Removal: The Southern Judiciary and the Sovereignty of Native American Nations* (University of Georgia Press, 2009).** This important study looks at the way state courts in Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee dealt with the issue of Native sovereignty in the run-up to Cherokee Removal. This will be especially helpful Instructor's Manual 19 to the Treaty Party and the White faction in constructing their arguments. It should also prove useful, however, to the National Party in finding the arguments and rhetoric they must counter.

**Brian Hicks, *Toward the Setting Sun: John Ross, the Cherokees, and the Trail of Tears* (Atlantic Monthly, 2011).** A highly readable account by a southern journalist. This work will be especially good in helping John Ross build his role.

**Charles Kappler, ed., *Indian Treaties, 1778-1883 (Rpt., Amereon House, 1972)*** This work, originally published in 1904, is the authoritative collection of treaties between Native nations and the United States. The Cherokee treaties that may be particularly helpful to students are the Treaty of Hopewell (1785) and the treaties of 1817 and 1819. This resource is now available on-line at:  
<http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Kappler/>

Direct Link to Treaty of Hopewell (1785): <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/Vol2/treaties/che0008.htm>

Direct Link to Treaty of 1817: <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/Vol2/treaties/che0140.htm>

Direct Link to Treaty of 1819: <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/Vol2/treaties/che0177.htm>

**Wilson Lumpkin, *The Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia* (General Books, 1909).** Reprint of primary document by Wilson Lumpkin. William G. McLoughlin, *Cherokee Renaissance in the New Republic* (Princeton University Press, 1986). This may be the single best book written on the history of the Cherokee and the events leading up to removal. It is packed with information. It is, however, lengthy.

**Jill Norgren, *The Cherokee Cases: Two Landmark Federal Cases in the Fight for Sovereignty* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2004).** This is a good, compact history of the two cases that set the tone for so much of the removal controversy by a first-rate legal scholar.

**Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot* (University of Georgia Press, 1996).** Collection of primary documents by Elias Boudinot, including articles from the *Cherokee Phoenix*. This will be valuable to both the National Party and the Treaty Party in constructing their arguments. In particular, Elias Boudinot's last publication (recommended in role sheets) will help the Treaty Party.

**Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green, *Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents* (Bedford, 2004).** The history is largely replicated in the required text above. Several of the primary documents are already contained in the game book, but there are others that will also be helpful to students.

**Robert V. Remini, *Andrew Jackson and His Indian Wars* (Penguin, 2002).** Highly relevant treatment of the subject by the leading scholar of Andrew Jackson.

**Russell Thornton, *The Cherokees: A Population History* (University of Nebraska Press, 1990).** This book, written by one of the best demographers of Native America (himself a Cherokee), will be useful in documenting the terrible population declines suffered by Cherokees from disease in the early nineteenth century.

**Anthony F. C. Wallace, *The Long, Bitter Trail: Andrew Jackson and the Indians* (Hill & Wang, 1993).** A concise and very good history of the events leading up to Cherokee Removal by a major historian of Native America.

**Thurman Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy: The Ridge Family and the Decimation of a People* (2d ed., University of Oklahoma Press, 1986).** This book makes the best case for the Treaty Party.

## VII. Canvas Course Resources

**Materials.** The instructors will post all course materials, including the syllabus, game books, PowerPoints presentations, multimedia content, course readings, and other handouts in the "Files" section of Canvas. The instructor will also upload students' Primary Source Analysis Papers and Constituency Reports as resources for the game.

**Grade Center.** Students may access their scores for all course exercises and assignments throughout the term in Canvas.

**Faction Groups.** Students will be enrolled in "Groups" within Canvas based on their faction affiliation to facilitate confidential planning and communication among faction members for each game: Forest Diplomacy: Interpreters, Indians, Proprietary, Anti-Proprietary, Independents; Red Clay: Treaty Party, National/Ross Party, the Whites, and the Indeterminates. The "Groups" can be accessed under "People" in Canvas. Although the Indeterminates do not represent a formal faction, an on-line space will be provided for their consultation as well. Participation in these faction "Groups" is optional and will not be graded/evaluated by the instructor. They are provided as a resource for the players.

**Audio Recordings:** The instructor will upload audio recordings of formal game sessions as a reference for the class.

## VIII. Assignments & Evaluation

### 1) Primary Source Reading Discussions & Analysis Papers/Presentations (15 points for each Analysis Paper | 5 points for each Analysis Paper Presentation) [30/10 points total]

To explore the broader historical context and specific circumstances surrounding the Treaty Councils depicted in *Forest Diplomacy* and *Red Clay*, the class will critically examine a body of primary source materials authored by the key historical actors portrayed in the game. Students will need to develop a strong understanding and familiarity with these primary sources to enact their roles effectively during the game. Hence, it is expected that students will read all the primary source materials included in the game books.

Each student will select one of the primary sources for each game, compose a one-page (250-word) analysis paper, and present their analysis to class during one of the scheduled primary source discussions.

**Primary Source Analysis Papers** will require some additional research to complete and will:

- Address the questions posed in the Game Book (as relevant).
- Provide additional biographic and cultural context about the author, including their purpose/motivation for authoring this source; their intended audience; and their perspective, bias, or principal argument/position.
- Assist the class with contextualizing the source within the broader themes that will frame the game, such as sovereignty, nation/nationality, culture, race, slavery, gender, colonization, removal, assimilation, resistance, dispossession, identity, indigeneity, ethnocide, and war.
- Avoid offering only a descriptive summary of content and instead adopt an analytical and interpretive focus.

**Primary Source Analysis Paper Presentations** will be approximately 5 minutes in length including time for facilitating discussion and questions from the class. Presenters may choose to recite their papers directly or offer more extemporaneous comments based on their written work, however, either approach must convey the key points of their analysis.

Students will upload their Primary Source Analysis Papers to the Course Canvas Site to serve as a resource for the class during the game.

### 2) Red Clay Quiz (10 points for course grade | possible votes and competitive advantage for the game)

Students will perform a short quiz after the completion of reading discussions and prior to the first *Red Clay* game session. Although the Primary Source Analysis Papers will offer a narrative-based opportunity for students to demonstrate their content knowledge, interpretive skills, and analysis of historical questions and themes, the Quiz offers one last check-point before the game begins.

High performance on the Quiz will also provide a tangible advantage for players in the game. The Game Master will award one extra vote each to two different entities. The three factions (National Party, Treaty Party, and the Whites) will compete. The faction that cumulatively scores the best on the quiz (weighted by number of members in the faction) will receive one extra vote. If the National Party wins, this vote will accrue to George Lowrey. If the Treaty Party wins, the extra vote will be given to Elias Boudinot. Should the White faction win, the

vote will be added to Elias Boudinot. The second awarded extra vote will go to the Indeterminate who scores the highest. In the event of a tie, in the case of factions, no extra vote will be awarded. In the case of ties among the Indeterminates, those achieving the highest grade will each receive one extra vote. This extra vote may be cast on subsidiary issues. It may not, however, be cast in either vote on a treaty.

### 3) Game Play Role Assignments

Each student will be assigned a Role with unique responsibilities and victory objectives for each game. The Role Descriptions explicitly outline the biography and assignments for each Role. Many roles sheets will also detail special powers (as applicable), identify relationships with other players, and offer strategy advice. Please read and re-read your Role Descriptions carefully.

Students are NOT graded on whether they win or lose the game. Instead, students are graded on their written and spoken work and how well they play the game. However, to encourage healthy competition and active participation students may receive up to 10 extra credit points if they win—accomplish their character’s victory objectives. As one game creator states, “winning’s not everything, but it is something.”

The following is a general overview of the types of assignments students will perform. Each student will complete a total of five written assignments—two for Forest Diplomacy and three for Red Clay. The specific format of each written assignment will vary based on the students’ role.

#### Forest Diplomacy:

##### A. First & Second Assignments. (20 points each | 40 points total)

These reports may take the form of written work (e.g. reports, letters, treaty drafts), and in some cases will entail “one big written assignment,” such as publishing a pamphlet or composing a narrative history. In other cases, these assignments will assume the form of spoke work (e.g. addresses, oratories, recitations, performing ceremonies). The specific parameters and instructions for each assignment will appear in the role description. The written text of all speeches should be submitted to the Game Master immediately prior to or after the delivery of the speech.

#### Red Clay:

##### B. Hermitage Debate. (20 points) Although only certain roles will perform and speak at this first game session, all students will submit a short written narrative—both speakers and observers.

- a. **Speakers:** Andrew Jackson, John Ross, John Ridge, Lewis Cass, Joseph Story, Theodore Frelinghuysen, and Jeremiah Evarts will debate the nature and extent of Indian Sovereignty, including a discussion about the decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* and *Worcester v. Georgia*. Students in these roles will submit a 250-500 word narrative of their arguments.
- b. **Observers:** Those not speaking will observe the debate and cast their votes to determine which side “won.” Each student will have only one vote. Students will not be voting in their factions, but instead are voting “out-of-character” and rendering their decision based on who made the best arguments and who presented the most persuasive evidence and interpretations of the

primary sources. Students in these roles will submit a 250-500 word narrative explaining their reasons for their vote.

### **C. First & Second Constituency Reports. (20 points each | 40 points total)**

#### **First Constituency Report:**

These reports may take the form of written work (e.g. letter to a relative) or speeches delivered during the game. The written text of all speeches should be submitted to the Game Master immediately prior to or after the delivery of the speech. Role Descriptions clarify the specific instructions and guidelines, as well as due dates, for the First Constituency Reports.

#### **Second Constituency Report:**

The Second Constituency Report substitutes for a final examination, and functions as a final analytical essay for the course. Hence, I have established the following criteria to clarify the parameters of this assignment. Ultimately, the Second Constituency Report represents your opportunity to demonstrate your understanding and summative assessment of the key historical concepts and questions we have explored during our preparatory readings and discussions, and subsequent game play. (e.g. doctrine of discovery, tribal sovereignty, federal power/states rights, slavery, race, assimilation, colonization, removal, ethnocide, treaty making, Cherokee culture)

- 1) Adhere to the thematic and structural framework outlined in your Role Description.
- 2) Compose your narrative in first-person voice from the perspective of your character. Add a creative element to your diction and writing.
- 3) Cite evidence from and quote relevant passages of primary source materials.
- 4) Evaluate critical events, exchanges, and ideas that occurred during the game.
- 5) Compose five to six, double-spaced pages. Oral versions of Second Constituency Reports delivered as speeches may represent abbreviated iterations of one to two pages in length.
- 6) Submit printed copies on the Final Day of Class on Tuesday, March 21 (2:45 PM).

### **4) Participation and Discussion “in-character” During Formal Game Sessions. (30 points)**

Students will be evaluated on their overall contributions to game sessions, especially their public speaking and debating. Students will sometimes speak as a member of a particular faction; sometimes alone; and sometimes they will have an indeterminate role and have the freedom to write some of their own game objectives in response to what they have read and heard. But in most roles, students must sooner or later seek to persuade others so as to achieve their victory objectives and win the game. Unless a student is “dead” or has somehow been silenced, students can participate in all oral discussions.

The following general rubric will be used to assess students’ performance:

#### **A-level:**

- accurate, unexpected, and inventive comments
- demonstrates keen understanding of primary source materials

- demonstrates keen analysis of game play
- B-level:**
- accurate, expected comments
  - demonstrates credible understanding of primary source materials
  - demonstrates credible analysis of game play

- C-level:**
- accurate, reiterated comments
  - demonstrates limited understanding of primary source materials
  - demonstrates limited analysis of game play

- D/F level:**
- factually inaccurate, off-topic, out-of-character comments
  - demonstrates little to no understanding of primary source materials
  - demonstrates little to no analysis of game play

## 5) Overall Course Participation & Engagement (10 points)

Beyond the minimum responsibilities and objectives unique to each role, student are encourage to engage in game play with extemporaneous questions and remarks, as well as participate creatively within faction meetings and inter-faction negotiations and private dealings. These actions will enrich student’s experiences and elevate the overall quality of the game.

**Total Possible Points for Entire Course = 190 points\***

### Final Course Grade Breakdown

<b>“A” Range:</b>	<b>190- 171</b>
<b>“B” Range:</b>	<b>170.99-152</b>
<b>“C” Range:</b>	<b>151.99-133</b>
<b>“D” Range:</b>	<b>132.99-114</b>
<b>“F” Range:</b>	<b>113.99 and below</b>

## IX. Policy on Absences, Missed Deadlines & Incompletes

The course structure makes it impossible to make up missed classes, so regular class attendance is mandatory. If you are unable to attend a class session, you must email the instructor. Once Game Play begins full attendance is imperative. Students anticipating missing a game session must provide the instructor and their faction members with advanced notice. The game will move quickly and cover significant ground each session. As such, missing deadlines should only be done in case of emergency and with approval from the course instructor.

## **X. University Academic Honesty Policy**

All work submitted in this course must be your own and produced exclusively for this course. You must acknowledge and document the ideas and words of others. The presentation of un-cited or un-acknowledge material acquired from any source—written, verbal, online—is defined as plagiarism. Violations are taken seriously and are noted on student disciplinary records. Please consult the instructor if you have more specific questions about the definition of plagiarism. Students are also encouraged to visit the UO Libraries’ website: “Avoid Plagiarism – Give Credit Where Credit is Due.” <http://libweb.uoregon.edu/guides/plagiarism/students/>

## **XI. Policy on Accessible Education**

The University of Oregon is working to create inclusive learning environments. Please notify the instructors if there are aspects of the instruction or design of this course that result in disability-related barriers to your participation. You are also encouraged to contact the Accessible Education Center (formerly Disability Services) in 164 Oregon Hall at 346-1155 or [uoaec@uoregon.edu](mailto:uoaec@uoregon.edu) . <http://aec.uoregon.edu/faculty/procedures.html>

## XII. SCHEDULE

DATE	DUE	AGENDA
<i>*Please consult individual Role Descriptions for the due dates of First and Second Constituency Reports</i>		
<b>WK 1:</b>		<b>Teaching, Learning, and Knowing History: A Pedagogical Reflection</b>
M 1/9		<b>Presentation &amp; Introductions:</b> Course & Game Overviews <b>Thought Experiment:</b> Exploring the Past: What do you know? How do you know it? How did you learn it? How were you taught it?
W 1/11		<b>Lecture:</b> Native America & the Doctrine of Discovery <b>Reading Discussion: Forest Diplomacy: Historical Context</b> Forest Diplomacy Game Book, pp. 5-58
<b>WK 2:</b>		<b>Forest Diplomacy: Historical Context</b>
M 1/16		<b>No Class: Martin Luther King Day</b>
	↻	<b>Assignment of Forest Diplomacy Roles.</b>
W 1/18		<b>Forest Diplomacy Game Overview &amp; Primary Source Analysis &amp; Discussion</b> <b>Reading:</b> 1) Philadelphia Treaty of 1742; 2) Lancaster Treaty of 1744 Part I: Maryland; 3) Part II: Virginia; 4) Part III: Conclusions; 5) Carlisle Treaty of 1753; 6) John Heckwelder, "The Coming of Miquon"; 7) David Zeisberger, "Delawares and the Allegheny River Valley, "; 8) John Woolman, "Epistle from Society of Friends, 1755"; 9) William Smith, "A Brief State of the Province of Pennsylvania, 1755,"
<b>WK 3:</b>		<b>Forest Diplomacy: Prelude</b>
M 1/23		<b>Forest Diplomacy: Primary Source Analysis &amp; Discussion</b>  <b>Reading:</b> 10) "Deliberations of the Governor's Council, 1756"; 11) John Armstrong's Account of the Kittanning Fight, 1756; 12) Testimony of John Cox, an Escaped Prisoner, 1756; 13) Great Law of the Iroquois League; 14) Merrell, <i>Into the American Woods</i> , chapter 5; 15) Merrell, <i>Into the American Woods</i> , chapter 7.
W 1/25		<b>Prelude, Part I</b>  <b>Game Play:</b> Players assemble into three groups: Interpreters, Pennsylvanians, and Indians. Interpreters serve as "go-betweens."

DATE	DUE	AGENDA
W 4: M 1/30		<b>Forest Diplomacy: Prelude &amp; Formal Treaty Council</b> <b>Prelude, Part II</b> <b>Game Play:</b> Players assemble into two groups: Pennsylvanians and Indians. Players complete their First Reports and prepare for formal Treaty Council.
W 2/2		<b>Treaty Council First Session</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opening Ceremonies and Oratory</li> <li>• Talks “In-the-Bushes” as needed</li> <li>• Council Deliberations</li> </ul>
W 5: M 2/6		<b>Forest Diplomacy: Treaty Council</b> <b>Treaty Council Second Session</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indian Response</li> <li>• Talks “In-the-Bushes” as needed</li> <li>• Council Deliberations</li> </ul>
W 2/8		<b>Treaty Council Third Session</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begin with separate faction meetings (Pennsylvanians &amp; Indians)</li> <li>• Resume formal Treaty Council</li> <li>• Conclude Council</li> <li>• Return to separate faction meetings to prepare for Coda</li> </ul>
W 6: M 2/13		<b>Forest Diplomacy Coda &amp; Debrief</b> <b>Coda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Players meet in separate factions</li> <li>• Distribution of publications and official treaty document</li> <li>• Registration of Side Deals (as relevant)</li> <li>• Indians make final decisions on matters before them</li> <li>• Pennsylvania Assembly votes on appropriations</li> <li>• The Proprietary makes final decisions.</li> <li>• Interpreters serve as “go-between” to ensure Treaty is Upheld</li> </ul>
W 2/15		<b>Forest Diplomacy Game Debrief: “Flipping Over the Cards”</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Game Master Announces the Game Outcomes</li> <li>• Students Break Character &amp; Reveal Their Strategies &amp; Machinations</li> </ul>

DATE	DUE	AGENDA
WK 7: M 2/20		<p><b>Red Clay Historical Content</b></p> <p><b>Red Clay Game Overview and Primary Source Analysis &amp; Discussion</b></p> <p><b>Reading:</b> 1) John Ridge, "Letter to Albert Gallatin"; 2) Elias Boudinot, <i>Address to the Whites</i>; 3) John Ross, et al., "Letter to John C. Calhoun"; 4) Jeremiah Evarts, "William Penn Essay"; 5) Andrew Jackson, Excerpt from the <i>1<sup>st</sup> Annual Message to Congress</i>; 6) Georgia General Assembly, <i>Georgia Indian Laws</i>; 7) Lewis Cass, "Removal of the Indians"; 8) Sen. Theodore Frelinghuysen, "Speech Before the Senate;" 9) Cherokee Women's Petitions; 10) Wilson Lumpkin, "Speech Before Congress"; 11) David Crockett, "Report of a Speech Before Congress"</p>
	↻	<p><b>Assignment of Red Clay Roles</b></p>
W 2/22		<p><b>Primary Source Analysis &amp; Discussion</b></p> <p><b>Reading:</b> 12) Indian Removal Act of 1830; 13) Memorial of the Cherokee Nation; 14) Andrew Jackson, Excerpt from 2nd Annual Message to Congress; 15) Resolution and Statements of the ABCFM; 16) Elias Boudinot, Editorials in <i>The Cherokee Phoenix</i>; 17) George Troup, "The Sovereignty of the States"; 18) Wilson Lumpkin, Message to Georgia General Assembly; 19) <i>Cherokee Nation v. Georgia</i>; 20) <i>Worcester v. Georgia</i>; 21) Joseph Story, <i>Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States</i>; 22) Alexis de Tocqueville, <i>Democracy in America</i>; 21) James Kent, <i>Commentaries on American Law</i></p>
WK 8: M 2/27		<p><b>Red Clay Hermitage Summit &amp; Prelude</b></p> <p><b>Visiting Scholar Presentation &amp; Discussion:</b> Kirby Brown, Assistant Professor of English Professor Brown is a citizen of the Cherokee Nation and professor of English and Native Studies specializing in Native writing from the late eighteenth century to the present, Indigenous critical theory, and nation/nationalism and sovereignty/self-determination studies. He is also the author of <i>Stoking the Fire: Nationhood in the Early Twentieth Century Cherokee Writing</i>, which examines how four Cherokee writers variously remembered, imagined and enacted Cherokee nationhood in the period between Oklahoma statehood in 1907 and tribal reorganization in the early 1970s. Kirby also knows the author of Red Clay, Jace Weaver, and will situate the historical actors of the game in the context of his own family history and identity.</p>
W 3/1		<p><b>Quiz</b></p> <p><b>Hermitage Meeting &amp; Debate (Nature &amp; Extent of Indian Sovereignty)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrew Jackson Delivers Welcome, Introduction &amp; Address</li> <li>• John Ross Delivers Address</li> <li>• Andrew Ross Delivers Address</li> <li>• Jackson Chairs Open Discussion/Debate Among Hermitage Guests: John Ross, Andrew Ross, Lewis Cass, Joseph Story, Theodore Frelinghuysen, and Jeremiah Evarts</li> <li>• Observers Vote to Determine Which Side "Won" the Debate</li> </ul>

DATE	DUE	AGENDA
<b>WK 9:</b>		<b>Red Clay Council</b>
M 3/6		<b>Game Play:</b> Faction Meetings & Indeterminates Meeting with Game Master <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faction Planning</li> <li>• Preliminary Negotiations Between Factions &amp; Indeterminates</li> </ul>
W 3/8		<b>Game Play:</b> First Day of National Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faction Meetings &amp; Council Debates</li> <li>• John Ross Delivers “State of the Nation Address”</li> <li>• United States Representatives Present Treaty Terms</li> <li>• Ross Chairs Open Discussion &amp; Hears Motions</li> </ul> <p>➡ <b>First Constituency Reports Due</b></p>
<b>WK 10 &amp; Finals:</b>		<b>Red Clay Council &amp; Debrief</b>
M 3/13		<b>Game Play:</b> Second Day of National Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faction Meetings &amp; Council Debates</li> <li>• Ross or Principal Chief Calls National Council to Order</li> <li>• Debate Resumes on Removal and Treaty Terms</li> </ul>
W 3/15		<b>Game Play:</b> Third Day of National Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faction Meetings &amp; Council Debates</li> <li>• Ross or Principal Chief Calls National Council to Order</li> <li>• Debate Resumes on Removal and Treaty Terms</li> <li>• Deadline for Decision on Whether to Vote to Remove or Not</li> <li>• Outcomes of Possible Votes</li> </ul> <p>➡ <b>Ross Faction Publishes Phoenix &amp; Ridge Faction Publishes Pamphlet</b></p>
U 3/21		<b>Game Debrief:</b> “Flipping Over the Cards” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Game Master Announces the Game Outcomes</li> <li>• Student Break Character &amp; Reveal Their Strategies &amp; Machinations</li> </ul> <p>➡ <b>Second Constituency Reports Due</b></p>