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 courses when students have played Red Clay singularly, the students agreed that they would have preferred to play two games. The coupling of Forest Diplomacy and Red Clay offers 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.

For the second year at the University of Oregon the Reacting to Past curriculum is being integrated with FIGs! Our Hidden History FIG connects this course with Professor Brian Klopotek’s ES 256: Introduction
to Native American Studies course and our History 199: Hidden History seminar. Hence, the content, themes, theory, readings, and exercises of these three courses will reinforce one another, and enables student to apply their learning, ideas, and questions across all three classes. The FIG and Hidden History Seminar will also host a research-based project enabling students to apply what they are learning and the issues they are interrogating in the RTTP games and ES 256 in a meaningful and experiential way to the campus and local community. RTTP students have frequently reflected at the end of the course how they can take the next step from student/scholar to activist/organizer and transfer the knowledge and context they have gained of the past to the present and address the legacies of colonization, white supremacy, slavery, and structural racism.

We are also uniquely fortunate to have three undergraduate peer educators co-facilitating our RTTP games. Daniel Berger, Kyley Brewer, and John Wallace are all RTTP veterans having played both games, and will be embedded in our course as peer mentors and coaches, called “Preceptors,” to students and factions as they enact their roles. Karlie Scott will serve as our FIG Assistant for the Hidden History FIG but will not be serving as a preceptor.

*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


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, hardcopies 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:


**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 in now available on-line at: [http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Kappler/](http://digital.library.okstate.edu/Kappler/)


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.


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.


### 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** (10 points each for Analysis Paper | 10 points each for Analysis Paper Presentation) [20/20 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 be assigned one of the primary sources for each game based on their role/character in the games to help students analyze the primary sources from the perspective of their role and faction.

Students will compose a one-page (250-word) analysis paper, and present their analysis to class during one of the scheduled primary source discussions.

Papers will be due after all oral presentations are completed so students have time to identify additional relevant sources for their roles.

**Primary Source Analysis Papers** will include the following three elements:

1) **(Author’s Identity and Intent)** 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.

3) **(Historical and Cultural Context)** Historical and cultural context for 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.
3) **(Additional Relevant Sources & Your Role)** Identify at least three additional relevant primary sources in the Game Book and presented by other students that are relevant to your assigned role and faction; these examples should include specific ideas, events, laws, reports, speeches AND explain how you plan to use this information and evidence as you prepare and play the game.

**Tips:**

- Avoid offering only a descriptive summary of content and instead adopt an analytical and interpretive focus.
- Read the primary source prompts in the Game Book as relevant to help frame your reading and analysis of the source.
- Review the sample Primary Source Analysis Paper shared by instructors.

**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. Presentations will include the key points outlined above for the written analysis paper. The instructors will provide additional examples and guidelines for the oral presentations.

Presentations will be delivered individually but within a “faction” groups to allow faction members to contribute to their fellow faction members’ presentations.

During the presentations, students should be actively taking notes and identifying ideas and content that will help them develop game strategies to achieve their individual and faction victory objectives.

Students will upload their Primary Source Analysis Papers to the Course Canvas Site to serve 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 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. The instructor and preceptors will clarify the deadlines for each assignment, which can vary based on your character, and provide coaching and mentorship to students as they complete this work.

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) 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. The instructor and preceptors will clarify the deadlines for each assignment, which can vary based on your character, and provide coaching and mentorship to students as they complete this work. Some general guidelines are provided below.

**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.

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
- demonstrates active listening and analytical and extemporaneous responses

**B-level:**
- accurate, expected comments
- demonstrates credible understanding of primary source materials
- demonstrates credible analysis of game play
- demonstrates active listening and credible responses

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

**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
- demonstrates little to no listening and no responses
5) **Tutorial Meeting** (10 points each / 20 points total)

Each student will schedule a 15-minute tutorial meeting with the preceptor or instructor assigned to their role prior to the first game session for both Forest Diplomacy and Red Clay. The preceptors’ and instructors’ office hours are posted in this syllabus and can be available by appointment if needed. The role assignments are listed in the Preceptor Guidelines Handout.

The objective of these tutorial meetings is to ensure students understand the following elements of their roles:

1) What faction are you in?

2) What are the individual victory objectives of your role?

3) What are the collective victory objectives of your faction?

4) What are some specific strategies or action steps you have to achieve these victory objectives?

5) What is your stance on the key issues, such as land, war, peace.

6) What are your First and Second “Constituency Reports”?

7) Do you understand how to use your special powers or unique abilities?

8) Do you understand how to perform any special responsibilities or actions?

Students will prepare answers or questions to these prompts prior to their tutorial meetings.

**Total Possible Points for Entire Course = 200 points*\**

**Final Course Grade Breakdown**

- **“A” Range:** 200-180
- **“B” Range:** 179.99-160
- **“C” Range:** 159.99-140
- **“D” Range:** 139.99-120
- **“F” Range:** 119.99 and below

**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.
http://aec.uoregon.edu/faculty/procedures.html