FOSAP has had a good year. Our listserv (FOSAP@cstl.semo.edu) is up and running. The two paper sessions we had at the 2007 meetings were the result of people networking on the listserv, and an active discussion has started for the 2008 meetings. Besides sharing ideas for a specific goal such as organizing a paper session, the listserv has provided a useful sounding board for announcements, concerns, requests for assistance, etc. The two FOSAP paper sessions were excellent (personal experience for the first, organized by Debra Picchi, and by reliable report for the second, organized by Clare Boulanger, since I had to depart on Saturday). The turnout for our business meeting was very good and there was an animated discussion concerning expanding the role of our newsletter ANTHRO-AT-LARGE, and possible topics for the 2008 meetings in San Francisco (see Robin’s minutes below).

I had my student assistant go through the recent Guide to Departments of Anthropology to identify those departments with 5 or less full-time faculty. She identified 144 of these departments, of which 37 were not represented by a FOSAP member. I took a small ‘sample’ (two random pages) of individuals in the Guide and it appeared that those at ‘small’ programs are only at about 2% of the AAA membership. Of course, these are just for those that pay AAA dues and are therefore listed in the Guide.

My guess is that the Guide has a fairly complete listing for larger programs, but I believe that there are a considerable number of us working at small institutions, and that they are underrepresented in our professional association. As I come across anthropologists at institutions that are not in the Guide I tender an invitation for them to get on our listserv and I encourage each of you to do the same (regular membership in the AAA and in GAD is encouraged, but not insisted upon for being on our listserv). A few years ago a suggestion was made for those in FOSAP who will attend a regional anthropology meeting to take some newsletters and even sit at an information table for a little bit to advertise our presence. We have some funds in our budget (from GAD) that can partially support this effort (a subsidy toward the meeting costs and funding for making additional copies of the newsletter).

FOSAP is now listed on the AAA website under “Interest Groups,” and I hope that this will provide some useful notice of our presence. FOSAP has a lot to offer those in small programs and we need to keep spreading the word.

John (jrhoades@sjfc.edu)

In Attendance:
Christina Beard-Moose, Suffolk Community College
Clare Boulanger, Mesa State College
Paul Grebinger, Rochester Institute of Technology
Sarah Hautzinger, Colorado College
Barbara Joans, Merritt College
Melvin Johnson, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Carol Morrow, Southeast Missouri State University
Bob Myers, Alfred University
Robin O’Brien, Elmira College
Julie Pelletier, University of Minnesota, Morris
John Rhoades, St. John Fisher College
Frank Salamone, Iona College
Deborah Tooker, LeMoyne College

The meeting was attended by twelve members and a guest, Melvin Johnson, from University of Nebraska, representing AAA publications. The minutes of last year’s meeting were approved with minor corrections.

The meeting began with introductions and the benefits of FOSAP membership were outlined for new attendees. John Rhoades also outlined the benefits of GAD for the meeting. Carol Morrow announced that the listserv has been “fixed”, although there were initial start-up problems. She will investigate whether we can post archives, newsletters and other information. A brief general discussion about the FOSAP web page followed.

Carol noted that changes in AnthroSource will affect ANTHRO-AT-LARGE, most likely in a beneficial way. She suggested that we expand the newsletter. Possible additions could include book and film reviews, and small program profiles.

Discussion of papers and panels for the 2008 meetings in San Francisco followed generating a range of topics. It was decided that paper and panel topics could be submitted for discussion to the list-serv. Clare Boulanger noted that Reflecting on America: Anthropological views of U.S. Culture, a group of papers that began as a FOSAP panel in 2003, has recently been published under her editorship.

John Rhoades agreed to serve again as President of FOSAP. Julie Pelletier will continue her co-editorship of Anthro-at-Large through the next issue, working with Carol Morrow. Claire Boulanger said she would consider becoming FOSAP webmaster. Sarah Hautzinger agreed to become secretary.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin O’Brien

Robin, we thank you for your dedicated service as FOSAP Executive Secretary!
Your fellow FOSAP Officers & Members
The following papers are from the FOSAP Panel organized by Clare Boulanger.

**WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE UNITED STATES? VIEWS FROM HERE AND ABROAD**

In recent decades, anthropologists have been excoriated, not least by fellow anthropologists, for enclosing the world's peoples in conceptual boxes marked "Other." While acknowledging that this practice has issued from and perpetuates the global damage wrought by Eurocolonialism and its successors, I note that the "observation" half of participant observation, the hallmark method of cultural research, privileges a neither-here-nor-there position from which to study society. This training enables anthropologists to regard even their own societies as "Other," and to craft the kind of incisive critique to which an "outsider" perspective lends itself.

This set of papers has been written by anthropologists and like-minded scholars who, throughout their careers and in some instances prior, have been able to turn the "anthropological lens" on the United States to worthwhile, if not always reassuring, effect. While some session participants have received assistance in this endeavor from a foreign background or significant contact with foreigners, others have drawn on the distance established by a growing sense of alienation from American culture to diagnose, and potentially treat, its ills.

Clare L. Boulanger
Mesa State College

---

**"We Thought You Deserved It": Malaysia And The U.S. In The Post-9/11 Era**

Clare L. Boulanger
Mesa State College

In the summer of 2002, I traveled to Malaysia to attend a conference and to visit with friends and in-laws. During a casual conversation one afternoon, it occurred to me to ask one of my husband's friends how Malaysia had reacted to the news of the September 11th attacks. I confess I was expecting some expression of sympathy and dismay, and perhaps even a hint of the resentment non-Muslims may murmur against Islam, given that Malay/Muslims, who are politically and socially dominant in Malaysia, rarely recognize how the power structure exacts a toll on the morale of Malaysians from other ethnic/religious groups. But my conversation partner did not become grave or bitter in his response; in fact, he was quite breezy. "Oh, we thought you deserved it," he said, and then moved on to another topic while I lingered, somewhat in shock, not only on his reply but on the unhesitating, matter-of-fact manner of its delivery.

Since that time I have returned to Malaysia once more, for a summer's worth of research in 2006, and in the interim I corresponded with Malaysians and followed the newspapers online. I knew that even as Prime Minister Datuk Seri Abdullah Ahmad Badawi was trying to improve relations with the U.S., his irascible predecessor, Tun Dr. Mahathir, who had used his office to deliver strident criticisms of the U.S. and its allegedly domineering Jewish minority, was holding meetings with 9/11 conspiracy theorists. In 2006, while visiting a university, I accepted a ride back to Kuala Lumpur from a professor friend and his colleague. "So who is it you think committed the attacks?" asked the professor, chuckling, while his companion gazed back at me expectantly.

I was well aware, then, that if Malaysian/U.S. relations were officially on an even keel, all was not well on ground level, and as an anthropologist I was secretly pleased that Malaysians considered me sufficiently simpatico to share their feelings frankly.
When I was faced with the prospect of writing this paper, I thought it would be an ideal opportunity to encourage them to commit their feelings to a more permanent medium. Hence I sent an email to a number of Malaysian contacts, encouraging them to disseminate it even more widely. The email posed the following questions:

- How do you feel about the United States today?
- How did you feel about the United States when you were growing up? Has your opinion changed? How and why?
- Why do you think the 9/11 attacks occurred?
- Does the United States need to improve its image in the world? If so, what actions would you recommend?

The response was not overwhelming, but provided sufficient data, with enough intriguing and hopefully instructive consistencies, for a 15-minute report. In all, there were five individual respondents, plus a sixth response from a lecturer who had structured a class discussion around my questions. Two of the five individuals were Muslim while three were non-Muslim: there are, of course, additional characteristics I could cite, but I mean to indicate that non-Muslims were not necessarily more sympathetic toward the United States simply because the attackers were Muslim. There was one woman among the individual respondents, and all of the individual respondents could be said to be in my generation. With respect to the students, the lecturer sent me the notes she took on the discussion, so I have no idea how many students participated, whether each statement recorded was made by a different student, how many of the students were men and how many Muslim. I actually think this an ideal way to preserve anonymity, especially of concern in the case of students. I presume that most of the students, if not all, were in the generation succeeding mine (what we call “non-traditional” students are still a rarity, relatively speaking, in Malaysia), and that there was a mix of men and women, and Muslims and non-Muslims.

There were two common, related threads in the responses on which I would like to comment at length here. The first—a more minor point, perhaps—reveals how effective American entertainment media have been in marketing an American image around the world. This was not, arguably, their primary intent, but the latent function of such products has been realized fully. One respondent, who stated that he no longer respected the United States, recalled that when he felt differently, “maybe there were too many movies [in] those days which portrayed the good guys and [the] bad guys, and of course they [Americans] always were the good ones.” Another respondent recognized that, “like most teenagers” from his era, he was “influenced by...American culture,” most especially, in his case, popular music. He grew up believing, from what he had gathered about American racial policy, that minorities suffered less discrimination in the United States than in Malaysia, but he was dramatically disabused of this notion after a visit Stateside. A third respondent noted, with “discontent,” the fact that the current U.S. administration had taken on the “role as a cowboy with the biggest pistol in an old Western movie.” The respondent had doubtless been exposed to these old Western movies, but he has also been exposed to the rhetoric of President George W. Bush, who has deliberately incorporated such imagery in his speechmaking. While the President likely does so to stress his Texan upbringing and hence reinforce the “good ol’ boy” persona that once gained him wide popularity, he may be unaware (and/or unconcerned) that around the world, such references are received with scorn, laced with some fear that Mr. Bush really thinks of himself in these terms and therefore may act them out. Malaysians know the potency of American media images, having received them during the impressionable years of childhood. It may have been especially traumatic, then, for Malaysians to divest themselves of illusions they had cherished for so long, but many have done so. Certainly the contempt these newly-minted cynics have developed for President Bush is only exacerbated by their sense that he is still mired in fantasies only the very young believe.

Ironically, when Bush first assumed office in 2001, then-Prime Minister Mahathir found this a welcome development, primarily on the strength of the fact that George Bush was not Al Gore, who in 1998 delivered a speech in Malaysia praising Southeast Asian democratic reform movements, pointedly including the one that had its roots in the
dismissal, detention, and eventual incarceration of Mahathir’s third Deputy Prime Minister, Datuk Seri Anwar Ibrahim. While throughout his tenure as premier Mahathir never desisted from his firebrand condemnation of colonialism and neocolonial globalism, U.S. investment in Malaysia remained desirable, and in order to calm the stormy relationship between the two countries, the Mahathir administration paid Jack Abramoff’s lobbying firm MYR 4.56 million (USD 1.2 million) to arrange for a face-to-face meeting with Bush, which finally came to pass in 2002 (the deal was at first casually admitted to and then vehemently denied by Mahathir, who, in light of the outcry that ensued when the story finally broke worldwide in 2005, insisted he and his offices had not been directly involved in any dealings with Abramoff). Some rectification had already begun: when the 9/11 attacks occurred, Malaysia expressed its sympathy, and Mahathir took advantage of the moment to vindicate his efforts to rid his country of extremist Muslims (“extremist,” in this instance, including any elements opposing the Mahathir administration). But any goodwill fostered between the nations during this period was compromised by the U.S.-led action against Afghanistan, and thoroughly dashed by the build-up to the Iraq War. Malaysians had seen that movie before, and they knew how it ended.

My informants had little good to say about U.S. ventures, military and otherwise, in the world today. Such expressions as “big bully,” “big brother,” “world police,” “the United States abuses its power,” and “arrogance” are threaded through the questionnaire results. The events of 9/11 were portrayed as a just, if not necessarily justifiable, act of retribution against a country whose misdeeds had long demanded corrective action (cf. Johnson 2000). If these misdeeds were specified, they involved the relationship between the United States and Israel. “I believe it [9/11] was coming because of the differential treatment the U.S. gives the Jews against the Palestinians,” wrote one respondent, “the extremists took the opportunity to use this difference to…wake the U.S. up.” Other respondents did not mention the Israel/Palestinian conflict by name, but made it clear that the U.S. was paying for past and present policy mistakes. One of the students (possibly more than one) is cited as saying, “U.S. political actions angered certain groups of people. [The] U.S. provoked them to attack.” Another student added that the attacks were “a warning to the U.S. that they are not as invincible as they think they are.” Underlying these sentiments is a belief, especially prevalent among the students, that the U.S. has no authority to interfere in the affairs of others. The lecturer wrote the following summary of the class discussion she conducted: “They [the U.S.] have so many internal problems yet they are more concerned with problems in other countries. My students have used the phrase, ‘minding other people’s business.’” Further on in the account of the discussion, this phrase recurs, and is extended into the following: “Americans should change their views that they are greater. They should be more open and accept the views of others. …Stop being bossy.”

In the past, Malaysians may certainly have delivered such admonitions, but more likely in the *sotto voce* manner of Scott’s “hidden transcript” (1990). That these transcripts are audible nowadays is a barometer not only of the declining stature of the U.S. but a sense on the part of countries like Malaysia that the global playing field is becoming level. For years Malaysia sought to enhance its worldwide visibility through such arguably pathetic devices as erecting the tallest flagpole, and stitching the largest flag. When the country experienced a major economic expansion in the 1990s, Malaysia could finally enter this competition in earnest, with the Petronas Twin Towers holding the record as the world’s tallest buildings until they were topped by a structure in Taiwan. Within the same decade, Mahathir introduced a plan for Malaysia to achieve the status of a “fully developed nation,” on par with the United States and Japan, by the year 2020. In the meantime, he instigated the campaign called “Malaysia boleh”—i.e., “Malaysia can do it!”—and encouraged his countrymen to undertake the gamut of grand feats from trekking to the poles, to climbing Everest, to sailing around the world, to traveling into space. While there were certainly Malaysians who regarded the campaign with a jaundiced eye, even they likely experienced in some measure what Mahathir had intended—a boosting of national pride.

---

1 A quotation from Mahathir which conveys far more than he likely intended: “I did not touch the money. But, I think somebody paid…. That is their system. It is not corruption at all. It is very open” (cited in *The Star Online* [“Fee paid to meet Bush”], 21 Feb 06).
and confidence. It was not yet 2020, but it seemed that in many ways the era of developed-nation status had already arrived.

During colonial times, Europeans (and Euroamericans) indulged chronically in an unsavory habit Thornton (2005) has identified as “reading history sideways.” Evolutionary models of culture change, suffused with the misapprehensions of Lamarck, were believed to describe, in the words of Morgan, a “natural as well as necessary sequence of progress” (1885 [1877]: 3) through which all human societies pass. Cultural differences resulted from the variable rates at which societies proceeded through the sequence—some peoples, Morgan suggested, had stalled at the level of Savagery, while others, having developed the necessary technological wherewithal, had graduated to Barbarism and thence on to Civilization. In that it granted to all human beings the capacity for “advancement,” Morgan’s thinking was actually more benign than that of his contemporaries who saw no hope for the “lower races.” Nonetheless, Morgan engaged in what I call “soft racism”—with respect to his scheme, it remained the prerogative of the colonial power to set what was “savage” against what was “civilized.” Like so many similar ideologies, the scheme established an egregious category of “not quite…,” with the so-called “Civilized Man” judging when it was that others might even approach his level. The insinuation of “not quite…” is greatly, and rightly, resented, since it is at base a denial of full human status by people who would not seem to have any legitimate claim to that prerogative. At a stroke, the Euroamerican notion of progress, conveyed in tandem with elaborate exercises of force and coercion, belittled a huge portion of the world’s peoples, while igniting within them the fire to prove themselves in precisely the terms their oppressors had designed.

Malaysians have certainly absorbed these ideas. Even Mahathir, who is not known for his humility, did not have the temerity to declare Malaysia “fully developed” in the 1990s (admittedly he intended to use the interim to construct development in a somewhat different way; see, e.g., Stivens 1998, 2000). But while many Malaysians may continue to see their country as somewhat less than the measure of the United States, they feel as though Malaysia has been doing everything necessary to “catch up.” So when, they may reasonably wonder, will America give Malaysia its due? Why do Americans persist in their course of thoughtless arrogance when the world all about them has changed? To the extent that the U.S. even acknowledges the rest of the world, its attentions have become unwelcome. The “big brother” references within my questionnaire results do not refer to the surveillance capacities of the regime depicted in Orwell’s 1984; rather, the United States is seen an officious older sibling, administering unneeded discipline and unwanted advice to a “little brother” who has already grown up.

It is not as though all of my Malaysian informants expressed such negative sentiments about the United States. One individual respondent began his note to me with, “I think US is a great country,” and went on to say that his “great admiration” had never changed. Even so, this respondent believed “what the US did in Iraq was a misadventure” and that “perhaps a better President would have made the world a safer place.” Some of the students praised what they saw as a friendlier attitude toward minorities—“it [the U.S.] is a place where education opportunities are fair,” “U.S. is an open-minded country where people voice their opinions freely”—but in this regard, we might recall the experience of the individual informant who held similar views before actually visiting the United States.

In a paper I read at the AAA meetings in 1996, I called on American anthropologists to spearhead a task for all Americans that even then was overdue: “we must examine ourselves as the products of hegemony and decline.” This is distinctly a time of reflection and redress, if we would only seize the moment. Roger Keesing once described a seminar he co-taught in Norway, where Fredrik Barth made the point that while powerlessness is experientially rich and therefore acutely knowable, power is only “this vague, diffuse imagined force…which is the assumed complement…of powerlessness” (Keesing 1992: 222-223). But most Americans are scarcely conscious of their growing powerlessness even as their attempt to imagine power becomes desperate. In the end, the emperor’s well-worn capacity for duplicity is exercised primarily against himself: he will be the last person to know he is naked.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


The Culture of Jazz and Jazz as Critical Culture

Frank A. Salamone
Iona College and
University of Phoenix

Salamone (1990), Keil (1979, 1992), and Crouch (2000), among others, have noted similarities in the use of humor among Africans and African-Americans, and more particularly they have noted this similarity among African-Americans and African musicians. Dizzy Gillespie, for example, continued the Trickster tradition in jazz. Dizzy, born John Birks Gillespie in 1917, was given his nickname early in his career. The bandleader Teddy Hill gave him the nickname because of his crazy antics on stage. For example, Dizzy used to come to rehearsals dressed in a hat, gloves, and overcoat, which he kept on throughout the rehearsal no matter the temperature. However, Hill always added, “Diz crazy? Diz was crazy like a fox.” He claimed, quite rightly, that Diz was a stable person, “the most stable of us all”. Hill, as most jazz musicians, thought quite highly of Diz. He gave him his first recorded solo and featured him at Minton’s Playhouse, one of the fabled “birthplaces” of be-bop.

It is important to note that Dizzy’s humor was not common among his fellow modernists. In fact, as he later acknowledged, it was related to the type of humor that Louis Armstrong used because he was such a great showman. Many modern musicians, who acted “cool”, turning their backs on their audiences and failing to acknowledge applause or announce tunes, put down Armstrong as an “Uncle Tom” whose antics kept jazz in the show business category. They want jazz to be considered high art in a league with classical music and separate from entertainment. Diz, who was a close friend of Armstrong’s, used humor to draw people to the new jazz. Even though both Diz and Satch recorded parodies of the other’s music, their uncanny ability to reproduce it showed they had listened closely to it. Indeed, material in the Louis Armstrong archives shows that his taste in music included not only opera, classics, pop tunes, but the most modern of jazz recordings. His recorded comments while listening with musician friends, shows

FOSAP prides itself on being an open organization, not only in terms of suggestions for paper sessions and submissions for ANTHRO-AT-LARGE, but also for inclusion in our administrative structure. If you wish to become involved, please contact one of the officers.
his ability to critique the musicianship of performers. He rated Gillespie quite highly on all accounts.

Just as Armstrong used humor to bring his superb music to audiences that had not heard his music before, so, too, did Gillespie. Audiences found humor, correctly, in the twists and turns of bop tunes and extended lines. If humor is built on surprise, then bop was an appropriate vehicle for humor. Charlie Parker is often caught on recordings, laughing out loud, especially when he and Diz played together and finished each other's phrases, as friends finish one another's jokes. Diz's dress was another humorous sales technique for bop. His infamous bop glasses, string ties, and, above all, his beret gave bop a sartorial identity, which all but squares found humorous. There was a trickster humor about bop, which many missed, although many sensed its subversive nature, questioning the status quo and seeking to replace old, unjust verities with new equitable ones. Bop was the musical language of the post-war African-American but its roots went deeper than that. Try as some of its adherents did to deny the fact, it partook of the humor of the African trickster, just as Satchmo did and Gillespie came to admit he did as well.

The Trickster and the Diz

The Trickster myth is found in clearly recognizable form among both aboriginal tribes and modern societies. We encounter it among the ancient Greeks, the Chinese, and the Japanese and in the Semitic world as well. Many of the Trickster's traits were perpetuated in the figure of the mediaeval jester, and have survived right up to the present day in the Punch-and-Judy plays and in the clown. Although repeatedly combined with other myths and frequently drastically reorganized and reinterpreted, its basic plot seems always to have succeeded in reasserting itself. (Radin 1955: ix)

We have a fundamental figure here, which is both general and specific. There appears a general need for the Trickster but a need clothed in specific features of a culture. The Trickster can be creator and destroyer, one who gives and one who takes, one who tricks and is tricked. The Trickster inspires awe and affection at the same time. Seemingly, the Trickster is one who gives into primal impulses without thinking. But I would argue that he is sly as a fox, who does, at least at times, clearly see the results of his behavior but who can get away with much because of his humor.

I have argued that powerful, sacred African figures require humor so that the audience can approach them (Salamone 1995: 3-7; Salamone 1976: 208-210). The informality prevalent in American jazz allows the royalty to temper the awe inherent in their status in order to permit youngsters to approach them. I suggest that much the same practice can be found in Nigeria. For example, I worked with a traditional priest who was one of the more powerful "doctors" in Nigeria. However, in order to encourage clients rather than discourage them, he cloaked his power beneath a persona of humor. This humorous presentation drew people to him whom he might otherwise have frightened away (Salamone 1976). Similarly, giants such as Count Basie, Duke Ellington, Dizzy Gillespie and Louis Armstrong shared an ability to draw people to themselves. Doing so enabled them to work their music for the good of the people while being open to further innovations. Although the Bori was an African trickster, I have not gone on a diversion here.

I am explicitly suggesting that Gillespie and Armstrong, among others, are in that same tradition. They clearly used humor to draw people to them. They would do almost anything to make the audience receptive to their message, for their music did indeed have a message. For Gillespie and Armstrong before him that music was, in fact, "spiritual". I once asked Dizzy about why he said it was spiritual. "Makes the other fellow sound good," he replied with his usual arch wit.

Additionally, there is an African tradition which holds that the musician has a sacred duty to stand up to oppression and speak the truth to power. In that task, Gillespie followed a long tradition of African musicians. It is no accident, I think, that the Yoruba musician Fela Anakulapi-Kuti studied and worked with Gillespie early in his career. Even Fela's claim to be The Black President has traces of Gillespie's half-humorous Presidential candidacy. Fela combined various aspects of African based music into his style. Interestingly, its foundation was the jazz of Gillespie and Charlie Parker, which he heard as a young man and which he used to create something
different for Nigerian music, something he deemed would be revolutionary. He put on a mask of the Trickster to perform. Mocking those whom he deemed had betrayed Africa, the colonialists and their African collaborators.

The Humor of Subversion

Dizzy would often open his performances by saying he would like to introduce the band. Band members would then turn to one another and shake hands, giving their names to each other, smiling and nodding. The routine, which I saw repeated many times, never got stale. Diz would sometimes stand aside and raise his eyebrows bemusedly at the audience. Eventually, he would get to introduce the musicians in the band, for Diz was a fair man who gave each person his due.

I remember one night in the winter of 1957-58 when he arrived in the middle of a blizzard to perform in Rochester, NY. He was late, something unusual for him. The audience, however, waited for him, knowing that somehow he’d make it through the storm. In those days, Diz traveled by car along the Birdland Circuit and he was coming in from Detroit. As the band scrambled to take off their heavy, snow-laden coats and assemble their instruments, Diz began to play solo trumpet.

The audience laughed as they recognized a current hit “Tequila” by the Champs. They stopped laughing when they realized Diz had bested them again because he was playing it straight. He took the novelty tune and reimagined it as a lovely then torrid Latin tune. One by one the band members joined in as they assembled their instruments, Diz began to play solo trumpet.

After ten minutes or so, Diz then began his spiel. He apologized for being late. “I was playing a benefit for the Ku Klux Klan at the White Citizens’ Hall in Montgomery Alabama.” As the crowd broke up, he launched into “Manteca” (Grease) with his then new opening chant, “I’ll never go back to Georgia. No, I’ll never go back to Georgia.” Again, as the crowd, and it was a crowd despite the snow, roared with laughter, he launched into a brilliant high-note solo, complete with all the pyrotechnics of which he was capable in his prime.

I reminded Diz of this performance thirty years later when he was performing at Elizabeth Seton College. He remembered it with a smile and repeated the opening of his solo for me vocally. It was then that he talked about humor and the spirituality of music, among many other topics. Diz took his role as a teacher/musician seriously, reminding me of Chaucer’s scholar “Gladly would he learn and gladly teach.”

There was another routine he had when doing “Swing Low, Sweet Chariot”, his version of “Swing Low, Sweet Cadillac”. The song is not only an American spiritual but according to the saxophonist Archie Shepp comes from an African religious song. Diz began his version with a Yoruba chant from Chano Pozo, a Cuban Santeria. The chant often drew befuddled laughs from the audience, and Diz played it up big. For him humor and spirituality were not polar opposites but complementary principles. Humor was a means of leading people to the spiritual.

As he told me, “When Chano Pozo came, the music all came together.” Again, once Diz finished his chanting, also setting the cross-rhythms of his tempo, he started the song, in the midst of which he took a brilliant solo. When the tenor sax player James Moody was present, there would be two brilliant solos. Then the piece would end with Dizzy’s tag line, “Old Cadillacs never die. The finance company just tows them away!”

The examples could continue. Just what was this once wild bad boy of jazz getting at? What did his great dancing in front of his band mean? His mugging with his frog like checks? His tilted bell on his horn? His African robes later in life? His pointedly supercilious vocabulary? His outrageous twists and turns, with his deeply serious playing on frivolous tunes and his humor on serious ones. What was he telling the audience? And just which audience was he addressing?

The following vignette displays most of the characteristics I have discussed. One night in Texas in the mid-1950s (Kliment 1988:75-76), the incomparable Ella Fitzgerald was sitting backstage eating a sandwich and watching the band members playing dice, a group that included renowned trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie. Fitzgerald was
terrified by the sudden arrival of local law officials, who arrested the entire group for gambling. The officers, upset because the group was performing in an all-white theater, took them to the police station where they were booked and jailed—Fitzgerald still in her ball gown. During the booking process, an officer asked Gillespie for his name. He replied, "Louis Armstrong."

And that is what the officer wrote down. Several hours later, after the band’s white manager paid the $50 bail, an arresting officer asked Ella Fitzgerald for her autograph. The next day, local papers reported that she was the best-dressed prisoner the jail ever held. (Iris Carter Ford: 43)

The subversive quality which Satchmo and Diz exemplified, the indistinguishability of the sacred and profane, the refusal to take accepted interpretations of reality at face value, the substitution of new realities for old are often found in literature based on jazz culture.

**Jazz in Literature**

In *African-American Satire: The Sacredly Profane Novel* Darryl Dickson-Carr writes of Wallace Thurman’s *Infants of the Spring*,

*Infants of the Spring*, then, asks us to reconcile what is normally considered an oxymoron, at least in the United States: an individualistic group consciousness. . . . What . . . Thurman . . . demands, however, is actually a precursor to the conundra that Ralph Ellison would propose in his widely acclaimed *Invisible Man*. Raymond argues that principles upheld by masses of African Americans are the ultimate linchpins to African Americans’ cultural and political progress, not unlike the narrator of *Invisible Man*, who argues that African Americans “were to affirm the principle on which the country was built” despite the reality of staunch, violent opposition, lest the nation, and therefore African Americans, be lost forever. It is precisely this fear of total loss, of an African American community swallowed up because it wastes its energies on frivolities instead of a fight for principles that drives *Infants of the Spring*’s satire. *(Dickson-Carr 2001: 56-57).*

This satirical glance is common to jazz and literature based on jazz. Jazz is music of freedom and, as such, opposed to that which hinders freedom. Thus, it is the supporter of all that promotes freedom, although just what constitutes that freedom is open to debate. Indeed, sometimes it appears that everything is open to debate in the jazz world.

Although the origins of jazz as an essentially African American music are not seriously in doubt, the exclusivity of it as something only African Americans can perform is in doubt. I have written about it earlier (Salamone 1990). Indeed, I find the fact that some “white” players can sound as black as “black” players a significant cultural phenomenon and will return to it in the conclusion. Jurgen E. Grandt has similar thoughts.

In 1951, James Baldwin wrote that" ... it is only in his music ... that the Negro of America has been able to tell his story' (24). But that same year, British jazz critic Leonard Feather published in the pages of Down Beat magazine a blindfold test with jazz trumpeter Roy Eldridge. Throughout his distinguished career, Eldridge had repeatedly expressed his firm belief that white and black jazz musicians had distinctly different styles and that he could easily distinguish between them. When Feather took him at his word and administered the test, the results were somewhat astonishing: The musician, nicknamed "Little Jazz" by his peers, was either noncommittal or wrong much more often than he was right (Feather, Book 47). Listening to Billy Taylor’s recording of, ironically, "All Ears," the seventh of ten selections, Eldridge’s irritation mounted: "I liked the pianist. Couldn’t tell who was colored and who was white. They could be Eskimos for all I know," he admitted and had to concede defeat in the end (Feather, "Little Jazz "12). *(1)* Eldridge’s blindfold test again raises the old yet still provocative question: Can white folks play the blues? If indeed the end product of a jazz performance transcends what W. E. B. Du Bois called “the problem of the color-line” *(v)*—can jazz itself still provide a useful critical framework for the study of black American cultural
expressions? To be sure, music, instrumental music at least, is a much more abstract art form than literature, but the contemporary critic still faces the same dilemma that confronted Roy Eldridge: the apparent paradox that jazz music is at once a distinctly black American art form as well as a cultural hybrid.

Jazz, indeed, in literature has taken on this hybrid, multicultural aspect. It is both "a distinctly black American art form as well as a cultural hybrid."

The point is that jazz is a Creole art form, which combines elements of seeming opposites, making reality a matter of "this" and "that too." Like American society and culture which it mirrors and shapes, jazz derives its power from its combination of opposites, which it combines into some new thing. That new thing appears to change constantly before our eyes, making any absolute understanding of reality but a tentative guess. Everything can be other than it is.

Such a perspective is a metaphor of American culture itself. It, too, is always in the process of becoming, rarely taking time to "be". Even the most banal themes can be transformed into things of exquisite beauty and at the most unexpected times. In the midst of despair, hope explodes into consciousness. America and jazz have grown up together and each expresses the fact that our seeming differences must be reconciled in a creative tension of harmony that can produce something far more beautiful and productive than their individual elements or else fall into broken fragments far inferior to those from which they came.
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What's The Matter With US Foreign Policy, And Who Says So?

Josh Klein, Iona College

What's wrong with US foreign policy, and according to whom? A theme in elite hawkish foreign policy discourse of the 1990s, intensified after 2001 for obvious reasons, was US weakness in responding to terrorism. In the terms of the dominant ideology (or Washington consensus), the biggest problem with foreign policy has been the "Vietnam Syndrome," i.e., the hesitancy to use force among a portion of the domestic population.

I am a political sociologist, an interloper into the land of anthropology. I expect my trespassing will go unpunished, given that crossing into foreign lands is a major activity among anthropologists. My interest here is to explore one aspect of foreign policy culture in the contemporary US. Specifically, I am interested in better understanding the foreign policy (de)legitimation process. One aspect of hawkish foreign policy discourse is the idea of US weakness or unwillingness to fight. There is evidence of growing discord within the power elite regarding foreign policy, not to mention dramatic declines in popular support for the conquering of Iraq. Can we interpret these changes as an example of de-legitimation or ideological crisis?

The structural side of the war on terror is the system of institutions the conduct US foreign policy. The war on terror is an example of state-corporate crime (Michalowski and Kramer 2006 14). Michalowski and Kramer's state-corporate crime concept is part of their "conceptual framework...that explore[s] how collaborations and structural intersections among economic and political interests have created... threats to social peace and human well-being" (Michalowski and Kramer 2006 4). This critical criminology approach argues for an expanded definition of criminology and of crime, including taking into account the breaking of international law and legal but injurious actions. This allows social scientists to consider, for example, imperialism, racism, and exploitation as crimes.

US foreign policy legitimation may be usefully understood using the criminology concept of neutralization. Neutralization theory argues that an offender rationalizes his or her criminal behavior before contemplating the act, by subscribing to values or rationalizations that make the behavior subjectively favorable. Thinking along these lines, we can speak of criminogenic cultural processes - actions, symbols, and meanings that rationalize harmful or unlawful behavior.

We can analyze nationalist and racist discourse as a kind of macro-level, society-wide neutralization of crime. For example, denial that US actions resulted in a victim, or denial of the harmfulness of US policy, are discursive ways to legitimate actions or policies. This is much like what
Freudenberg and Alario (2007) call diversionary reframing, a political strategy for deflecting criticisms by diverting audience attention from challenges to authority.

What have been the changes in rhetorical statements and factual claims about problems with foreign policy? Given the dominant ideology (or Washington consensus), several hawkish / militarist themes I believe are prevalent in the media and everyday culture are:

1. A problem with US foreign policy is the Vietnam Syndrome or domestic hesitancy to use force.
2. A problem with US foreign policy is weakness or softness in general.
3. Too few Americans are willing to do what must be done to be safe.
4. Critics of US foreign policy are dividing and hindering the war on terror.

I searched for US mass media newspaper articles including the terms "war on terror" and "Vietnam Syndrome." Here are a few quotes I found, all of which convey the importance of overcoming hesitancy to use force, or to be sufficiently tough:

1. "Vietnam is affecting the way the country is organizing itself to wage the war on terror... the ghost of Vietnam still haunts us" (Marano 2001). (United Press International.)
2. "Operation Desert Storm was stunningly successful. Much too much so, in one critical respect...Yes, it ended the "post-Vietnam syndrome" - the fear of engaging American military might in any far-off lands.. But to Americans at home in their living rooms, it looked like a video game" (The New York Post. 2001).
3. "...the Persian Gulf War of 15 years ago exercised the "Vietnam syndrome" - the fear of engaging American military might in any far-off lands...But to Americans at home in their living rooms, it looked like a video game" (The New York Post. 2001).
4. "[T]he healthcare reform failure of 1994 has created its own post-Vietnam syndrome, leading to a hesitation to act" (Davis 2006). (The New York Sun.)

The first and second quotes, from shortly after the September 2001 attacks, indicate a concern that hesitation to fight might limit the war on terror effort and worry that America's newfound willingness to fight is based on illusion. The third and fourth, are from 2006. Though the latter is not about foreign policy, both communicate a negative view of the Vietnam syndrome, as hesitation or indecisiveness.

Further research must systematically examine the discourse and ideology of foreign policy to help criticize the militarist drift. This needs to be done using ethnographic methods, as well as surveys and content analysis. The powerful have brought back crackpot realism to make the US in their militarist image. Public sociologists, public anthropologists, and critical criminologists unite: you have nothing to lose but your chains!
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Robert Myers' paper, while not part of the above FOSAP panel, provides a strikingly relevant exploration of apprehension in the U.S.

America the Fearful: Enculturated Anxiety in Modern U.S. Society
Robert A. Myers, Division of Social Sciences, Alfred University, Alfred, NY 14802 myers@alfred.edu

"A scholar can hardly be better employed than in destroying a fear." — Clifford Geertz (2000:42)

What's wrong with the United States? We have a culture of fear, for one thing. Fear is one of our most elemental emotions. Its evolutionary dimension, its survival value, is obvious: danger is near, be alert, seek safety, flee, hide, fight, do not let your guard down. Such fear is normal. Its goal is preservation. Fear is bio-cultural, with physiological consequences, sometimes mildly generalized, described by Hans Selye as "stress" (1956), or severe as in Walter Cannon's "voodoo death" (1942), but its cultural forms are what interest me. Webster defines "fear" as "a feeling of anxiety and agitation caused by the presence or nearness of danger, evil, pain, etc.; timidity; dread; terror; fright; apprehension. . . . a feeling of uneasiness; disquiet, anxiety; concern" (Webster's New World Dictionary).

Our many synonyms for fear, including angst, worry, horror, and panic, suggest varied causes and intensities. In today's post-9/11 climate of terrorism, we should remember that the word "terror" refers to "intense fear," deriving from Old French and Latin meaning "frighten."

Many have noticed fear's self-replicating nature. Henry David Thoreau wrote, "nothing is so much to be feared as fear" (1851), an idea FDR echoed in his first inaugural address: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," referring to traumas from the Great Depression (1933). Among the four essential freedoms Roosevelt later described in a 1941 message to Congress was "freedom from fear" (all historic quotes from Bartlett's Familiar

Some of our anxieties are inevitable byproducts of our rapidly changing world. In addition to the social and technological changes of the present, other characteristics of modern life—isolation, loneliness, social fragmentation, shrinking kin-based support networks, loss of community, competitive consumerism—all provide fertile soil for fear.

In American Tough, British scholar Rupert Wilkinson identified four historic American fears: fear of being owned (including fears of dependence and of being controlled and shaped by others); fear of falling apart (a fear of anarchy and isolation); fear of winding down (losing energy, dynamism, forward motion); and fear of falling away from a past virtue and promise (1984: 2, 114). Barbara Ehrenreich wrote about similar anxieties in Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle Class (1990). Susan Faludi describes how our current levels of fear have revived and heightened asymmetrical gender relations in The Terror Dream: Fear and Fantasy in Post 9/11 America (2007). In Amy Schalet’s comparative study of adolescents in the U.S. and the Netherlands, the deep concern American parents have about their teenagers’ sexuality can be understood as parental fear for their well-being, although she does not use the word “fear” explicitly (2000). Fear affects constructions of gender relations and sexuality as well as other dimensions of life.

Several authors have written about our misplaced fears, i.e. how we consider high risk those behaviors and situations which are not (Glassner 1999, Kluger 2006, Lee 2004, Stossel and Varner 2007). Others have emphasized the political uses of fear, including Frank Furedi’s Politics of Fear (2005). Fear is a prominent feature of life today.

In myriad familiar ways we accept lives saturated with fears, however unlikely or misplaced. As with most familiar culture, we take them for granted (Schalet 2000: 79). Consider a few examples:

- At a lake near my house: Lake Closed. High levels of bacteria.
- On a restaurant menu: “Consumption of raw or undercooked food, such as meat, shellfish, and eggs, may contain harmful bacteria and may cause severe illness or death.”
- On an aspirin bottle: “Warning: Aspirin Sensitive Patients: Do Not Take this product if you have had a severe allergic reaction to aspirin, . . . cross-reactions may occur in patients.”
- At the gas pump: Warning. Failure to Follow These Warnings Could Cause Serious Injury or Death.
- On every wine bottle: GOVERNMENT WARNING: (1) ACCORDING TO THE SURGEON GENERAL, WOMEN SHOULD NOT DRINK ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES DURING PREGNANCY BECAUSE OF THE RISK OF BIRTH DEFECTS. (2) CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IMPAIRS YOUR ABILITY TO DRIVE A CAR OR OPERATE MACHINERY, AND MAY CAUSE HEALTH PROBLEMS.
- In every airport frequent loud announcements never let us forget the threat of terrorism: The current threat level is orange. Do not leave your luggage unattended or carry any luggage for someone you do not know.
- On every car’s sun-visor, about air bags: WARNING. DEATH or SERIOUS INJURY can occur.

Daily, we are warned and warned. In our litigious society, we caution constantly about the dire consequences of mundane acts, motivated, I suspect, more by fears of lawsuits than genuine concern.

Our culture seems to have done something different with this elemental emotion. We have made fear useful far beyond political purposes. We have commodified it as a moneymaker, as a facet of commerce. We promote, advertise, and enculturate fear. We enlist fear as a marketing tool. Moreover, we use intense fear as entertainment. If these uses
of dread or anxiety are not exactly new, they seem more pervasive than in past decades. It is the daily cumulative presence of fears, large and small, real and imagined, which I find striking, and unsettling.

Sex sells, fun sells, weight loss sells, but fear trumps all. Ads for miscellaneous products play upon our worries: “Take the Fear Factor out of Checking Your Cholesterol.” TV and magazine ads market drugs directly. Take this medicine if you have that condition. BUT do not take it if you have any of the half dozen conditions which are then listed. Advertisers, and politicians at every election, have long known the power of fear to sell. It is not simply the marketers’ faults, however. We consumers are entirely cooperative.

No activity or area of life is worry free. Consumer society emphasizes fear of personal shortcomings or social disapproval. Politicians and talking heads on TV and radio hype fears about everything from the imminent collapse of social security to the loss of basic American cultural values. Religious firebrands promise eternal damnation to non-believers. The government warns about invading terrorists plotting massive destruction, dirty bombs concealed in shipping containers, and fuel trucks turned into bombs. Airlines won’t let me take an open bottle of water on board. Chinese global domination, bird flu and HIV/AIDS pandemics, nuclear proliferation, rising gas prices, trans fats, gay marriage, the Republicans, and the Democrats all worry me, or at least someone insists that they should.

Television generates fear by creating the “mean world syndrome” as described by the late George Gerbner. According to Gerbner, the more one watches television, the more one thinks the world is a dangerous place. This fear is rational, given the real and fictional crime and murder saturating us nightly on TV. Specific channels and programs push fears even more:

- The 11 o’clock news infamously reports all the reasons you should fear leaving your house or opening your door.
- The 2007 Super Bowl ads, viewed by some 90 million people, were notable for their scary nature, especially one for Bud Light showing an attractive, young couple stopping at night for ax-wielding and chain-saw-wielding hitchhikers carrying that beer. Researchers at UCLA studying brain patterns of subjects viewing Super Bowl ads demonstrated that the strongest responses to many ads were those of fear and anxiety (Hampp 2007).
- Stephen Colbert satirizes our fears on his “Threatdown.” He makes the point perfectly: fear is everywhere.

The Weather Channel, with more than 85 million viewers, stands out as a purveyor of fear, especially to the elderly and the infirm confined to their homes and mesmerized in anxiety by threatening weather extremes.

TWC’s weathertainment language is alarming. Nightly we hear about megastorms, supercells, wind shears, category 4 or 5 hurricanes, F5 tornados, flash floods, tsunami devastation, and drought. The glee with which weathertainers announce the arrival of hurricane season has little to do with responsible weather information. Every evening, someone’s home is swept away, a forest fire threatens, a volcano erupts, or giant hailstones assault vehicles. But mostly not today, and not nearby, because usually these stories are from the past or from elsewhere, and hence the unnecessary anxiety generated by the channel. Generalized weather worry is not unlike the generalized fear we are supposed to have from domestic terrorists, except that weather is more familiar, is more real, and therefore is scarier.

The cumulative effect of intense weather stories and endless warnings about dangerous weather is to increase our worries and our sense of vulnerability even when it is a balmy 70 degrees outside. Today may be beautiful, but look what’s coming. There is no humor in weathertainment, only anxiety about potential threats heightened with images of historic disasters. TWC has created the mean weather world syndrome.
We are surrounded by warnings and fearmongers, but they are just a part of our culture of fear. We actively seek out scary experiences. Many of us love the rush we get on roller coasters and extreme rides, but I will never forget the father forcing his crying 8-year-old son onto an intense ride at Busch Gardens in Virginia. Son: "I don't want to go, it's too scary!" Father: "It's not scary. It's fun!"

Children learn early to associate fear with fun. A Berenstain Bears Halloween book for children, *Ghost of the Forest*, ends with Leader Jane saying, "There are no such things [as ghosts!] There never have been! But just as sure as night follows day—it's fun to be scared of them anyway" (Berenstain 1988). The fear-fun connection turns up elsewhere. The Wax Museum at Fisherman's Wharf is "Fun, educational, and just a little scary." An ad for figurines based on Tim Burton's *The Nightmare before Christmas* reads, "Life's no fun without a good scare" (*Discover* June 2007). Halloween is the annual pinnacle where fear and fun mix (Blum 1999, Stoeltje 2007).

Fear as entertainment permeates American culture. Both in film and in print, purveyors of fear have huge followings. Stephen King's books sell tens of millions of copies and become successful, frightening films. Teen-oriented slasher films are widely watched. Horror films such as *Halloween, Friday the 13th, Wes Craven's Scream* films, and many others, more numerous in recent years, are without question more gory and grotesque. Many in the genre are promoted as fun. *Hannibal* was reviewed in *USA Today* as "brain-eating, face-slicing fun." *Resident Evil* was "A Killer Thriller!" "It's Terrifying Scary Fun." *The Haunting* was "A funhouse of shrieks and screams."

"Thrillers" thrive, playing to our fears of the unpredictable and the unstable. A recent film *P2* in a full page *New York Times* ad promotes itself with "The only thing more terrifying than being alone is discovering you're not. ... A new level of fear." Rated R for "Strong violence/gore, terror and language." (NYT 11/9/07). *Saw IV* is "The scariest, most suspenseful Saw movie yet" and "The best horror movie of the year!" rated R for "Sequences of grisly bloody violence and torture throughout, and for language." *The Mist*, Stephen King's newest "visionary tale of terror" is both "terrifying and fun" (NYT 11/23/07). The new 3D *Beowulf* with its "intense sequences of violence and disturbing images" is "your own private fun house" (NYT 11/23/07). The special effects "fright industry" keeps pushing the envelop with new terrifying sights. Fear provides a direct, conspicuous source of entertaining fun. Fear is commercially lucrative.

The usual interpretation of popular artificial terror is that it provides stimulation in an otherwise bland existence and that it does so in a safe environment (Blum 1999, Stoeltje 2007). Perhaps, but that doesn't go far enough. We have enculturated ourselves with this approach to artificial fear; we have learned to seek fright and to tease ourselves with it. We welcome market-driven fear. We use fear to strengthen the cultural theme of toughness, often reinforcing gender stereotypes by displaying male toughness in the presence of females.

Beyond frightening films and books are other sources of anxiety from which there is no easy escape. Consider a random list:

---Do I have bad breath? body odor? yellow teeth? Am I going bald?
---What are the results of my prostate test, colon test, or your PAP smear, or mammogram?
---Is the mall safe?
---Are the children safe playing at the park? in the woods? at home alone?
---If I get a flu shot, will I be the one in a million who gets paralyzed?
---Is that hamburger thoroughly cooked?
---Is that bag of spinach safe to eat?
---Does the toy made in China I just bought have lead in its paint, or is it coated with toxic chemicals?

In the U.S., fear's name is legion. It is culturally entrenched and exacts a cost. The Mayo Clinic estimates that 12 percent of the U.S. population experiences a phobia at some point, "making this disorder the most common mental illness in the U.S." ([www.mayoclinic.com/health/phobias/DS00272/](http://www.mayoclinic.com/health/phobias/DS00272/)). The National Institute of Mental Health reports that anxiety disorders, ranging from specific phobias, panic disorders, social phobias, PTSD, OCD, and generalized anxiety disorders, "affect about 40 million American adults age 18 and older (about 18%)"
in a given year, causing them to be filled with fearfulness and uncertainty (www.nimh.nih.gov/publicat/anxiety.cfm). These private anxieties are not necessarily caused by pervasive fear-enculturation to which I am calling attention, but they do not exist in a vacuum either. Our stressful, anxious cultural climate makes them worse.

U.S. fearfulness plays a role in our international perspectives. While in Mali recently, Jimmy Buffet commented that if one read and took seriously every State Department warning, one would never travel outside the U.S. (Vanity Fair, Nov. 2007). Fear is confining and feeds xenophobia, both at home and abroad.

Clifford Geertz, writing about Na non-marriage and Han-Na relations in China, noted that difference powers most fear (2001: 30). If difference drives fear, our limited familiarity with other cultures increases our tendency to magnify both difference and the fear it creates.

Others have noted our exaggerated world of anxiety. Writing in Foreign Affairs, Dominique Moïsi, a senior advisor at the Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI) in Paris, extends the idea of fear in the U.S. to Europe as well. Moïsi contrasts the Euro-American “culture of fear,” with the Arab-Muslim world’s “culture of humiliation” and the Asian “culture of hope” (2007). “The United States and Europe are divided by a common culture of fear.” Each of the fears emphasized for Europe applies equally well to the U.S., concerning loss of control over territory, security, and identity—“in short, one’s destiny” (2007:9). Both European and American fears include “fear of being blown up by radical Islamists,” “fear of being left behind economically,” and “fear of being ruled by an outside power, even a friendly one” (9).

Canadian journalist, writer, and activist Naomi Klein is on the mark when she asserts, “The main difference between [our] two countries is that the United States is driven by fear. There is not a strong social safety net in the U.S., so you worry that you will have no money when you retire, or have no one to take care of you when you get sick. The look-after-yourself mentality is at the core of how the United States has chosen to build its society” (Solomon 2003). She describes larger, conspicuous sources of anxiety, a situation amplified by our many enculturated fears.

Is there hope for less culturally-induced fearfulness? Not much, I fear, but becoming more aware of it is an important step. On the positive side, consumer culture creates counter-swings and counter-niches by promoting the absence of fear. Fearless this and fearless that identify many websites, from shopping and driving to music and sports predictions and hundreds more. "Fearless Planet" on the Discovery Channel seems oddly named, except that it emphasizes this counter-theme. Nick Lachey and Eva Mendes are Cosmopolitan Magazine’s “Fun, Fearless, Male and Female of 2007.” “Mastering yourself makes you fearless” is the tagline for the recent (2006) Jet Li martial arts film, Fearless. The Fearless Living Institute sells "Be Fearless" bracelets. "Fearless" is the new marketing logo of Oberlin College: "We are Oberlin. Fearless." Fearlessness fits well with a culture emphasizing macho toughness. In a fearful culture, being Fearless is distinctive and marketable. It does not neutralize fear, but at least highlights a welcome counterweight.
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**SPOTLIGHT on SAPS**

The following is a new feature for ANTHRO-AT-LARGE. In every issue we will shine our SPOTLIGHT on one or more small anthropology programs, providing details on your program’s history, structure, goals, and challenges. Robin O’Brian from Elmira College is breaking the ice with the inaugural SPOTLIGHT but you can be next! Brief is fine; just send your SPOTLIGHT to Editors Carol Morrow (cmorrow@semo.edu) and Julie Pelletier (pelletja@morris.umn.edu).

**Anthropology Program at Elmira College**

Robin O’Brian

As is true at many small colleges, anthropology at EC exists jointly with sociology. We offer a joint major, with concentrations in either anthropology or sociology. Students may also minor in either discipline. All majors must take both introductory cultural anthropology and introductory sociology, and take courses in both disciplines, while concentrating in the field they are most interested in.

The program of necessity is strongly oriented toward cultural anthropology. We offer a course yearly in biological anthropology and every other year a field-based archaeology course is offered by the classicist on our faculty. Anthro concentrators are required to take one of these courses (their choice) and may take the other as an elective if they wish.

Robin O’Brian is the anthropology professor and teaches introductory anthropology and all other cultural anthropology courses. Martha Easton is the sociology professor and covers all sociology courses. They share responsibility for social theory, qualitative methods and the senior seminar, which are required of all majors.

Anthropology graduates at EC have gone on to do graduate work in anthropology, have joined the Peace Corps and have entered graduate programs in social work, education and counseling.
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