Almost by accident, I discovered before this year's meetings in New Orleans that the Federation of Small Anthropology Programs, affectionately known as FOSAP, turned ten years old in 2002. This discovery, of course, has prompted me to reflect on the history of the organization and what it has accomplished over the years. Let me report on the results of my historical sleuthing.

FOSAP was born out of discussions between Pat Rice of West Virginia University and Franklin Young of University of San Diego who agreed that there needed to be a forum to address the issues that concern anthropologists in small programs. They operationally defined a small program as one with five or fewer full-time anthropologists. Realizing that an organizational home had to be found within the AAA, Rice and Young succeeded in getting FOSAP approved as a committee within the General Anthropology Division, a status it continues to hold. In order for FOSAP to become a committee, at least one hundred members of the AAA had to indicate interest in becoming members. That, apparently, was no problem: an early edition of the Newsletter indicates that 215 people became members of FOSAP.

In the first year of operation, Rice and Young conducted a survey of 150 small programs culled from the Guide to Departments in an effort to discover what problems and issues were faced by the many anthropologists in small programs across the country. From this survey, they organized what was to be the first of many symposia for the national meetings in 1992. Appropriately enough, the session was entitled “Problems and Issues in Small Programs.”

One of the most significant accomplishments of FOSAP has been the organization of symposia for the annual meetings. Over the last ten years, there have been twelve sessions which usually have been given “invited” status by GAD on topics that frequently concern teaching: four field coverage in introductory courses, teaching anthropological methods, using electronic media and courseware, the utility of the Internet, and teaching the anthropology of North America. In addition to the sessions on pedagogy, a number of symposia have tackled issues of particular concern to those in small programs, for example, working with collateral disciplines such as sociology, assessment, anthropology and the multicultural movement, and the marginalization of anthropology in higher education.

The topics of these symposia have usually been generated out of discussions at the annual business meetings with follow up in the months afterwards. These symposia invariably have attracted large crowds despite the sometimes inopportune scheduling. Here’s a complete list of the sessions, along with the two scheduled for this year. Be sure to check out these two in Chicago:

1992 San Francisco: “Problems and Issues in Small Programs” organized by Pat Rice and Frank Young.
1997 Washington, D.C: Assessing Assessment: Success, Failure, and Ambiguity in Higher Education” organized by Dan Moer
1998 Philadelphia: "Mad About Methods: Teaching the Ethnographic Approach to Undergraduates"
organized by Catherine Cameron
organized by Manuel Carlos.

"Course Web Sites, Web Connectivity, and Internet-Assisted Teaching," electronic poster session
organized by Manuel Carlos.

2000 San Francisco: "Internet Dreaming: Information Technology and the Restructuring of Post-Secondary Education" organized by Wes Shumar and Catherine Cameron

organized by Paul Grebinger and John Rhoades.

2003 Chicago: "Asserting Anthropology in the Liberal Arts Curriculum" organized by John Rhoades.
"Teaching US/Teaching U.S.: Anthropologists Teaching To and About the Natives at Home"
organized by Robert Myers and Robin O'Brian.

Many anthropologists in small programs are not able
to come to the national meetings on a regular basis because of limited support from their home institutions (a problem in itself). Fortunately, the papers from many of the FOSAP-sponsored sessions have been published in the Newsletter. Twelve newsletters have been published since 1992: the one you are currently reading is the 13th. We are grateful to the succession of faithful editors: Angelo Orona (1992-1996), Ann Maxwell Hill (1997-1999), Jim Wanner and Sally McBeth (2000), and Paul Grebinger and John Rhoades (2001 to the present). Thanks is also due to Dan Moerman for his efforts to put FOSAP on the Web at www.fosap.org. John Gatewood is the current web master.

The FOSAP leadership positions include the president, secretary-treasurer, program chair, and newsletter editor. In recent years, the program chair position was replaced by the membership chair. Betsy Baird has dutifully maintained the unruly list. She has our gratitude for this task. The list of presidents include: Frank Young (1992), Dan Moerman (1993-1995) and co-chair with Ann Hill (1995-1997), co-chairs Ann Hill and Cate Cameron (1997-2000), co-chairs Cate Cameron and Paul Grebinger (2000-2001), and co-chairs Cate Cameron and Bob Myers (2002 to present). Among the duties of the chairs is attendance and reporting of activities at the annual GAD board meetings. We welcome Bob Myers to the fold.

Although most of us trained in large anthropology programs, many of us got jobs in colleges and universities where there are just a few, and, in some cases, only one anthropologist(s). It is sometimes daunting and often challenging to be the lone voice of the discipline we love in those institutions where we work. The mission of FOSAP has always been to advance anthropology in higher education and provide support and resources to those in small programs. The bulk of that support is in the form of education through the symposia that are organized and the newsletters that are published. This work will continue, we hope, in the years ahead. We do need to hear your ideas for the direction of FOSAP. (See page 9, "Request for Member's Participation)

So, happy birthday, FOSAP. May you always prosper!
Cate Cameron, co-president

MINUTES FROM BUSINESS MEETING

The minutes for the 2002 FOSAP business meeting can be found in the General Anthropology Division section of the February Anthropology Newsletter, 44(2):43-44. Here is an update from Cate:

Good News for Small Programs!
The AAA has acceded to a FOSAP request to lower the cost of listing small programs in the Guide to Departments. Many of you told us in our survey that the old cost of $150 was a hardship. Depending on the size of the listing, the cost can be as low as $50.

If you have never listed in the Guide, you will need to contact the AAA for information on getting a user name and password to submit electronically. Use www.aaanet.org. Click on "2003-2004 AAA Guide Listing UPDATE." If you prefer, you can also submit hard copy, but you need to get forms from AAA.

Even if you do not support a major, a listing in the Guide is useful. It is also helpful for advising students about graduate programs. We hope you take advantage of the new fee structure.

Happy listing!
Anthropology Reborn: The Creation of an Anthropology Minor in a Midwest Institution
Lorenzo Covarrubias, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Department of Sociology & Criminal Justice, St. Louis University

There is something unique about teaching, sharing, and learning in a department where an anthropological perspective exists "in the margins." The challenges, expectations, and objectives seem so different from our own niche in an established Anthropology Department throughout the country. I, as many others, "assumed" that if your Ph.D. said Anthropology, this also meant that your professed disciplinary home would be a teaching or research unit with the same name. I still recall when one of my professors in the Graduate Program in Anthropology at UC Santa Barbara mentioned that the fault with many established doctoral programs in the field was that they prepared future Ph.D.s as if they were all going to find work in the top 50 universities in the land. We could somewhat add now that these programs may also presume that those graduating will find their academic space in our own discipline.

That is surely how I felt. In fact, I often felt a sense of loss, or even sadness, when publications or conference authors would follow their titles with a department name other than anthropology. What could have gone wrong, I would ponder. Well, as of this year, nothing much. Maybe, just maybe, it's more a reflection on the multifaceted preparation and profile of the job seeker than anything else. Or, as has been my experience since the Fall 2002 at my university, a need existed previously and the anthropologist(s) found were a near-perfect match.

At St. Louis University—a Jesuit institution in the city of St. Louis, MO—anthropology has officially returned. I say returned, because the university had an anthropology program until the 1970s or so. I don't entirely know how and why, but key faculty in the Sociology and Criminal Justice Department decided to apply a couple of years ago for an innovative in-house program to bring (and, more importantly, to fund) innovation in introductory and freshman courses. Before long, a special introduction to anthropology course was born, a search to find a sociologist of race and ethnicity mutated so that I would arrive instead, and a second anthropologist materialized only a month after I had accepted the offer.

The end result has been a freshly minted Anthropology Minor which has received the attention reserved for large majors or well-funded research centers. Stories in the student paper, on-line documents, and the staff/faculty monthly continuously point to the new anthropologists on campus (a cultural and biological one) and the impending and welcome Minor. I, of course, am not that naive to think that this will go on and on, or that a Minor is really that important. What I do sense, however, is a genuine feeling among colleagues who seek us out that they trust and respect the anthropological vision.

A side benefit of teaching in non-anthropology departments or small programs, is the close relationship that can develop among those anthropologists present. For some reason or another, stories in the Anthropology News, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and even the American Anthropologist, point to the disarray and internal conflict among the several branches and specializations in our discipline, particularly the biological and cultural split. I am sad to say that this could happen more in well established anthropology programs, and happy to say less frequently in small programs. My new colleague (physical/biological) and I (sociocultural) are wholly bound to one another through our "anthropologyness", and seek to instill that thought in the several students who have shown interest in our minor. We are both anthropologists and attempt to answer similar questions about the human experience through complementary approaches. We feel that this is important for our students to hear, especially since one of our goals is to plant the seed of graduate work in anthropology in them. Something quite different from the many instances that we know of, where representatives of each branch seek to 'steal' students from each other.

As I conclude, I want to point out that I also foresee, in fact expect, to face some of the particular challenges that have been reported in recent FOSAP Newsletters. Currently, the small anthropology program to which I belong is more in the middle than in the margins. However, I also realize that a sort of 'tokenism' may exist right now
that, when finished, could easily push us to the margins. Yet, I also know that our presence, and the minor, is a means to strengthen and expand sociology and criminal justice in relation to other departments in the humanities and social sciences. Thus, the near future is assured. From what I have just read in the Newsletter, will FOSAP be?

contact: Lorenzo Covarrubias corarrl@slu.edu

~

The Academic Prioritization Trend in Higher Education: Opportunity or Threat?
Dr. Debra Picchi, Anthropology Department
Franklin Pierce College Rindge, NH 03461

I work in a small Anthropology Department. We are a band of three full-time faculty members, and although we offer a major in Anthropology to the students at our liberal arts college, we have only about 45 undergraduate majors at any given time. This is quite different, of course, from the huge Anthropology Departments that house ten times as many Anthropologists and boast three times as many graduate students alone. However, one source of fear and pain that unites all of us is the trend in higher education that is called the Prioritization of Academic Programs and Services.

In case this tsunami has not appeared on your College’s horizon yet, program prioritization is described as a process that allows institutions the opportunity of setting programmatic priorities so that they may use their resources more efficiently and more economically. It is described in a book by Robert Dickeson (1999) called Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services. He includes seven postulates in his text. Three of them, which were first presented to the faculty at our College at a monthly Faculty Meeting, struck immediate terror in the hearts of us Anthropologists. They are: (1) most colleges and universities try to be all things to all people, but end up doing nothing with distinction, (2) academic programs have been allowed to grow without consideration of their relative worth, and (3) the most likely source for resources (funds and faculty lines) is existing resources that need to be reallocated.

Our introduction to this process took place in late 2001, and by spring of 2002 we were hard at work. My two colleagues and I spent many hours in meetings and then preparing what came to be known as our "Anthropology Program Prioritization Report." This twenty-page combination of history of Anthropology at our College and justification for its existence was twenty-pages double spaced (the maximum allowed) plus about thirty pages of appendices. In May of 2002 it was ready, and with trepidation, we submitted it to the Academic Prioritization Committee (as opposed to non-academic version which went through its own process).

And then we waited through the hot summer of 2002 as this committee weighed Anthropology’s relative strengths, weaknesses, costs to the College, and market value (student draw potential). We knew we would receive one of five possible grades: “enhance,” “maintain,” “maintain and monitor,” “reduce support,” or “eliminate.” It goes without saying which we really wanted to receive; however, what could we realistically expect?

In fact we received a “maintain and monitor” along with a set of recommendations about how we should proceed in improving our program. At first we were relieved that we actually survived when across the hall, Sociology and Women’s Studies received “eliminate.” (And, in fact, they have “gone down.” The 2003-2004 academic catalogue of programs will reflect their termination.) But then the possible implications of the “monitor” part of our sentence soon struck us. We resolved to do all that we possibly could to make an appeal for changing our program’s status. Below are four “postulates” (to use Dickeson’s term) we developed as we went through the excruciating appeal and follow-up phase. I share them with you so that you can consider using them should you find yourself in a similar situation. Predictably they revolve around the concept of changing a threat into an opportunity.

Prioritization Opportunity 1: This is the hardest. Do not take what is happening personally. Although the categories and outcomes “feel” very personal indeed, do not waste the energy on emotional reaction. We mourned our fate and bitterly castigated the committee members for not recognizing the stellar attributes of our program and of our contributions as professionals to the College community. We are to pass through this process again in five years, and I will be better prepared next time around. Stoicism will be my goal.

Prioritization Opportunity 2: Gather together statistics. These can be Admissions statistics from your own college or national trend statistics.
However, build a case to demonstrate demand for your program. For example, our College's admissions statistics indicated that in the years 2000 and 2001, 202 inquired about Anthropology, and 45 enrolled to study in our department. In 2002, 63 inquired about the Anthropology program. We did not have the actual enrollment figures for the appeal. We argued both in a written document and at a hearing that our program attracted a reasonable amount of interest for a college with 1,500 students, and that students actually came to Franklin Pierce College to study Anthropology. We also showed with SAT scores that the academic quality of these students significantly exceeded the College average. That is, Anthropology was attracting the kind of student the College really wanted.

Prioritization Opportunity 3: Link aspects of the program to the mission of the college and make the case that without Anthropology, the college will not be able to achieve its goals in the same way it did before. For example, we contended that the essential mission of the discipline of Anthropology includes: global awareness, the understanding and positive awareness of diversity, and an increased knowledge of alternative perspectives of gender, race, sexual orientation, and national origin.

Prioritization Opportunity 4: Connect Anthropology to important current events and warn the committee that the program has something valuable to offer the students and college community at a crucial time. For example, we reasoned that the actions of the College might be misunderstood so soon after September 11, 2001. We strongly argued that in last century and this century of serious world conflict, highly complex ideological discord, reduced efficacy of traditional military solutions, a rapidly diminishing natural environment and resource base, and the WTO and Global trade, we at our College need to expand not contract the College's commitment to an international perspective.

Our story has a happy ending in that following the appeal process, our status was changed from "maintain and monitor" to "maintain."

Dickeson, Robert C.
1999 Prioritizing academic programs and services: Reallocating resources to achieve strategic balance San Francisco:Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Contact: Debra Picchi picchids@fpc.edu

Putting the Four Fields Online for Intermediate Undergraduates at the University of Maryland University College.

Merrily Stover, Ph.D. Professor.
University of Maryland University College
The anthropology program in the School of Undergraduate Studies at the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) is indeed small. In the past academic year, only one course was offered, although with several sections. This course, Outlooks in Anthropology, is an introductory six-credit interdisciplinary course covering both physical and cultural anthropology. The course is unusual in that it was designed for distance delivery before the days of the Internet. Since our university no longer supports print-based distance education classes, we are designing two three-credit hour courses for online delivery to replace our original course. The first course is scheduled to be offered in Spring 2004.

The first online course we are planning is Physical Anthropology and Archaeology; the second, Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics. These two intermediate-level courses will focus on contemporary issues in each of the four fields. While introductory-level courses are highly recommended for students, they are not required; thus the new courses will survey the foundations of the four disciplines as well.

We cannot support actual labs for these courses since our students are located all around the world. We do plan to simulate as much as possible real-world experiences, including field and laboratory work. We ask our colleagues in FOSAP for suggestions of computer programs in any of the four fields which could be recommended for intermediate and/or beginning student. These could be programs purchased with textbooks or downloaded from the Internet.

We hope that by including all four fields in these two online courses we can keep a comprehensive presence for anthropology in our undergraduate distance education curriculum. We have worked closely with administrators and the University curriculum committee in justifying the need for today's students to have a cross-cultural, holistic, perspective. Being proactive, we gained permission and resources to design the two courses to keep the
discipline alive in our University. These courses represent two of the more than 500 online courses that UMUC offers.

We will be happy to share our experiences as we move through putting all four fields online. If any of you have advice and suggestions, please do share as well.

Contact: Merrily Stover ml_stover@msn.com. Telephone: 530-533-9465. Address: 45 Cabana Drive, Oroville, CA. 95965.

Embedding Anthropology in the Curriculum: Tactical and Strategic Experiences from Alfred University.
Robert Myers, Professor of Anthropology & Public Health, Alfred University

Since the term “embed” is so much in vogue with war correspondents reporting from U.S. military units in Iraq, I will use it to describe the situation at a small (2200 students), diverse (Colleges of Liberal Arts & Sciences, Art, Business, and Engineering), regional university in rural (poor) western New York. I am writing from the perspective of a lone cultural anthropologist housed with sociologists, political scientists, and criminal justice faculty in a liberal arts division of social sciences located in our College of Business building. While not exactly on a war-time footing, as the only anthropologist here for 16 years, I have replaced the evangelical anthropological hat I once wore with a more adaptive model resembling a helmet providing both defensive protection and offensive possibilities.

It has been the case for years that Alfred cannot be persuaded to hire another anthropologist for a variety of reasons familiar at other institutions I am sure. There has never been more than one full-time anthropologist here, thus there is no institutional tradition or experience with an anthropology major or department of anthropology. Tiny budgets in a university heavily tuition-dependent on student enrollments from year to year, where most students are from the region and mostly lacking in international or cross-cultural outlook, work against a discipline without clear-cut employment or career prospects for its graduates. Despite these obstacles, I have worked with interested colleagues in other disciplines to create majors and minors, concentrations, and programs in which anthropological courses and perspectives are an essential part.

My efforts to embed anthropology fall under three approaches:
1. Emphasize Kinship. One of the most undeveloped relationships on many campuses for cultural anthropologists is the one with the study abroad or off-campus studies director. Form close associations with the person who sends students abroad. Some of those studying abroad may be future anthropologists. All of them will be engaged in one of our core activities: experiencing another culture. Serve on the study abroad advisory committee. Help prepare students for culture shock before they leave and after they return through workshops. Participate in NAFSA (the Association of International Educators, www.nafsa.org), the large association under which study abroad directors and programs operate. Take students on international trips during the summer or during winter breaks. Work with international faculty and with alumni abroad to create summer internship possibilities for students. Serve on the campus multicultural committee. There are employment possibilities in study abroad organizations for anthropology majors who have been abroad themselves. Meet with the career development center director to create a sheet listing jobs for anthropology majors. Encourage students and colleagues to apply for Fulbright grants to study abroad. Encourage colleagues to attend CIEE summer seminars abroad (www.ciee.org), thus enhancing an international outlook at the institution. All international orientation is potential anthropological perspective. Collegiality is adaptive alliance formation.

2. Pay Attention to Semantics. Watch your language. Find the right words or labels. Some colleagues like and understand the word “anthropology” as much as we do, but most think of it only in popular, “primitive” terms. Colleagues in other disciplines sometimes explain how we should emphasize a broader, less specific label such as “social scientist” to reach those who view anthropology more narrowly and that we should also talk about skills such as “intercultural communication” which businesspeople can understand. Here, a "Comparative Cultures" major substitutes for an "Anthropology" major, yet the perspective remains heavily anthropological. Be flexible about what you call yourself and your orientation.
3. Develop Inter-Tribal Relations. Play the "multidisciplinary" or "interdisciplinary" card as often as possible. No field lends itself to this endeavor as much as anthropology. Alliances with other disciplines or campus tribes work to the mutual benefit of everyone. Furthermore, as we all know, "multidisciplinary" is clearly a productive approach to obtaining funds for new or existing programs. Both deans and funding organizations like this angle. And remember, we are engaged in a struggle for the hearts and purses of our deans.

With colleagues in other departments we have successfully created:

- A Health Studies minor requiring Medical Sociology and Health Care Delivery Systems and including medical anthropology (called Health and Culture), other anthropology courses I teach, public health, and several biology and psychology courses are electives.

- A Violence Studies minor requiring The Anthropology of Violence and a 1-credit Non-Violent Crisis Intervention course, with electives chosen from a variety of disciplines including history, literature, and criminal justice courses.

- A Comparative Cultures major. Working with two religious studies colleagues, a sociologist, and a non-western art historian, we have managed to locate anthropology (for which there is a minor, but no major) as central to this interdisciplinary effort, which encourages but does not require study abroad.

- A new Global Studies major and minor is in the works for this spring [Editors’ note: Bob asks that we notify the readers that this major has been approved by the faculty] with required study abroad, two and one-half years of language study, and courses in world politics, anthropology, macro-economics, and modern world history, students choose electives from three tracks: general global studies, international relations, and international business. Additionally, students are required to take an Introduction to Global Studies and Intercultural Communication and a Senior Seminar in Global Studies, which serves as a capstone course in which they write a senior thesis. Since I teach both of these new courses, the perspective will be anthropological. The major is one of several products of nearly three years of work by an ad hoc faculty initiative called the Global Awareness, Global Literacy Committee, which I have steered, and whose members come from every college.

It may be difficult or impossible in small departments or as solitary anthropologists to be as prominent or dominant as we might think we should be in a perfect academic world, but it is possible and practical to make oneself indispensable, and, therefore, to make one's skills useful and appreciated widely. This sort of blurring of disciplines amounts to stealth anthropology, a guerilla curricular development effort.

All of these efforts add up to embedding your anthropological skills and perspective across the curriculum. The effort becomes a win-win situation for all concerned: the institution, colleagues in other disciplines, ourselves, and especially for anthropology.

Contact: Robert Myers myers@alfred.edu

~

Anthropology and the Existential Moment.
Paul Grebinger, Professor of Anthropology, Gannett Lecturer and Coordinator of Senior Seminar, Rochester Institute of Technology

For twenty years I plied the trade in a department of sociology and anthropology as the anthropologist. The lack of a community of kindred "anthro spirits" may seem alienating on first reflection. On the contrary, I have been fortunate in having been thrown together with supportive sociologists. And, while we have not converted to the other's discipline, we have shared insights and engaged in important collective action ("Liminal No Longer: Collective Action at the Margins," FOSAP Newsletter, Spring 2002). More important for me, however, has been simply "being there" as the sole practitioner in my department, in a College of Liberal Arts. That dimension of my being has led to a number of transformative existential moments.

Now nearer the end of a career it is valuable to reflect on how the original circumstance of engaging anthropology set me on a path of repeated moments of decision about what to do with my training. The decision to pursue anthropology as a career came in the summer before my senior year in the School of General Studies at Columbia University. I was a political science major with a career in international law as the probable outcome. Fellow students were much given to situational ethics and interest in monetary gain. The prospect of a future with such colleagues propelled me into intense reflection and
heavy reading, especially Søren Kierkegaard's *Fear and Trembling*. Based on relatively limited experience with the literature of the discipline, I decided to take the Kierkegaardian leap of faith in the direction of anthropology rather than Christianity. The fundamental question was how shall I live my life and do so with total commitment (despite the extra year as an undergraduate required by this leap into anthropology)?

Since then my career has not been a trajectory, but a series of existential moments of decision in circumstances where the service of an anthropological generalist were required. Here I shall share only three for the purpose of illustration.

**Coordinator of Study Abroad and International Cooperative Education**

In the mid 1980s (1983-1986) I was a Visiting Professor at Rochester Institute of Technology, RIT, and uncertain about my future there. The Institute was going through a process of expanding its horizons academically and globally. An office to explore connections for study and business abroad was established. As the sole anthropologist on campus I had already worked with the Office of International Student Affairs in a study of the international student response to RIT. Also, in 1981 and 1982 I had participated in cultural study experiences in Colombia, South America through Eisenhower College, at the time a campus of RIT. The international activities were in the interest of helping friends and/or course related.

In 1986 I was asked to become Coordinator of Study Abroad and International Cooperative Education. The latter was for the purpose of developing co-ops (paid work-study) abroad. The sum of my previous experiences did not add up to taking on such new responsibility. Further, my research interests were not coordinate. So, I took a leap of faith. The outcome was for me personally very rewarding. From 1986 through 1991 I made 5 trips to Colombia (ended by the generalized drug violence in the country), established an exchange program involving students from RIT and Universidad Externado de Colombia (pay at home institution/study at host institution), and secured a three-year U.S.I.A. University Affiliations Program grant to support faculty exchanges 1989-1991. In addition there have been on-going friendships with Colombians and the opportunity to create and teach a course on Cultural Change in Global Perspective in which I could apply the experience in Colombia.

**Gannett Lecturer and Coordinator of Senior Seminar**

Twice, from 1991-1993 and again this year 2003-2005 I have been asked to assume the responsibilities of organizing the Caroline Werner Gannett Lecture Series and coordinate the associated capstone liberal arts seminar for all senior students at R.I.T. Ten years ago the topic of the lecture series/seminar was *Difference and Community, race, gender and social class in America*. My involvement as citizen activist in the developing Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls from the late 1970s through 1986 was an element in the decision of the selection committee. Also, I had chaired an interdisciplinary committee that created a new course in Cultural Diversity at the request of the Social Work Program. But it was clear from the comments of those involved in the process that anthropology itself was considered the appropriate disciplinary expertise for the role, and I was the anthropologist.

The topic of the Gannett Lecture Series and Senior Seminar changes every two years through submission by, discussion among, and a vote of the faculty. The topic for 2003-2005, *Globalization, Human Rights and Citizenship*, is one in which others, for example, sociologists, economists, and political scientists might be expected to have a peremptory interest. Their other commitments, my senior status and experience teaching a successful course in Cultural Change in Global Perspective, and anthropological training made me the choice for this role once again.

In assuming both of these responsibilities I have experienced considerable personal conflict as their requirements reduce time available to pursue my own research interests. In each existential moment I have had to make a subjective choice (more personal than rational) in order to take the leap. In retrospect the guidelines for such choices have been the following. First, the positive support of my colleagues and friends, nudging me toward the precipice, has been essential. Second, commitment to community takes precedence over personal interests. Successful collective enterprise is ultimately more rewarding than individual endeavor. Third, I have imagined, even from my graduate school days, that there must be value in the insights of anthropology
for those beyond the priesthood of anthropology itself. Much that I have done professionally has a public outcome. Fourth, taking a leap of faith is risky business, and exhilarating. While the regular routines of academic life have their attractions, the counterpoint of the existential moment is exciting and an opportunity for personal growth. As anthropologists we have an obligation to be open to existential moments. Anthropology is a field that encompasses the entire range of human experience. Be on the alert for the existential moment—it has the potential for shaping your future as an anthropologist!

Contact: Paul Grebinger  
pfggss@rit.edu  

~

REQUEST FOR MEMBER’S PARTICIPATION

Please let FOSAP know what you would like to see it do to better serve your needs in a small program:

1. What topics would you like to see addressed in future symposia?

2. Do you have ideas for ways that FOSAP could expand its role? (A forum for small program concerns. Creative techniques in regard to the teaching of anthropology? Opportunity for networking among small programs and regional larger programs? ....)

3. Would you be willing to serve in FOSAP? (officer, session organizer, editor, help with web page ....)

Cate Cameron and Bob Myers would be happy to hear from you on all or any of these matters (Their contact information is on the back page). They especially invite you to come to the AAA meetings in Chicago and attend the two FOSAP sessions, “Asserting Anthropology in the Liberal Arts Curriculum” and “Teaching US/Teaching U.S.” In particular, you are invited to the FOSAP Business Meeting, followed traditionally by a dinner at a local restaurant (BYOD). Look for an email from Betsy Baird giving the details of time and place.
FOSAP 2003

Co-presidents:
Cate Cameron (Cedar Crest College, ccameron@cedarcrest.edu)
Bob Myers (Alfred University, myers@alfred.edu)

Membership chair:
Betsy Baird (University of New Hampshire-College for Lifelong Learning, re Baird@megalink.net)

Executive Secretary:
Ann Hill (Dickinson College, hillan@dickinson.edu)

Webmaster:
John Gatewood (Lehigh University, jbg1@lehigh.edu)

Website: http://www.fosap.org

FOSAP Newsletter Co-editors:
Paul Grebinger (Rochester Institute of Technology, pfgangss@rit.edu)
John Rhoades (St. John Fisher College, jrhoades@sjfc.edu)
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