Fulbright Scholars International Interdisciplinary Conference, October 2004
Theme: Olympism – Humanism in Action

Plenary Speaker: Dr. James E. Alatis
Title: "Olympism and the Fulbright Spirit: Humanism in Action"

Thank you for that generous introduction. I would like to thank and congratulate the organizing committee for their choice of venue and topic for this wonderful conference: "Olympism and the Fulbright Spirit: Humanism in Action." There are clearly many commonalities between the two concepts included in the title, the most important of which are Peace, Harmony, and Humanism.

This may all be summarized in the Greek word sophrosyne. The Greeks had a word for it; at least classical Greeks like Plato did. Translating the idea into English has always posed a difficulty, since we don't have one word that summarizes his ideal of excellence of character and soundness of mind combined in one well-balanced individual. He defined it as "the agreement of passions that Reason should rule."[1] It is usually translated as prudence, temperance, moderation, self-control, or self-restraint; the idea of this harmonious balance is the basis of two famous Greek sayings: "Nothing in excess" and "Know thyself." It is the exact opposite of arrogant self-assertion or hubris. It derives from the Greek sophron, of sound mind, prudent. In this case, balance between competition and collaboration, a sound mind in a sound body, which underlies the whole idea of interdisciplinary cooperation inherent in Olympism, the Fulbright Spirit, and Humanism.

But I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate all of Greece, its people, the Olympic Organizing Committee, and the city of Athens for their remarkable accomplishments during the 2004 Olympic Games. It was a unique phenomenon, an outstanding triumph. Nenikikamen – we have triumphed. As Dick Ebersol, the chairman of the American TV network, NBC, put it, "The Greek people did more than just prove the naysayers wrong by hosting impeccably organized and safe Games in which the

[1] See The New Encyclopedia Britannica, Micropaedia, Volume IX, page 356 for "sophrosyne." Also: Macropaedia, Volume XIV, page 534a for Plato's Dialogues Concerning Virtue.

athletes took center stage. The Greek people made their Olympic Games extraordinary and special." (Ebersol)

In Olympism, what began as the Pan-Hellenic truce among the ancient Greek city-states has been metaphorically transformed into the quest for international peace among the modern nation-states. I would like to point out here that the literal meaning of the Greek word for "truce," ekecheiria, is "the laying down of arms," literally "the holding of hands."

That the Olympic Games could be a vehicle for peace and harmony – the "holding of hands" by the nations of the world – was an idea cherished by two extraordinary men, Pierre de Coubertain and J. William Fulbright.

Pierre de Coubertain is the man credited as the inventor of the revival of modern Olympics. He was a French educational reformer who drew a number of lessons about the character-forming attributes of sport from his travel in England. In 1896, de Coubertain envisaged a grand Olympic festival which would bring the youth of this world together in friendly and fraternal competition, improving and developing their moral character through sport.

But de Coubertain saw Olympism as more than creating a venue for world-wide sporting competition. As it says in the Olympic Charter, "Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy of effort, the educational value of good example and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles" (Olympic Charter). Olympism is no less than "the holder and distributor of social peace" (Coubertain 396).

J. William Fulbright had similar hopes for the Fulbright Program. He too was an educational reformer: he had been a Rhodes scholar at Oxford University and he was also President of the University of Arkansas. In 1946, the former Senator of Arkansas introduced legislation establishing the Fulbright Program, "the flagship international educational program sponsored by the U.S. Government [which was] designed to 'increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and people of other countries.' With this goal, the Fulbright Program has provided more than 250,000 participants – chosen for their academic merit and leadership potential – with the opportunity to study and teach in each other's countries, exchange ideas and develop joint

solutions to address shared concerns." (Fulbright Program) In the Senator's own words, "the Fulbright Program aims to bring a little more knowledge, a little more compassion into world affairs and thereby to increase the chance that nations will learn at last to live in peace and friendship." (Fulbright Program)

The fundamental value of Olympism is hoping to build a better world via the search for excellence, fair play, the joy of effort, respect for others and harmony between body and mind (Nous hygeies en somati hygeien). De Coubertain resolved to devote himself to the reform of education in his country. "Olympism is a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind." Conclusion: "The spirit and the Olympic idea are intended to promote friendship, mutual understanding, and cooperation between the nations and people of the world" (de Coubertin 387).

Olympism connects sport with world peace; the Fulbright Program connects academic effort with world peace. In this paper, I would like to extend those ideas by making a plea for interdisciplinarity among the various academic disciplines in educational systems through the U.S. and the world. I believe that by breaking down the barriers that confine areas of study, we can free our minds to embrace collegial cooperation towards a better understanding of the world we share. After all, can we hope for peace if we do not have open minds?

Unfortunately, what we are facing now is this: internecine warfare among advocates of these disciplines, many of whom have insisted on disciplinary autonomy, or specialization, as opposed to collegial cooperation or interdisciplinarity. This is particularly true of my own discipline of language and linguistic science for which whole treatises on the Linguistic Wars and the Politics of Linguistics have been written.

In his Revolt of the Masses, Jose Ortega y Gasset writes about "the Barbarism of specialization": "Science itself – the root of our civilizations – converts man into a 'modern barbarian'... Enclosed within the vision of his field...he takes no cognizance of what lies outside the narrow territory specially cultivated by himself...He is not learned, for he is formally ignorant of all that does not enter into his specialty; but neither is he ignorant, because he is 'a scientist,' and 'knows' very well his own tiny portion of the universe. We shall have to say that he is a learned ignoramus... The most immediate

result of this unbalanced specialization has been that today, when there are many more 'scientists' than ever, there are fewer 'cultured' men..." (107-114)

In these words, Ortega y Gasset characterizes – or anathematizes – the modern scholar. He bases this indictment on the lack of common intellectual experience he has noted among the educated specialists of our times. Our higher education programs produce lawyers, doctors, and hundreds of other varieties of specialists, but they do not promote culture if, by this word, we understand "the essential system of ideas concerning the world and man, which belong to our time." Here he encompasses both kinds of culture: Olympic culture or MLA culture as well as "hearth stone" culture.[2]

Perhaps Ortega's words sounded revolutionary when they were first written, but the basic truth of this statement has become almost commonplace. There is not a dean's office in the United States where the problem of universality as against specialization of knowledge has not been the subject of lengthy and, I profoundly hope, fruitful discussions. But theory is a long way ahead of practice. There is general agreement that the fences by which the vast field of knowledge is divided into cucumber beds and cabbage patches ought to give way. But as yet they stand as firm and forbidding as ever, and mere discussion will hardly remove them. In my opinion, they will never be breached until someone is resolute enough to lay hands on that part of the fence that serves to limit his own backyard.

The fences between disciplines must be torn down. This is what I would wish to do with the field of language. I would like to stress the connections with such neighboring disciplines as the history of culture, of religion, of political history, sociology, and psychology, rather than to emphasize the unavoidable distinctions in material and method. I would also like us to consider together how much linguistic studies stand to gain from these contacts.

The study of language cuts across the interests of many fields. First of all, we recognize a group of scientists, scholars, and teachers whose interest in language is central, the linguists. Linguists, students of linguistics, study languages, their own and foreign languages, as examples of mankind's faculty of language, to learn more about the

---

[2] See Omaggio Alice Hadley's Teaching Language in Context, pages 361-2 for a discussion of Olympian vs. Hearthstone Culture.

way language works and how it may best be described and analyzed. Linguistics is quite simply the scientific study of human language in all its manifestations and uses, near and far, present and past, without restriction on time, place or culture.

There are still some respected linguists who maintain the view that so little is known about human language that linguists should spend their time learning more about language rather than trying to apply the little they already know or think they know. The implicit assumption of all linguistics is that language is patterned human behavior subject to systematic, objective analysis. This is a way of stating the linguist's tremendous reverence for language. The linguist acts under the strongly-, almost passionately-, held assumption that if you observe genuine language phenomena carefully enough, you will find all kinds of complex patterning and regularities in design of which the user is largely unaware. This principle insists on the possibility of objective, scientific analysis, and that language behavior can be studied systematically to discover its structure.

One topic that commonly finds a place in discussions of linguistics as a science is its "autonomy," or independence of other disciplines. Linguists have tended to be somewhat insistent on the need for autonomy, because they have felt that, in the past, the study of language was usually subservient to and distorted by the standards of other studies such as logic, philosophy and literary criticism. They have thus felt that linguists should study language "for its own sake" or "as an end in itself." This principle of "autonomy" has promoted the study of language as a formal system; this conception of the nature of language has been summed up in the term "structuralism."

However, now that linguistics has established its credentials as a mature academic discipline with its own methodology and criteria of relevance, there is no longer the same need to insist upon the principle of "autonomy." The last few years have seen an increased interest among philosophers, psychologists, anthropologists, literary critics and representatives of other disciplines in linguistic theory and methodology. Some scholars consider that the time may now be ripe for the incorporation of the theory of language into a more embracing synthesis of science and philosophy. Linguistics is the study of language as a human phenomenon. At the present time, linguistic study is following two primary paths: descriptive (or structural) linguistics, which is concerned with the segmentation and the classification of human speech; and transformational—generative

grammar, which seeks to explicate utterances in order to comprehend how original sentences are created and understood.

Many linguists nowadays regard the analysis of linguistic structure as their central and perhaps their only concern; but we cannot assume axiomatically, as some linguists are inclined to do – or at least were inclined to do in the 1950's and 1960's – that the units used in analyzing language are also those needed in learning it. The learning process is clearly a psychological one, and a meaningful one, and psychology and meaning until recently were not part of the linguist's concern. In recent years, however, the horizon has indeed widened, and a great deal of work has been done in the border areas between linguistics and other disciplines relevant to language learning such as sociology, psychology and anthropology.

The term "Applied Linguistics" has become popular in recent years. In this paper I shall use the term to mean simply the application of any of the insights, methods, or findings of linguistic science to practical language problems in general and to the problems of the acquisition and teaching of language in particular. Applied linguistics has a basis in theory and principle and seeks and accepts illumination from any and every source; it is essentially multi-disciplinary. It looks to theoretical linguistics, psychology, neurophysiology, information theory, social theory, education, philosophy, logic and scientific method. This multiple basis of interlocking disciplines makes applied linguistics capable of responding in a principled way to <u>any</u> language-related problem.

The next broad group of pure and applied scientists who are concerned with language are the psychologists; there have recently been a number of signs of increasing communication between linguists and psychologists. Most psychologists are aware of the fact that the human mind operates on linguistic symbols. Similarly, most linguists have always admitted that some sort of psychological drive must set the grammatical process into motion. The interaction of these attitudes in the process of first- and second-language acquisition has come to be known as psycholinguistics. Psycholinguists are scholars who apply psychology to language problems — especially to first- and second-language acquisition. In the past several years, researchers in second-language acquisition have been attempting to determine what factors are involved in the second-language learning

process. The most recent developments in psycho-linguistic research show potential for important major breakthroughs in language teaching and learning.

A third broad group of specialists whose interests touch problems of linguistics is represented by the social sciences: these are the anthropologists and the sociologists. Next to linguistics, anthropology is the social science most closely concerned with the problems of language and communication. In fact, a major branch of present-day American linguistics developed primarily within anthropology, that is, cultural anthropology. The most important theoretical contribution of cultural anthropology has been what is generally known as "cultural relativism." This means, in effect, that man is capable of satisfying his biological and culturally-derived needs in a variety of ways. The anthropologist makes no value judgment as to which of a number of ways is better, and only goes so far as to say that cultures are different and that the difference should be respected. Teachers must be aware of the points where there is a discrepancy in cultural fit, where the cultural assumptions of language students differ from those of speakers of the foreign tongue. Cultural insights illuminating these stress areas should be given first priority in deciding what to teach. Areas where cultural contours tend to harmonize are less likely to lead to misunderstandings.

Cultural anthropology has broadened our horizons, so that we no longer view Western Europe and North America as "standard" and the rest of the world as "curious." We have become more urbane and less chauvinistic. We no longer require some newly-discovered language to fit the pattern of the grammatical categories of Latin or Greek, valuable as they have been and still are.

The question of the relationship between language and culture has long been a fascinating one. Basically, it is concerned with whether or not the language – or the structure of a language – forces the thoughts of the social group using that language in certain specific directions. This is the theory of linguistic relativity, analogous to the theory of cultural relativity mentioned earlier.

This theory has been prominent in the minds of many language teachers since the last century. One version of the theory asserts that a language influences the minds of those who use it and that consequently people using different languages classify their experiences differently and have different world pictures, different outlooks. However,

although many people – bilingual people of necessity – feel intuitively that there is an element of truth in the idea, proof has been difficult to obtain.

The theory of linguistic relativity has been hotly debated for years, often with emotional overtones. Here again differences in personality and temperament may enter into the matter.

Until recently the field of sociology has demonstrated surprisingly little interest in linguistic problems. However, the study of language as part of culture and society has acquired the now commonly accepted name of "sociolinguistics." As might be inferred from the term, sociolinguistics deals with the sociological applications of linguistic data and the linguistic uses of sociological data. It studies the varied linguistic realizations of socio-cultural meanings which are relative to particular cultures, societies, social groups, speech communities, languages, dialects, varieties, and styles. Language interpenetrates with almost all walks of life and varieties of experience. It does not exist "for its own sake." This interpenetration of language with so many areas of human experience is reflected in the difficulty of arriving at satisfactory criteria for the demarcation of boundaries between one language and another and one dialect and another. India, Belgium and Canada show in their language and social problems the importance of one of these areas, to the other. Furthermore, though we are all conscious of geographical dialects (e.g., North and South Germany, "southern" [actually southeastern] American English and New England English), there has been little awareness of the importance of social dialects.

Since the study of sociolinguistics pertains to the use of language in context, the influence of sociolinguistics places the process of language teaching within the social context of language use. This is significantly different from an approach that deals only with language in the abstract, and has far-reaching influence both on the order of presentation in the classroom and the degree of importance attached to particular processes. The study of sociolinguistics gives a teacher access to those aspects of language which speakers of the target language hold important as well as those which the students – speakers of the source language – hold important. A sociolinguist is more aware of the purposes for which a language is being used and can order the acquisition sequence accordingly. Discourse analysis – the study of language beyond the sentence –

now plays an important role in the field of sociolinguistics.

In general, the influence of sociolinguists on language teaching methodology amounts to two basic things: first, a sociolinguist can evaluate the purposes the students have in acquiring the language in the context – social, political, or other – of the teaching situation; second, such teachers can apply their knowledge of sociolinguistic techniques to match processes of language and varieties of language to the needs of the students so that structures with high functional load or important social significance can be emphasized, introduced first, drilled more, etc. Such teachers strive to understand the linguistic attitudes of the students as well as their purposes, and teach accordingly. They are able to apply their appreciation of the constraints of language-use to their knowledge of language structure so that appropriateness characterizes not only the classroom situation, but also the learner's variety of language.

The theory of linguistic variation represents another major breakthrough in the study and teaching of language. This theory shows us how language changes from class to style and from one social environment to another.

Yet another important contribution of sociolinguistics is the concept of communicative competence, a concept formulated as an extension of Chomsky's notion of linguistic competence. By competence Chomsky means the speaker-hearer's implicit knowledge of his language, contrasting it with performance, the actual use of language in concrete situations. Hence, competence does not deal with speech but with the ability of the speaker to produce, out of a finite set of rules, an infinite number of grammatical sentences. However, it has been suggested that a person endowed with mere linguistic competence would be a sort of cultural monster. He would know the grammatical rules of his language, but he would not know when to speak, when to be silent, which sociolinguistic options to select from a repertoire on what occasion, and so on. In an effort to deal with these problems, Dell Hymes has elaborated the concept of communicative competence which refers to the psychological, cultural and social roles which discipline the use of speech in social settings (5-24). Roughly defined, it is the ability to use sentences appropriately in a suitable context or situation. The notion of communicative competence runs through many of the most recent discussions on the methodology of language teaching.

Traditionally, in the audio-lingual approach it was assumed that the goal was competence in the language. This would result when students had internalized the grammar of the language to a sufficient degree that they could spontaneously and fluently produce a well-formed utterance in the language for the purpose of communication. This approach has unconsciously been equating linguistic competence with communicative competence. This is actually very close to the Chomskyan concept of competence.

Language educators have come to realize that linguistic competence does not necessarily lead to communicative competence in the strict sense. To use a Chomskyan label again, competence in performance is also a necessary condition to learning a language.

Communicative competence really involves two elements: (1) the linguistic and (2) the social-cultural. Language occurs in the social setting and language use varies cross-culturally. Thus, communicative competence involves proper language usage.

Looking back, we can see that students have been learning to speak languages using the traditional method, i.e., "grammar translation," some better than others. We can also see that language teachers may have unconsciously been teaching the social usage of language and that students have been learning it, again unconsciously. What is needed, however, is to recognize the importance of competence in the uses of language in the social setting alongside that of linguistic competence. The teacher should seek ways to teach it explicitly. The teacher should stress language as the activity of a speech community; he/she should stress the social implications of usage. Language should be taught as being in a social setting, i.e., what the student says depends on factors other than linguistic alone.

We have seen thus far that there is a varied assortment of specialists interested in the study of language, a study which has become one of the most fundamental disciplines in the psychological arid social sciences – quite as important as the study of physics in the natural and biological sciences. Thus, at the teacher-training level, the disciplines of Linguistics, Anthropology (Ethnography), Psychology (and the newly emerging interdiscipline of Psycholinguistics), Sociology (and the interdiscipline of Sociolinguistics), as well as of professional Education (Pedagogy) must be closely intertwined. The basic principle is that teacher preparation be interdisciplinary. It must be

emphasized that teacher education, as opposed to mere training, is at the heart of the matter. This has been the insistence of the TESOL organization and other organizations in the United States which have set forth a set of guidelines for teacher preparation emphasizing a multi-disciplinary applied-linguistics approach to first and second language teaching and learning based on the most recent research in psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and professional education.

Language teachers (professional educators) are becoming increasingly more sensitive to the interdisciplinary aspects of language study. This interdisciplinary focus, deriving from the intersection of linguistics with psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology and education, provides a comprehensive framework against which to view problems of language acquisition and language teaching.

Language study cannot be reduced merely to an audiolingual, i.e., behaviorist, experience; nor is it simply a cognitive experience. Language is the medium in which we exist, with which we understand the universe around us and through which we war, love, or praise. Language is not an element added to or imposed upon some pre-existing human state; on the contrary, it is central to the nature of man, his behavior and his world. Language touches upon every aspect of a person's life. The cognitive, psycho motor and affective states of the learner are intricately involved in speech events. Such speech events must also be viewed within the framework of the social and cultural context. The social and cultural matrices of speech acts help define the meaning of language.

When it comes to curriculum, therefore, we must take an interdisciplinary approach to language study at every level – beginning, intermediate, and advanced – in order to insure the learner a complete and value-oriented experience. This interdisciplinary focus must also extend to all levels of the educational process from elementary school through university study. Moreover, the goal of such an approach must not be only to build communicative competence, but to build an awareness of moral and social values. Language study must itself be humanizing as well as skill-building.

Earlier in this paper I have referred to psycholinguistic studies which demonstrate the necessity for achieving greater personal involvement in the study of language. These studies have suggested the importance of emotional attitudes and cognitive awareness in facilitating the learning process. In his book Memory, Meaning and Method, Dr. Earl

Stevick has examined the classroom as an environment for verbal interaction within the framework of Transactional Analysis. In his chapter on "The Meaning of Drills and Exercises," Stevick examines classroom interaction using the insights of Transactional Analysis, i.e., the classroom version of Eric Berne's Games People Play. As in other sections of his book, Stevick includes very practical pedagogical suggestions as illustrations of the "direction to take." (65-85) But the emphasis is never on technique; it is rather on the insights which can be gained from a wide variety of sources and on the importance of deep personal security and investment before real learning can take place. This has come to be known as "non-defensive" language learning.

Emphasis throughout Stevick's book is placed upon the conditions of learning that create personal security and commitment. Within the framework of psycholinguistics, Stevick encourages a low socio-affective filter and low anxiety level. The book's most original contribution to language-teaching methodology lies in the analysis of the psychodynamics of the language classroom. To explain psychodynamics, Stevick examines six contemporary (and sometimes unconventional) approaches to language learning – Community Language Learning, The Silent Way, The St. Cloud (Audio-Visual) Method, language teaching as a branch of applied linguistics, Audiolingualism, and Suggestology.

In 1990, Stevick published a book entitled Humanism in Language Teaching. In this highly original study, Stevick invites readers to radically reassess their understanding of the term "Humanism" in relation to language teaching. He approaches his subject with rigor and lucidity and is relevant to the theme of this paper.

In this connection, Richard Brod of the Modern Language Association has written: "As humanists we have sought and accepted the mission to expound and interpret the words and ideas of the past, and as teachers of languages we have accepted the mission to communicate across borders. Our values remain strong because they are humanistic in the sense of the word, and our scope and vision have expanded in both space and time. Leaders of departments need to take advantage of opportunities for rethinking and renewal by helping their colleagues to redefine the mission of the department yet again in the wider context of the institution, the discipline, and the nation. In responding to this urgent challenge, we can connect with colleagues everywhere who

share our values and we can establish our profession on a stronger basis than in the past. With such demands on our abilities, and under such circumstances, leadership will not be easy, but I can conceive of no higher calling in the American educational community of the next twenty years" (104-106). Brod (1971) also says: ... "I am enough of a Romantic to cherish the hope that the foreign language profession can do something tangible and meaningful for 'global society' by helping to construct and teach a spirit of Humane Internationalism as an answer to both neo-colonialism and the neo-isolationism that seem to have infected our political life" (7-10). I think we can all agree that this is compatible with the concepts of Olympism and the Fulbright Spirit.

Thus, as a result of the new interest in interdisciplinary study, we see the emergence of new strategies of instruction. Teachers have experienced the limits of the grammatical and situational syllabi. The concern for the <u>what</u> it is we communicate through language has caused a shift in orientation toward organizing language teaching in terms of both the content and the form of language. D.A. Wilkins argues for the advantage of the "notional syllabus" as superior to the grammatical and situational syllabus. He views the notional syllabus as taking into account the communicative facts of language as well as the underlying formal features of sentences.

The affective state of the learner is especially brought out in Suggestology, a strategy developed by Lozanov in Bulgaria. Charles Curran, in Community Learning, sets up a counselor-learner paradigm to encourage greater involvement of the learner in the process of learning. The use of the "internal dialog," in which the communicative intentions of the speaker/hearer are noted is further indication of the personal dimension of contemporary language study.

This new learner-oriented instruction has given rise to language exercises that focus on personal attitudes and values. The aspect of choice is an integral part of classroom activities. Problems are posed in which the student is urged to express his/her own feelings.

The study of language is thus largely a matter of social interaction and human psychology. I mean here "psychology" broadly defined. In calling language psychological, I am using a short formula for two basic things: First, any individual use of language is an outcome of individual experiences and behaviors. Second, any

development of language as a group phenomenon begins with an individual act of creation, but continues and is achieved through the acceptance of the individual act by a speech community. It is a process, in other words, of group reaction.

To acknowledge that linguistic behavior can be governed by the impact language makes on others is to say that language is not only a psychological but also a social phenomenon. Apart from the relatively rare cases of monologue language, there are always a speaker and an audience. That audience may consist of one person or many persons. So long as there is an audience, language establishes a social relation. Moreover, whenever social circumstances of any sort lead to the formation of a distinct group within the whole body of a society, the members of this group will tend to develop speech habits of their own. In return, such social dialects will strengthen the cohesion of the group. What I mean by insisting on language as a sociological and psychological phenomenon, then, is that all these forces of personal and social reaction have to be taken into consideration.

From all this it appears that the theoretical study of language is apt to be a complicated phenomenon. It becomes still more involved when to all the theoretical questions we add the problems of the practical or pragmatic use of language. It is not the duty of the scientific linguist to tell people how they ought to use their language. Still, I feel that some consideration must be given to the fact that skill and versatility in the use of language obviously can smooth a person's way as surely as tongue-bound ineptitude and lack of familiarity with accepted standards can handicap him.

To my fellow linguists I want to say that linguistics to me means the study of all the problems of language and that I do not limit the range of this discipline to those that can be approached by the methods of natural science. I view the study of language as broadly humanistic, and believe that the nature of human linguistic communication, in all its philosophic, social, geographic, and ethnic historical implications can be an exciting humanistic study in itself. I also view all the major uses and manifestations of language as essentially unified. Meaning and change of meaning, word creation, forms, phonetics, stylistics, standards of use, even humor are closely intertwined. They take their shape and function as results of the impact of the speech community upon the individual and the individual upon his community or communities. They cannot be studied wholly in

isolation. And they cannot be broken apart. There is plenty of room for the restricted and specialized study, of course, but the meaning of that study will never be complete unless we see it as a part of the whole rich complex which is language – and, in turn, see this complex as part of the total pattern of human behavior.

To conclude, I doubt that Ortega was necessarily right in equating specialist with barbarian; but, if he was, we must avoid being unreconstructable barbarians. We must accept willingly any useful stimulus that workers in neighboring fields may have to offer. Close cooperation between the study of language and other fields is not a matter of fashion but a necessity. Whether a linguist, by ignoring the traditional frontiers of his domain, can make a valid contribution to a "system of ideas concerning the world and man" (Ortega y Gassett, Prefatory note) remains to be seen. One thing, however, is certain. Language, an integral part of human organization, and influencing life, cannot be treated as a subject independent of the realities it represents. The alliance of history, anthropology, sociology and psychology with linguistics, therefore, may provide the key to any kind of linguistic problem, be it a detail of etymology or the intricate play of language and thought upon each other. And, because language is the single most characteristic attribute by which we distinguish that very special creature known as Man, it is devoutly to be wished that this interdisciplinary alliance may also provide the key to the many problems that beset Mankind.

Thank you.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arndt, Richard T. and David Lee Rubin, eds. The Fulbright Difference. New Brunswick, London: Transaction Publishers, 1993.

Brod, Richard. "Foreign Language Manpower Needs in the Seventies." ADFL Bulletin 2.3. 1971:7-10.

Brod, Richard, "The Mission of Leadership." ADFL Bulletin 25.3. 1994:104-106.

De Coubertain,Pierre. Selected Writings, Vol II. Paris: International Olympic Committee, 1919.

Dudden, Arthur Power and Russell R. Dynes, eds. The Fulbright Experience 1946-1984. New Brunswick, London: Transaction Publishers, 1987.

Ebersol, Dick. "An Open Letter to the Greek People." Hellenic Communication Service, LLC. 30 Sep 2004 <http://www.helleniccomserve.com/ebersol.html>.

Hadley,Omaggio Alice. Teaching Language in Context. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, 1993.

Harris, Randy Allen. The Linguistics Wars. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hymes, Dell. On Communicative Competence. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. The Politics of Linguistics. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

"Olympic Charter." International Olympic Committee. 30 Sep 2004 <http://multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_122.pdf>.

Ortega y Gasset , Jose . Revolt of the Masses. NY, London: WW Norton 7 Co. , 1932.

Stevick, Earl W. Memory, Meaning and Method. Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1976

Stevick, Earl W. Humanism in Language Teaching: A Critical Perspective. Oxford, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica, Micropaedia, Volume IX. Boston: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., H. H. Benton Publisher, 1974.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica, Macropaedia, Volume XIV. Boston: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., H. H. Benton Publisher, 1974.

Wilkins, D.A. Notional Syllabuses, London: Oxford University Press, 1976