“We live in a global world. We have to understand that world if we ... are going to be able to not only defend this country, but to extend our relationships to others so that we can work together to defend the world that we live in.”

Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta
Nisei linguists, mostly American-born Japanese, study reading and writing the Japanese language while attending the Fourth Army Intelligence School.
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It is truly an honor to be the 26th commandant of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and have the opportunity to witness the 70th anniversary of this great institute.

We have come a long way through history. DLIFLC has changed its name five times since its inception in 1941 when the secret Army language school was opened just weeks before Pearl Harbor and numbered 60 students. Today, DLIFLC has 3,500 students at any given time and supports another 35,000 through various programs.

DLIFLC currently has Language Training Detachments in 26 locations worldwide and supports six different types of language and culture training activities, all geared toward enhancing the security of our nation.

On the Presidio of Monterey there are eight schools, teaching 23 basic course languages that range in duration between 26 and 64 weeks, to students of all four branches of the Services. Our mission is important and we take our job seriously by continuously striving to improve our student output, through curriculum and faculty development, technology integration, test development, and research. Our goal has remained the same over 70 years – to train and provide the best foreign language instruction within the Department of Defense to better meet the needs of the Services.

Because of DLIFLC’s flexibility, we were able to meet the challenges brought on by the events of Sept. 11, 2001. Within three months of the attacks, DLIFLC was able to provide the first Dari, Pashto, and then Uzbek instruction to students deploying to Central Asia. The Institute created the Operation Enduring Freedom Task Force and immediately began producing Language Survival Kits to be used by all servicemembers deploying into harm’s way. By 2004, the Institute was also tasked to provide Iraqi predeployment training and increased the number of instructor Mobile Training Teams who delivered basic language and cultural awareness training to units on location, at no cost to the military.

In 2009, DLIFLC met the challenge set forth by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Mike Mullen, and military commanders on the ground, to provide the first General Purpose Force Language Training Detachments that would train servicemembers for 16 weeks in Dari, Pashto, or Iraqi before deploying. The program strived to provide one language enabled Soldier per platoon and the effort has been so successful that DLIFLC is opening up more detachments.

Simultaneously, the Pentagon created a new program called Afghanistan/Pakistan Hands that is a three to five year program which trains senior and Non-Commissioned officers Dari, Pashto, and Urdu, and is designed to maintain continuity of mission through several deployments. DLIFLC is responsible for the language piece of this mission.

But none of this would have been possible if DLIFLC had not had incredible people supporting its mission. Several of these individuals have been inducted into the Hall of Fame. For 2011, I am proud to announce the inductees: Marine Corps Major Jose Anzaldua, Dr. Ray Clifford, Dr. Martha Herzog, Mr. Everette Jordan, Mr. Robert Tharp, and Ms. Renee Meyer.

I welcome you to read through the pages of our incredible 70-year history.
DLIFLC:
Generations of support; decades of development
By 1st Lt. Scott Ghiringhelli,
Strategic Communications

Conceived on the eve of war, Nov. 1, 1941, the Institute, now known as the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), has evolved and adapted to the needs of the United States military through every phase of American involvement in foreign countries and withstood constant threats of being closed, moved or otherwise appropriated. Some of the most important events in recent American history – Pearl Harbor, the wars in Korea and Vietnam, the Gulf War, the end of the Cold War; and Sept. 11 – have shaped DLIFLC throughout the 70 years since its inception.

From fear to solidarity:
DLIFLC’s intricate relationship with the Japanese
By 1st Lt. Scott Ghiringhelli,
Strategic Communications

DLIFLC is today the premier language learning institution in the United States, if not the world, but conversely comes from modest origins.

The genesis of DLIFLC traces its roots back to the eve of America’s entry into World War II with the Nisei Japanese linguists who were organized in 1941 to serve as translator-interpreters for the Military Intelligence Service. The first class of 60 students was brought together in an abandoned airplane hangar with four instructors at the Presidio of San Francisco. The school soon moved to Minnesota, but ultimately ended up at the Presidio of Monterey in 1946, where the addition of more languages and several name changes over time have made DLIFLC what it is today.

During the war, Japanese language training increased dramatically. More than 6,000 graduates served throughout the Pacific Theater during the war and the subsequent occupation of Japan. Ironically, some of the Nisei who served as linguists in the Fourth Army Intelligence School also found family members interned by the very government they supported. But these committed Soldiers served selflessly, sometimes sacrificing their lives.

Today, Nisei and Munakata Hall at the Presidio of Monterey are named in honor of these earliest students and instructors, whose dedication and heroism is portrayed in the Institute’s “Yankee Samurai” exhibit. In addition, three academic buildings at the Presidio of Monterey are named for Nisei graduates who fell in action: George Nakamura, Frank Hachiya, and Y. “Terry” Mizutari.

This year, the 70th anniversary of DLIFLC, oddly coincided with the 9.0 earthquake that struck off the coast of Japan, and the subsequent tsunami and nuclear disasters that followed. DLIFLC quickly called upon its roots in Japanese language by offering Language Survival Kits (LSK) for servicemembers assisting with disaster relief. Foreign Area Officers (FAO) were called forward to use their language proficiency and cultural knowledge to work directly with the Japanese military and government allowing the U.S. military to contribute to relief efforts.

Regardless of past conflicts between the U.S. and Japan, the two
countries, governments, and people have enjoyed a close relationship of friendship and cooperation for most of DLIFLC’s existence. This has never been more evident than in recent months with the U.S. response in Japan following the disaster that struck in March. Aptly named Operation Tomodachi “friend,” U.S. operations supporting the Japanese government reflect the cooperative nature of this relationship and the camaraderie that exists between the two peoples.

During relief efforts, FAOs helped coordinate operations between the American and Japanese military. They served as liaisons for various projects, to include working at the Sendai Airport helping to reopen the severely damaged airfield and clearing debris at train stations.

While staff and faculty in DLIFLC’s Japanese department were saddened by the tragedy, they were also very proud of their former students and their efforts to assist the people of Japan, as well as their own part in preparing the alumni to do so.

“I very much appreciate… my former students’ tireless contribution to helping the Japanese government by using the Japanese language which they have learned. Also, I feel happy to know that I can contribute my teaching to saving Japanese people… in my home country. I strongly believe that DLI…can contribute to the strong relationship of the U.S.-Japan alliance. I am truly proud of teaching the Japanese language at DLI,” said Mr. Arita Kazuki, a team leader and instructor in the Japanese department at DLIFLC.

DLIFLC started with the selfless support of a few Japanese-Americans, and today the Institute has been able to give back to the Japanese people through training and preparing FAOs as Japanese linguists and cultural experts, serving in Japan as attachés and ready to assist the Japanese government when needed.
A favorable climate
By 1st Lt. Scott Ghiringhelli, Strategic Communications

From its origins at the Presidio of San Francisco as the Fourth Army Intelligence School (AIS), DLIFLC moved to Camp Savage, Minn., as the Military Intelligence Service Language School (MISLS), then to Fort Snelling, Minn., and finally settled at the Presidio of Monterey in 1946, where it has spent 65 of its 70 years in existence, and was renamed the Army Language School (ALS) in 1947.

General Order number 23, issued May 22, 1946, called for the move of MISLS to the Presidio of Monterey. “…the Military Intelligence Service Language School will close at Fort Snelling, Minnesota…and will open at Presidio of Monterey, California…11 June 1946.” Trains containing troops sleeping and kitchen cars moved personnel from Snelling to Monterey with classes scheduled to commence on July 15, 1946.

MISLS Travel Circular No. 1, by order of Col. Kai E. Rasmussen, the School’s first commandant, dictated the movement of MISLS from Fort Snelling to the Presidio of Monterey. It referred to the Presidio as “one of the most beautiful posts in the army.” Monterey was then only a small fishing community, what the circular referred to as “a settlement of some 10,000 people.”

The installation required little modification and included a post office and telegraph office, with more extensive facilities, such as the Commissary, available at Fort Ord, in nearby Seaside, Calif.

The description of furnaces and fireplaces heating wood buildings paints a picturesque scene. Indeed, its mild climate is mentioned repeatedly in documents pertaining to the original move to the Presidio and subsequent dialogue about its continued presence there. Officials took the surroundings in which students learned language quite seriously. Monterey had the right environment for language study, not just with regard to the physical setting, but also the intellectual atmosphere.

In 1946 almost all the instructors and students were Japanese, and their families were primarily on the West Coast and Hawaii. Even as the school began to teach other languages, it was still thought desirable for it to be located near a metropolitan area where students would be able to converse with appropriate language speakers in their target language.

These factors would play into decisions concerning the School’s locality throughout the years, and still help define DLIFLC’s character today in Monterey, where it has remained for more than six decades.

DLIFLC Name Evolution

1941
4TH AIS
Fourth Army Intelligence School

1943
MISLS
Military Intelligence Service Language School

1947
ALS
Army Language School

1963
DLI
Defense Language Institute West Coast

1976
DLIFLC
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

1941 - 1943
Camp Savage, Minn. graduates studying dictionaries circa 1941 - 1946

1943
WwII - Battle of Normandy - Operation Overlord, commonly known as D-Day, commences with the landing of 155,000 Allied troops on the beaches of Normandy in France

U.S. officers plant the American flag on Guam in 1944, recapturing the Central Pacific island from the Japanese who had occupied it in 1941

In the fall of 1943, 14 MISLS graduates from Camp Savage were "volunteered" into 'Merrill’s Marauders,' and trained with British Gen. Orde Charles Wingate’s guerrilla units in India
East Coast meets West
By 1st Lt. Scott Ghiringhelli, Strategic Communications

Heightened tensions during the Cold War brought more European languages into the Army Language School’s (ALS) focus. A large percentage of Soldiers were coming from the East Coast at that time, and many were to serve in Europe. The Army looked into different options that it hoped would alleviate cross-country travel costs. In the early part of 1955, the Headquarters Continental Army Command completed a study concerning the possibility of moving the school to Fort Devens, Mass., or Fort Meade, Md.

A memo from the Headquarters to the assistant chief of staff for the Department of the Army stated, “The psychological conditions of locations and particularly weather at the Presidio of Monterey is more conducive for effective language training than either Fort Devens or Fort Meade.” This, among various other considerations, led to the decision to keep the school in Monterey.

Also up for consideration was establishing an East Coast branch. Though the School on the East Coast would be a branch and not necessarily meant to decentralize the School, it was thought that “the creation of a branch of the ALS on the East Coast would result in an organization neither completely centralized nor completely decentralized.” The peril of having this type of an organizational structure could produce a situation where it would receive the benefits of neither a centralized or a decentralized organization, and would, in fact, be plagued by the problems of both.

Decentralization would help to minimize the costs of Soldiers traveling cross-country, but ultimately the benefits of centralization won out. The lower unit cost of training in not duplicating an entire organization and its staff, as well as maintaining standardization of training and quality, outweighed any benefits brought on by decentralization.

Though a modified concept of the East Coast branch would ultimately become a reality some years later, the ALS would remain in Monterey as a standalone institution at this time.

---

MISLS moves to the Presidio of Monterey

In September 1945, Japan formally surrenders to the Allied Powers

First Nisei members of the Women’s Army Corps classes begin

2nd Lt. Tom Sakamoto translates for General Douglas MacArthur in Japan

After the war, MISLS graduates served as interpreters and translators for many important functions required to administer occupied Japan. This photograph shows George Kitagawa from San Francisco wearing headphones while working with Japanese defense attorneys during the war crimes trials held by the Allied Powers in Tokyo, Japan, in 1946 (Courtesy NJAHS)
U.S. AIR FORCE urged not to take off
By 1st Lt. Scott Ghiringhelli, Strategic Communications

Roused by the Air Force’s announcement that it would no longer be sending students to the Army Language School (ALS) after July 1, 1959, and would rather send them to private colleges, universities, and institutions for language training, and an earlier visit by Senator Hubert Humphrey, an assemblage of officials including a committee from the House Armed Services subcommittee went to Monterey to Investigate the Army Language School.

The Honorable George F. Miller, the Honorable Charles E. Guber, members of the Special Subcommittee, together with the Honorable Charles Teague, who represented Monterey in Congress, Mr. John R. Blandford, Counsel, Committee on Armed Services, and the Undersecretary of the Army, Hugh Milton, met with Colonel Walter E. Kraus, Commandant, U.S. Army Language School on Dec. 9, 1958.

The Special Subcommittee noted some basic problems and made recommendations. With the constant threat of closing, moving or reorganizing ALS, there lacked any sense of “stability and permanency” for the instructors.

This anxious environment was not conducive to good language instruction, and, moreover, likely caused some instructors to leave ALS for more stable employment or not come to the Presidio at all. The Air Force’s impending pull out of ALS put further stress on instructors, most of whom were recruited from their native countries and found their status and employment in the United States in jeopardy.

At the time, the student to
teacher ratio was three and one half to one, and thought to be wasteful; however, the Subcommittee’s view was not that the School was ineffective, but rather that it was not being utilized to its potential.

“It is being operated today on an uneconomical basis because it is not being utilized to its fullest extent,” the investigation revealed.

The Subcommittee recommended that “classes should consist of six to eight students per instructor and thus there could be a substantial increase in the number of students attending the school without necessitating any unreasonable increase in administrative overhead,” which supported their proposal of having all military language training done at the Presidio of Monterey.

The Subcommittee also strongly urged that the Air Force continue to use ALS to provide its servicemembers language training, stating that, “The decision of the Air Force to withdraw from the Language School adversely affects the other services.” The withdrawal, the Subcommittee noted, would decrease the student population and therefore increase the individual cost per student. While some financial savings may have been argued for the Air Force, it would not benefit the armed forces as a whole.

The Air Force had already made commitments to some universities and, therefore, temporarily withdrew its students from ALS despite protests. The controversy initially fueled rumors that ALS would be closing, but eventually led to an agreement between the University of California whereby the university would provide some linguistic training to servicemembers and, in turn, university students in need of more intensive language training could fill empty seats at ALS.
Beginning in the 1960s, DLIFLC would once again find itself fighting for its existence in Monterey to stave off threats of being moved, absorbed or closed. Sparked by attacks on military waste from the Secretary of Defense and the Committee on House Appropriations in 1961, the Presidio of Monterey was identified as “an installation of marginal utility” and further that it may be “unnecessary as a military installation.” Though it is hard to imagine a time when an abundance of space was a problem at the Presidio of Monterey, the chiding came in part due to half the land on the Presidio being vacant, though it was acknowledged that this land would be used for future expansion.

But not all legislators were as harsh on the Installation and the mission it supported. Among them were Charles Teague, California Senator Clair Engle, and Senator Hubert Humphrey. They argued that not only should the Army Language School (ALS) remain open, but that all military language training should take place at the Presidio of Monterey.

On Sept. 21, 1959 the Monterey Peninsula Herald reported that U.S. Senator Clair Engle “promised to press for establishment of a single, all-service Armed Forces Language School at the Presidio of Monterey,” which he considered an inevitability.

A six month study by the Department of Defense explored the possibility of using private universities to provide servicemembers language training,
with government institutions teaching military terminology in the target language after the student had finished studying at the university.

Both the results of the study and the vehement objections of ALS’s Commandant, Col. Walter E. Kraus, were entered in the congressional record for July 27, 1959 by Humphrey. Both Humphrey and Kraus disagreed with any assessment that preliminary language training should be done in private institutions.

“To be blunt, this is nonsense… It is unthinkable that the Army Language School should be relegated to the minor and economically unsound role of simply adding technical terminology,” stated Kraus, adding that it “is not only inefficient but wasteful.” Kraus went on to say, “We found that students acquire vastly superior skill in discussing military subjects when technical terms are introduced at the beginning and integrated throughout the remainder of the course,” and finally concluded, “We are not competing with colleges. They teach a discipline; we teach a skill.”

Ultimately, the military appropriations subcommittee of House Appropriations “considered the Language School a worthwhile institution and should be continued.”

In the latter half of 1963 the ALS changed from a Class I Activity, under Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army, to a Class II Activity Defense Language Institute, West Coast Branch, under the Defense Language Institute, Washington, D.C. This created a central agency from which the Services would obtain direction and assistance in language training matters.

“The Defense Language Institute was created to fulfill these needs and for the purpose of standardizing, improving, and increasing economy in the conduct of foreign language training for all the services.”

Discussion about consolidating language training for all the services had been going on for some fifteen years before finally becoming a reality under the Defense Language Institute on July 1, 1963.

Dr. Mahmood Taba-Tabai, who came to ALS in 1959 as a Persian language instructor and still works at DLIFLC today, remembers the significance of the consolidation and how it raised the School’s standing. With the consolidation and name change to the Defense Language Institute (DLI) came a new vision that allowed for further growth in curriculum development.

Taba-Tabai identifies Col. James L. Collins as one of the instrumental figures in the Institute’s progress at that time. “Col. Collins was very prominent, very supportive of raising the level of ALS,” said Taba-Tabai. Collins, the ALS commandant from 1959 up until the consolidation, when he became the director of DLI in Washington D.C., helped implement a program whereby a limited number of faculty received scholarships to pursue education related to their duties and the mission of the School. Taba-Tabai was one of those recipients, allowing him to earn his PhD in education and enhance his credentials. The policy remains in effect today, affording faculty at DLIFLC financial assistance to pursue higher education and maintain the Institute’s level of distinction.
As World War II came to a close in 1945, the Military Intelligence Language School (MILS) expanded rapidly to meet the requirements of America’s global commitments in the upcoming Cold War era.

When the Cold War began to take shape, the Army Language School (ALS) recruited native speakers of more than 20 languages from all over the world. Russian became the largest program, followed by Chinese, Korean, and German.

The Army only had a handful of Korean linguists available when the Korean War broke out in 1950. With the Korean language being one of the most difficult to learn for native speakers of English, ALS retrained Japanese linguists in Korean, a process called “relanguaging.” The length of the Korean War required the development of a formal program on the Presidio of Monterey.

Today, Korean is one of the largest language programs at DLIFLC.

After the Korean program expansion and success, ALS developed a national reputation for excellence in foreign language education.

With tension on the rise in Vietnam, ALS increased student...
input to the Vietnamese and French programs. In 1963, the Department of Defense (DoD) consolidated the separate Army, Navy, and Air Force language training programs into the Defense Foreign Language Program and the Army Language School became the Defense Language Institute West Coast (DLIWC). Throughout the Vietnam War, DLIWC stepped up the pace in language training by opening a temporary language training center at Fort Bliss, Texas, that went on to produce 20,000 language trained servicemembers.

After Vietnam, the Army consolidated all of its resident language training programs and moved the Defense Foreign Language Program headquarters to the Presidio of Monterey in 1974. The DoD renamed the school the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center in 1976.

In 1979, DLIFLC became an accredited institution by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. DLIFLC became the world leader in language proficiency learning due to an emphasis on student learning outcomes through the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) and an emphasis on student learning outcomes.

By the end of the 1970s, the military services were experiencing another rapid growth in Russian requirements.

In the late 70s, the annual input for the Russian program grew again, reflecting a further deterioration of superpower relations, in part due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, but also the continued build-up of Soviet military power. When the Presidio facilities reached maximum capacity in 1980, the Institute established the Lackland Operating Detachment at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, which enabled the Institute to teach the Russian basic course for up to 600 airmen at a time. The Russian programs played an important role in national security of the United States and its allies during their long struggle with the Soviet super power.

In 1991, the Soviet Union finally dissolved into a state of economic, social, and political collapse after more than four decades of Cold War with Western democracies. As a result, the budget of DLIFLC, as well as of the entire DoD, was significantly reduced.

Various languages were phased out between 1988 and 1992, including Pashto, Dari, and Serbian-Croatian. These languages were written off due to the belief that they likely wouldn’t be needed in the future. However, even with the Cold War over, the various peacekeeping and contingency operations would increase the need for linguists.
In the spring of 1946 the War Department moved the Military Intelligence Service Language School (MISLS) from Fort Snelling, Minn., to the Presidio of Monterey. In September 1946 the school hired Gleb Drujina, then a graduate student at Stanford University, to join Army Master Sgt. Alexander Vorobyoff, as the first two Russian-language instructors. Their first class began with eight students on Jan. 3, 1947.

Over the next few years, requirements for Russian linguists grew tremendously to support increased American intelligence efforts directed against the Soviet Union. Within four years, the United States became involved in the Korean War, which took the lives of the Russian Department’s first graduates, Army Capt. Robert Pomerene, and one of the first military language instructors (MLIs), Army Tech. Sgt. Nicolai Bellegarde.

**Army Language School**

The Russian department at the Army Language School (ALS), as it was renamed in 1947, grew rapidly. Student input for Russian alone soared to almost 1,000 each year. By 1950 the faculty members numbered 70 and grew to 150 by 1953. All were native speakers, many of whom had lived in exile for years.

When Russian instruction began, the course length was 47 weeks. Students attended classes six hours per day and instructors rotated among classrooms to expose students to the widest variety of accents and dialects. Instructors wrote their own textbook materials and recorded listening exercises onto 78-RPM records, since commercial materials were not available.

By 1948 the ALS’s Russian program was the largest in the country. Other services and government agencies also established their own smaller programs. Military services also turned to civilian universities. In January 1946 the Army and Navy sent 10 officers to Columbia University in New York City to begin a special graduate program of Russian language and area studies, which eventually grew into the Army Foreign Area Officer program.

However, the Air Force took a different route. In the first years after becoming a separate service in 1947 it was scrambling to build up its worldwide intelligence network. For the first few years the Air Force continued to send its personnel to the ALS.

In 1950 it persuaded the school to offer a special six-month accelerated Russian “monitors” course for voice intercept operators. To meet its growing needs, the Air Force Institute of Technology signed a contract with Syracuse University in New York to establish a Russian program for several hundred airmen each year beginning in early 1951. Overall, the Air Force found this more cost-effective than training at the Army school. In 1958, the Air Force Institute of Technology awarded a contract to Indiana University for training several hundred airmen in Russian each year. The existing program for airmen at Syracuse University continued and the Air Force withdrew all of their students from the ALS.

In the days before overhead surveillance systems, communications intelligence was America’s first line of defense against the Soviet threat. Student input in Russian continued to climb after the end of the Korean War in 1953, reaching a peak of 985 students in fiscal 1957.

The school’s graduates were playing important roles throughout the United
States military, intelligence agencies and the academic world. The Russian faculty adapted to needs of the services, when the American and Soviet governments first established the “hotline,” or MOLINK, in 1963.

After 1965 the Vietnam War dominated service planning. Many Russian graduates who served in that conflict were retrained in Vietnamese. The Educational Testing Service developed a new-style Russian Defense Language Proficiency Test II (DLPT II) in the late 1960s. A comparison between DLI Russian basic course graduates and Russian majors at civilian universities found the DLI graduates were far ahead.

The contract programs designated for the Air Force at Syracuse and Indiana universities were phased out by 1970.

**Change in the Air**

Military services, intelligence agencies, and DLI suffered cutbacks and turmoil when the Vietnam War ended. Many of DLI’s faculty members had accrued 20 years of federal service during this period and had become eligible for retirement or, some had reached mandatory retirement age under then-current Civil Service rules.

In 1974 DLI headquarters relocated to Monterey and merged with the West Coast branch to become the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). The following year the East Coast branch closed. The chairman of DLIEC Russian department, transferred to the West Coast to become chairman of a new Russian Advanced Department. He left behind the MOLINK training section as part of the DLIFLC Washington Liaison Office. This move and the termination of university contracts left the DLIFLC Russian departments the Defense Department’s sole source of basic Russian language training.

**Rebirth of Russian language importance**

By the end of the 1970s, the military services were experiencing another rapid growth in Russian requirements. From fiscal 1978 to fiscal 1981 the annual student input for Russian jumped 50 percent to more than 1,500, reflecting a further deterioration of superpower relations. When the Presidio facilities reached full capacity in 1980, the Institute opened a branch at the Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. When Congress gave the Defense Department more money for new construction, DLIFLC began constructing new Russian classrooms and expanding the school houses.
DLIFLC closed the Lackland branch in 1986 and transferred 50 instructors to Monterey. In the same year the Institute reorganized the Russian program and created two schools with 10 departments and more than 200 instructors.

A third department opened in 1987 at the Presidio of San Francisco, but this was phased out a year later. By 1989 the student load had grown to the point that two Russian departments (later three) were shifted to the new School of Slavic Languages. In 1989 more than 60 percent of DLIFLC’s Russian basic course students were reaching Level 2 in listening and reading.

A new-style Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) IV was written and student proficiency results continued to climb, with more than 80 percent of students reaching Level 2 in listening and reading by fiscal 1991.

In 1991 the Soviet Union dissolved after more than four decades of Cold War with Western democracies. As a result, the American military rapidly scaled down its training requirements for the Russian language.

The Institute dismissed 49 Russian instructors in 1992. The next year it eliminated more than 100 instructor positions in Russian and other languages. Russian student enrollments fell from 1,258 in 1990 to only 458 Russian students by 2000.

By 1995, military needs were sufficient for only 121 instructors.

Fortunately, many found new work teaching Belorussian, Ukrainian, or Serbian/Croatian, languages similar to Russian, but in greater demand.

In 1996, DLIFLC established a dedicated Onsite Inspection Agency (OSIA) program consisting of ten instructors at all times. The OSIA program prepared students for duties associated with monitoring Russian compliance with international arms treaties. In 1997, OSIA was changed to Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) and continues to teach advanced Russian courses at DLIFLC.

In 2004, with only 67 teaching staff, the Russian program merged with the Spanish program to form the European and Latin America School. In 2006, the Russian Program produced only 153 graduates, a far cry from the three schools it had at the height of the Cold War.

But Russian remains a critical language as a tool for combating terrorism as many of the former Soviet states still use Russian to communicate. In the years following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Russian and Spanish programs have focused attention on implementing the Proficiency Enhancement Program (PEP).

Indeed, precisely due to declining student loads, officials chose the Russian and Spanish programs as the first to start PEP. The program emphasized a higher faculty to student ratio and increased student proficiency while staving off faculty layoffs.

DLIFLC’s Russian programs have played a distinguished role in helping secure the national security of the United States and its allies during their long struggle with the Soviet Union.
DLI during the Vietnam era
By Pfc. Ann Taylor, Strategic Communications

As tensions rose in Saigon throughout the 1950s, U.S. advisors were sent to South Vietnam to oversee the security assistance effort. In becoming more involved on Vietnamese soil, U.S. officials were faced with a severe language barrier and the realization that U.S. forces lacked language training.

The Army Language School (ALS) started teaching Vietnamese in 1955 through a 47-week course. Approximately 30 students per year graduated from the program from 1955-1963. As President Lyndon Johnson began deploying troops to South Vietnam in 1965, just two years after the consolidation of language training for all services at the Defense Language Institute (DLI), the Department of Defense realized that troops were woefully in need of language training, with only 145 Vietnamese language trained Soldiers in the Army and 59 scattered throughout the other branches.

As the U.S. increased the number of troops hitting the ground in South Vietnam, between 1964 and 1972, some 20,000 personnel studied Vietnamese at the Defense Language Institute South West (DLISW) branch at Fort Bliss, Texas, and DLI West Coast. DLIWC, located in Monterey, Calif., graduated 25,000 service members in both Vietnamese dialects; Hanoi and Saigon. Though the initial Vietnamese program results varied in success rates, DLI graduates demonstrated their value on the ground, using their language skills to translate, interrogate, and discover enemy plans.

According to DLIFLC historical archives, the change in public attitude toward the war in the late 1960s was felt at the Institute as well. “In 1969, some DLI students felt moved to participate in anti-war demonstrations and other demonstrations on and off base. DLI representatives, who attended the December convention of the Modern Language Association (MLA) in Denver, were confronted with angry attacks by radical anti-war activists who labeled DLI an ‘enterprise in imperial linguistics’ and drove MLA to expel their support in DLI activities.”

Despite the political unrest surrounding DLI, graduates continued to serve honorably and more than 100 gave their lives during the war. Today, several buildings, such as Sgt. 1st Class Alfred H. Combs dining facility, Chief Petty Officer Frank W. Bomar barracks, and Marine Gunnery Sergeant George P. Kendall, Jr. barracks, bear the names of DLI graduates killed in action.

As the war continued and the need for language trained troops skyrocketed, the DLIWC Vietnamese program became overwhelmed. The school house reached maximum capacity in 1965, and was allowed to expand and construct more buildings for teaching and student living quarters 1967.

In 1969, DLIWC’s Vietnamese program hit its peak enrollment for a single year since the start of the war, reaching 4,900 service members; however, as President Richard Nixon began withdrawing troops in July of 1969, enrollment plummeted to a mere 421 students the next year.

DLI graduates directly affected the war by bridging the language barrier and allowing communication between U.S. officials, working within Military Assistance Command Vietnam (MACV), and South Vietnamese advisors. This free flow of communication allowed for trust building between local nationals and U.S. military, thus providing a common goal for peace.
The Defense Language Institute (DLI) Washington D.C. office was established after DLIFLC officially moved its headquarters to Monterey in the summer of 1974. DLI Washington continues to provide a critical capability by meeting the demands for language education in the National Capital Region through a highly adaptive and responsive contract vehicle. The contract program is ideal for short-term or unprogrammed training requirements and is a critical rapid response capability for the Department of Defense (DoD).

DLI Washington has the responsibility to train and maintain capable Russian linguists to support MOLINK, a Washington-Moscow hotline critical for national defense. At one time, these linguists were required to be ready to operate a highly sophisticated teletype machine that connects Moscow with the National Military Command Center in the Pentagon. Today, simpler means of communication are used to carry out this tasking, mainly due to the use of the Internet.

The DLI Washington office took on a new highly visible mission in 2009, the Afghanistan/Pakistan (AFPAK) Hands program, a Joint Staff directed three to five-year program that involves four phases of language training via DLIFLC contracts. Management of the program involves working on a daily basis with companies delivering the language training and making sure that instruction is provided to meet DLIFLC and DoD standards.

The AFPAK Hands training centers are located in Washington D.C., Tampa, Fla., and Norfolk, Va. While the Washington D.C., AFPAK Hands program is managed by staff in Washington, the other two training centers are managed by staff from the Institute’s Continuing Education Directorate. All AFPAK Hands members receive tablet PCs and iPods® from DLIFLC which are preloaded with appropriate language materials.

Aside from special programs, DLI Washington manages several language contracts that can provide instruction in 65 languages to servicemembers in need of language training. Typically, these services are offered to Olmsted scholars, Defense Attaché System officers, and Foreign Area Officers.

Lastly, but also important, the DLI Washington office provides staff support and serves as a liaison between DLIFLC and the Washington community. In support of DLIFLC Headquarters, the Washington staff often communicate with oversight organizations in the Pentagon, facilitate the Annual Program Review meeting when conducted in the capital, and support visits to Washington by the DLIFLC Commandant.
On Feb. 8, 1974, the Department of the Army announced its plans to consolidate the Defense Language Institute's (DLI) Headquarters and East Coast branch in Washington D.C. with the West Coast branch in California. The restructuring was to put all foreign language entities under the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) and locate them at the Presidio of Monterey as the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC).

Fueled by the desire to reduce decentralization and provide a more conducive learning environment, at least by some, the consolidation had been looming since the School became DLI in 1963. The consolidation occurred under the larger restructuring initiative of the Army to streamline the organization within the U.S. starting in 1973. Part of that reorganization included the creation of a command to direct all Army training, education, and doctrine, TRADOC, in an effort to have one organization oversee Army training efficiency.

DLI's consolidation became effective on July 1, 1974 under the larger restructuring initiative of the Army to streamline the organization within the U.S. starting in 1973. Part of that reorganization included the creation of a command to direct all Army training, education, and doctrine, TRADOC, in an effort to have one organization oversee Army training efficiency.

DLI's consolidation became effective on July 1, 1974 under the larger restructuring initiative of the Army to streamline the organization within the U.S. starting in 1973. Part of that reorganization included the creation of a command to direct all Army training, education, and doctrine, TRADOC, in an effort to have one organization oversee Army training efficiency.
name Project CONCISE. Prior to CONCISE’s approval, it was being considered along with another project, called STEADFAST, which sought to move DLI to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. DLI proponents of the consolidation at the Presidio of Monterey supported Project CONCISE for obvious reasons, but while both DLI and TRADOC were in agreement on which project should move forward, they were not initially in agreement as to the reasons why.

TRADOC leadership saw the consolidation as a part of an overall reduction in the military force, and therefore assumed that language training requirements would be reduced proportionally. This seemed a valid assumption after the sharp decline in Vietnamese language training at the end of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The DLIFLC command did not agree, and made their case to TRADOC. They argued that language training requirements were, in fact, more likely to increase based on national policies, such as the Nixon Doctrine, which promised to furnish military and economic assistance to countries with which the U.S. had specified treaties, and that the consolidation would provide fiscal savings and increased efficiency that would help DLI support those increased requirements.

Project CONCISE moved forward and DLIFLC was established at the Presidio of Monterey.

The managing authority over DLIFLC and how to address language training issues would be the source of much debate for years to come, and came to a head during the Gulf War when major shortfalls in language proficiency were identified.

Shortly after, a reorganization of army schools brought DLIFLC directly under the Combined Arms Center (CAC) in 1996, which is responsible for professional military education for the Army, allowing for better representation of DLIFLC within TRADOC.

In 2005, the Defense Language Office (DLO) was established to provide oversight for the Defense Foreign Language Program which sought to establish a pool of language professionals within the military and track their accessions and separations.

CAC and DLO remain in DLIFLC’s command structure and have helped maintain its high standing and allowed DLIFLC to continually provide the best language training possible to the military services.
A History of shaping methodology and testing

By 1st Lt. Scott Ghiringhelli, Strategic Communications

From its origins, what is today the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, DLIFLC has approached language learning from an innovative perspective. When the school started at the Presidio of San Francisco in 1941 there were no text books designed to teach Japanese, or any language for that matter, at such an intensive pace with a focus on practical use. Instructors were forced to take materials from civilian schools and modify them to fit the demanding needs of their mission.

Since then, curriculum development has evolved in a myriad of different ways. From aptitude and proficiency testing to course length and classroom size, military and civilian professionals throughout the years have sought out the best methods for teaching language at a concentrated pace in a rigorous environment.

As early as October of 1947, research projects addressing teaching methods and language aptitude tests in the language field were being recommended to find ways of improving language instruction. The
research was used to determine the most effective teaching methodology, training aids, student-instructor ratio, and classroom time.

But even before the student entered the classroom, leaders wanted to know which servicemembers had the aptitude to learn a foreign language. They looked to “develop language aptitude tests whereby the prospective language student [could be] tested by a non-linguist to determine his aptitude for attaining conversational ability in a language,” according to documentation on Research Projects in the Language Field, dated Oct. 30, 1947. The test, it was thought, could be similar to the code aptitude test that was used at that time, and that by identifying servicemembers with a natural ability for learning language, the time needed to make a student proficient in a language could be reduced.

The Defense Language Aptitude Test (DLAT) became a reality in the 1950s, and would continue for more than twenty years until being replaced by the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) in the mid 1970s, which tested language aptitude for all the services, and is still in use today.

Likewise, in 1947 there was no standardized proficiency test to determine a student’s language ability. Up until that time testing had been accomplished in much the same way as private institutions, where individual faculty devised their own tests. In 1948, standardized tests were devised for 25 languages and implemented in 1949, with another six added by 1953. Though some form of language tests were used to evaluate Army linguists in the early 1950s, it wasn’t until the Army Language Proficiency Test (ALPT) came into existence in 1956 that any kind of standard was set. It was then renamed the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) in 1963, corresponding to the Army Language School’s (ALS) transformation into the Defense Language Institute (DLI).

Also under review were the texts that had been used since the language school’s inception as well as the need to create new texts for anticipated language requirements. The new and revised texts were to reflect up-to-date military and technical terminology, as well as rearranging content for the older books.

In a memo dated Oct. 25, 1954, course length was being addressed with regard to extending the Chinese-Mandarin, Japanese, and Korean courses form 11 to 18 months. Not surprising, three trial courses, one in each language consisting of 12 students, found that students showed significant improvement after completing the 18 month course. “Comparative

examinations indicate the margin between 18-month students, with no prior knowledge of the language involved, and the 11-month students is even greater than was expected from the additional training time.”

Course length, and its relation to language proficiency, was again examined by Dr. Ray Clifford, DLIFLC dean, at the meeting of the General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) in August 1981. Clifford had identified that there was a problem with the language proficiency of graduates. In 1984 he proposed adjusting course lengths according to the level of difficulty of each language.

A study was accomplished to determine how much language instruction would be required for 75 percent of students in each language category to achieve a level 2 (Limited Working Proficiency) in listening. Though there was initial resistance to lengthening courses beyond 47 weeks, when an Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) level 2 in listening and reading became a requirement for cryptolinguists, the GOSC stated that Category IV language courses (the most difficult for English speakers) should be extended to 63 weeks.

Over the next ten years the Institute saw a steady increase in the percentage of students achieving the required language proficiency, and
finally culminated in the objective to have 80 percent of students achieving a level 2 in listening, reading, and speaking.

The Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) had been revamped in the early 1980s to establish a third version of the test that standardized proficiency levels across different languages and agencies. Toward the end of the decade the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) was added as a speaking component to proficiency testing. Proficiency testing of DLIFLC graduates in the 1960s was based on the Foreign Service Institute's proficiency scale, but in 1985 gave way to the ILR scale.

Besides identifying the practical skills of students, proficiency testing also provided a standard from which college credits could be awarded through the American Council on Education. Today DLIFLC is fully accredited and offers an Associate of Arts in Foreign Language to students who graduate with the minimum proficiency level and grade point average, as well as completing general education requirements.

The DLPT is now in its fifth generation of development and DLIFLC continues to scrutinize teaching methodologies and language proficiency testing through departments like Curriculum Development, Faculty Development, Evaluation and Standardization, Language Science and Technology, and Technology Integration.

Technology has come to play an enormous role in language learning at DLIFLC, as the Institute continually strives to bring cutting-edge methods of instruction to the classroom.
The McNerney Years
a time to build at DLIFLC

By Ben De La Selva, President, DLI Alumni Association and retired Army Col. David A. McNerney

Col. David A. McNerney was commandant of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) from 1981 to 1985. He came to DLIFLC from the Training and Doctrine Command Operation Center (TRADOC) headquarters and was acutely aware of a number of major issues affecting DLIFLC. He also had a solid background in military construction, budget, manpower and civilian personnel management. McNerney was specifically aware that DLIFLC was projected to double its student population within the coming five years. Recognizing that DLIFLC possessed an abundance of dedicated talent in the staff and faculty who only needed leadership and guidance, McNerney embarked on an ambitious and comprehensive program to enhance DLIFLC.

Though McNerney retired 26 years ago, he has had such a tremendous impact on language training and linguist management that his legacy still permeates the very fabric of DLIFLC’s organization.

Munakata Hall’s construction was planned and initiated by McNerney during his tenure. The construction program initiated and carried out by the Commandant produced a wave of new construction activity that changed the face of the Presidio as no other building program has achieved before or since. His construction plan made a reality the Russian Village Complex at the southwestern tip of the Presidio; Munakata and Nicholson General Instruction Facilities; the Taylor Hall Personnel Processing Center; Collins Hall; Aiso Library; Belas Dining Facility; Hobson Student Activity Center; the Logistics Building; the Post Exchange; Price Fitness Center, and thirteen new dormitory buildings housing 1,350 students in two person rooms with private baths. This flurry of construction represented the largest building effort in Monterey County in the preceding 20 years. With sheer determination and an uncanny ability to get things done, McNerney was able to secure $100 million of Title IV Department of Defense (DoD) construction money and receive approval for an expedited construction program.

Troop command reorganization

McNerney realized immediately that Troop Command was not organized in accordance with the U.S. Army training policy nor was it supportive of the language learning process at DLIFLC. It consisted of three 700 person companies and was staffed with non-linguist leaders. McNerney had the Adjutant General Branch commander replaced with a Military Intelligence officer and proceeded to replace all Platoon Sergeant and 1st Sergeant positions with language specific leaders so they could mentor their students throughout the learning process. He then reduced the company size to approximately 200 to 300 students and tied them closely to the school organization.

McNerney also placed all officer and senior Non-Nommissioned Officer (NCO) students in one company, for better management, since they would have different processing and physical fitness standards than incoming Soldiers with minimal military service.

The San Francisco Annex

A DLIFLC annex was established in the old Merchant Institute dedicates Munzer Hall to Dr. Hans W. Munzer, faculty member 1952-1976 and founder of DLI Language Resource Center

DLIFLC becomes an accredited institution by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Hachiya Hall, Mizutari Hall, Nakamura Hall dedicated

Soviet Union invades Afghanistan

DLIFLC hosts Bureau for International Language Coordination for the first time in Monterey. BILC is the consultative and advisory body for language training matters in NATO
Marine hospital on the grounds of the Presidio of San Francisco to handle the student population increase until the new classrooms were built in Monterey. The Presidio Annex, as it became known, consisted of approximately 600 Army students in German, Korean, and Spanish, organized in different companies.

**Military professional development**

McNerney worked closely with DLIFLC’s civilian union leadership to clear the way for military linguists to work side-by-side with civilian faculty in DLIFLC classrooms and converted all the previous Foreign Language Training NCO and Petty Officer (PO) positions into a new position called Military Language Instructor (MLI), to give these personnel active teaching experience. This program created a very strong demand for assignment to DLIFLC by linguist NCOs/POs since they recognized the significant career enhancement opportunity afforded by this assignment. It also ensured that DLIFLC would have the highest quality linguists returning to the Presidio of Monterey. McNerney insisted on establishing a comprehensive development program for all NCOs and POs assigned to the language school staff and faculty. All incoming linguists were immediately assigned as students to an accelerated or advanced language program to refresh and enhance their language skills. Over the course of their DLIFLC tour, they were rotated into Platoon Sergeant positions, in the companies, MLI positions in the language schools, and/or Subject Matter Expert duties on course development projects. This ensured that they were well-rounded professionally in both the military and linguistic skill components of their military occupational specialty.

**Military linguist pay**

One of McNerney’s greatest achievements was his initiative to provide military bonus pay for linguists to maintain their language skills. His final proposal consisted of a matrix showing language proficiency on one axis and the language difficulty categories on the other. This proposal was later enacted into law by Congress for all DoD military personnel.
There was nothing high-tech about the early days at the Army Language School, as the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) was known back in the late 1940s, and students and teachers alike used orange crates for desks.

Obtaining blackboards was a major step forward at the time, and teachers had to make due with simple textbooks and the projection of their own voices to teach students language.

During the 1950s teachers produced textbooks with manual typewriters and in some languages the characters had to be manually written down with a pen or brushes. Audio visual aids were exploited to a great extent. Apart from a wealth of pictorial aids, a wide range of three-dimensional objects were utilized, as well as mock-ups of battle sites known as Military Terrain (or sand) tables.

A push to introduce 78 RPM records in the late 40s and early 50s did not last long, as these could only be played in class and were not durable enough to be shuffled from classroom to classroom. In very few classes, students were issued record players and records for homework practice.

It was not until the 1950s that the reel-to-reel tape recorder was introduced. This large 40 pound monster was used by teachers in the classroom, where the same dialogues and mechanical drills contained in the textbooks were played over and over while the students repeated, substituted, modified, transformed, and expanded the models provided on the tapes.

The reel-to-reel system was later converted into 36 position labs, where now three sections of students could be made to perform more of the same drills in unison, with only one teacher at the console. Later on, students could take the bulky tape recorder to their barracks or home, and perform the same drills in a more individualized fashion. As Voice of America recordings were received, they were duplicated and the tapes issued to students.

In the late 1960s the overhead projector was introduced. The teachers were now able to use a piece of acetate to write, draw, or show a diagram that could be projected onto a screen. Eventually, teachers were issued a set of transparencies that were developed with each new course.

The cassette player was the big technological leap in the early and mid 1970s. The use of cassettes allowed students to carry their players to and from the classroom and do listening exercises on an individual basis. The first cassette players were about the size of a cereal box, and weighed several pounds.

The cassette lab replaced the reel-to-reel lab, with a recorder installed in each student station. At this time, being able to play tapes at their own pace, students could do transcription and gisting (summarizing) exercises in the lab. During these two decades, the videocassette recorder (VCR) was also introduced.

1983
DoD invests $100 million into construction of new facilities on Presidio of Monterey. Col. David McNerney (far right) breaks ground on Nicholson Hall in 1985

1984
Institute dedicates Munakata Hall to Yutaka Munakata, who served the Institute for 38 years

Apple Computer Inc. unveils its Macintosh personal computer, which DLIFLC later used because of its multi-language capabilities

Dr. Martha Herzog develops first-ever proficiency-oriented Defense Language Proficiency Test III (DLPT)

Terrorist attacks on U.S. barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, kill 241 servicemembers
The stand-alone PC computer, without a hard disk, appeared on the scene in the late 1980s. These were first used in conjunction with laserdisc players.

In the early 1990s, there was an attempt to introduce the use of Apple computers at the Institute level. As there was a dearth of software programs in the Apple platform, the IBM PC was the preferred option. Because Arabic course developers had been working on computer based exercises for a couple of years, in 1990 the first stand alone computer lab was established in the Middle East School. These stand-alone computer labs were established in all DLIFLC schools and most used commercial software. Unfortunately, many of these programs contained countless fill-in, multiple choice, and mechanical exercises. Throughout the late 1990s, several schools were able to establish networked computer labs.

By this time, the Educational Technology Division was producing language materials on CDs, and the language departments were able to have CD libraries available for students in the lab and to loan for home use. In the meantime, students were still carrying cassette players back and forth to the barracks, but these players were now made the size of a Walkman.

In 1998, in a trial attempt to supplement the developing Spanish course, every student in one Spanish class was issued a laptop computer. Laptops were principally used for assigning homework, which consisted of a CD that included some of the same workbook exercises in the textbooks. The program was discontinued mainly because the laptops were damaged beyond repair after just 24 weeks.

In 2000-2001, after many DLIFLC buildings had been networked, a program dubbed TEC-1 began in the European and Latin American School (ELA). It consisted of a rolling cart equipped with a computer and 32-inch monitor, a VCR, and DVD player. This was the first Institute-level
attempt to network a classroom computer to other computers in the building and to the Internet. In 2001, an Institute initiative made ELA, along with the Korean and Russian schools, the recipients of two multi-media labs, which were connected to the network. These labs brought colorful text, audio, and video from the teacher's console to individual student computer stations.

Digitizing course materials using PCs made it easy to go to the next step, the creation of CDs containing documents, audio (MP3), and video (AVI) files. As a result, the Spanish course homework numbering some 30 audiocassettes could all fit on one CD. Accordingly, each school started issuing MP3 players.

As early as 2002, with the creation of the Emerging Languages Task Force (ELTF), the use of tablet PCs and interactive whiteboards, or SmartBoards™, was initiated. Accordingly, students were issued portable tablets for classroom and homework use.

The success of the interactive whiteboards in ELTF was so great that the Institute leadership decided to install them DLIFLC-wide. The interactiveness of the SmartBoard™ has literally transformed the classroom into an interactive working and learning environment, with the combined power of a projector, computer and whiteboard. Teachers can do everything they do on their computer, by simply using their index finger as a mouse, to touch the whiteboard and highlight key points, access applications and websites, and write notes in electronic ink. Instructors are then able to save their work to files that can be reused later, printed, e-mailed or posted to a website. At the end of 2004, there was a SmartBoard™ in every DLIFLC classroom.

In 2004, the Institute saw an opportunity to introduce in large scale the use of laptops. The ELTF programs had already switched the previous year from tablet PCs to laptops. In 2005 the other DLIFLC schools followed suit and started issuing laptops to every student.

In 2005-06 iPods® began making their way into DLIFLC classrooms. With a bigger display and much bigger storage capacity than MP3 players, students were better able to navigate through the myriad of exercises stored on the devices. The latest iPods® could store 20 and more gigabytes of audio files, plus video files, making it possible for students to carry a whole language course in a gadget the size of a pack of cigarettes.

Since the 1950s, advances in technology have been systematically applied to language teaching and learning at DLIFLC. Appropriately, DLIFLC has gradually moved from chalkboards and overhead projectors to SmartBoards™, from reel-to-reel labs to multi-media labs, and from analog tape recorders to digital iPods®. Without doubt, one can say with confidence that the application of technology at DLIFLC has indeed come a long way.

---

**Timeline:**

1987
- Congress appropriates funds for Foreign Language Proficiency Pay
- Nicholson Hall dedicated to Army Maj. Arthur D. Nicholson, Jr., shot by a Soviet sentry and denied medical assistance, he bled to death

1988
- NJAHS Museum Exhibit, Nakamura Hall, DLI, on permanent loan
- Rasmussen Hall, dedicated to Army Col. Kai E. Rasmussen, one of the language school's founders
- Iran Iraq War ends

### Anniversary:


---

**Aiso Library dedicated to Judge (Army Lt. Col. ret.) John F. Aiso, chief instructor when language school started**

**Pan Am Flight 103 bombed over Lockerbie, Scotland**

---

**Congress appropriates funds for Foreign Language Proficiency Pay**

---

**DLIFLC research division created**

---

**NIAHS Museum Exhibit, Nakamura Hall, DLI, on permanent loan**

---

**Rasmussen Hall, dedicated to Army Col. Kai E. Rasmussen, one of the language school’s founders**

---

**Acting Commandant, Air Force Col. Ronald Cowger, 1988-1989, DLIFLC**
Congressman Sam Farr, U.S. Representative for California’s 17th congressional district since 1993, has long been an advocate of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC).

In 2006 he helped author a bill allocating $6.1 million dollars to DLIFLC for specialized training equipment, language laboratories, and enabling the school to partner with local colleges, which allowed students to earn a Bachelor of Arts in Global Studies.

During his time in office, Farr has also honored DLIFLC staff and faculty at dedications and tributes. He entered Ben De La Selva’s name and accomplishments into the House of Representatives as a congressional record in 2005. De La Selva has served as dean of every resident school at DLIFLC during which time he helped develop several teaching methodologies and the Faculty Personnel System (FPS) still in effect today.

Alfie Tewfick Khalil came to the DLIFLC in 1979 to teach Arabic, and soon came to be a respected faculty leader. Up until his untimely death in 2006, Khalil, as Union leader, fought for faculty benefits and the School itself when it was threatened by the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Committee. Farr added Khalil’s name into congressional record in the House of Representatives in the early part of 2011, a short time before he attended the dedication of Khalil Hall, a new Arabic school building honoring Alfie Khalil.

“Over the years, in so many different ways, I’ve known him and seen him and honored him with resolutions for work he did. He always seemed to give more and help people, and had a very social conscience,” said Farr of Khalil.

Farr traveled to Cairo after the dedication and was struck by how important the gesture was to Egyptians. “This goes a long, long way to crossing the cultural divide between countries, and I think that’s what this school [DLIFLC] does so well.”

A half century and a generation earlier, in the spring of 1959, California State Senator Frederick S. Farr wrote letters to several other legislators addressing the Air Force’s planned withdrawal from the Army Language School (ALS).

“My father got elected to the California State Senate in 1955,” Farr remembered. “My father was keen on education...he put a lot of emphasis, when he was in the state senate, on bolstering up California institutions of higher education of which the DLI was one.”

In his appeals to Washington, Frederick Farr made mention
of Senator Hubert Humphrey, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization, and staff member Miles Scull, Jr., who Humphrey assigned to carry out a study on ALS. The study generated a U.S. Senate Report which found that the creation of an Air Force language school would duplicate resources and that, in fact, ALS should be expanded to teach language to all the services. In addition, it stated that an Air Force withdrawal "would be a tremendous blow to the prestige of the School."

"I'm touched to see them (letters) because some of the things he's saying in the letters back then are the exact same things that I'm saying now, 50 years later," said Farr after reviewing archived copies of the letters. "It's about creating a center of excellence here."

In his letters, Frederick Farr pointed out the importance of language skills within the armed forces and State Department, and illustrated that need by citing The Ugly American, written by Eugene Burdick in 1958, which criticized American attitudes toward foreign affairs and the lack of cultural and language understanding, and influenced John F. Kennedy's implementation of the Peace Corps.

"In those days The Ugly American had come out, a book telling about how Americans...were just so naïve to cultures and languages," commented Farr, adding that his father felt that those who received training at "DLI" were much more skilled when they went overseas, and therefore, much more effective.

Farr was encouraged by his father to travel abroad in order to understand cultural differences.

"I had a chance in college to work in the Merchant Marines and just wake up to, 'oh my gosh, there's lot's to learn out here and wonderful new cultures that I haven't even experienced,'" said Farr.

A summer working in Buenos Aires, Argentina, along with his previous travels, helped solidify Farr's resolve to spend time living abroad and learning a language.

"I did my Peace Corps service in Colombia," said Farr, speaking about "the importance of cross-cultural relations."

Elaborating on his Peace Corps experience, Farr commented, "It changed my whole life. I was going to be a high school biology teacher. I worked in the Peace Corps in community development, organizing a very poor barrio to go down and petition its local government to build infrastructure. Once I got 'bitten,' petitioning that government, I said, 'I can't stop here. There's poverty in America; there's a lot of petitioning of government that needs to be done back here in the United States. I'm going to go home and do it.'"

Farr sees DLIFLC as playing a leading role in language instruction for the Department of Defense due to its culturally-based approach.

"You can't learn a language well... without learning cultural values. I think DLI is the premier institution in the world for language learning."

Farr concluded with the hope that DLIFLC's future will be even brighter than its past. "Reading those letters...that my father wrote when I was sixteen years old, and reading the content of those letters, you could republish them today; the sentences say the same thing – that this is a great institute; we need to invest in it. It seems to me that DLI is best positioned to be that bridge."
In August 1990, Saddam Hussein invaded oil rich Kuwait and within two days President George H.W. Bush initiated Operation Desert Shield. Immediately following, the Defensive Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) organized an emergency staff meeting to discuss their involvement in the upcoming international conflict and established the Middle East Operations Center.

In the first deploying units supporting Operation Desert Shield, service personnel managers identified all Arabic linguists and rushed them to where they were needed most.

Several DLIFLC and Goodfellow Air Force Base Non-Commissioned Officers and Military Language Instructors were deployed within three weeks of the U.S. involvement. But branch managers faced a shortage in Arabic linguists and authorized units with linguists and thus resorted to training servicemembers via short Arabic courses in order to satisfy the demand of upcoming deployments.

A major problem identified through the Arabic linguist ranks was the deterioration of linguist skills over time, as well as the lack of exposure to the Arabic dialects of Iraqi, Kuwaiti, and Saudi.

To combat Arabic linguists’ struggle to sustain language proficiency, DLIFLC was committed to sending study materials to any and all military personnel requesting them, anywhere in the world. DLIFLC also partnered with the 311th Military Intelligence Battalion at Fort Campbell, Ky., to bring their linguists a refresher course and introduction to the Iraqi dialect. The Institute also constructed a course to be delivered via video tele-training by resident DLIFLC Arabic instructors.

Because of the long lead time required to produce proficient Arabic linguists, 18 months from start to finish, including technical training, DLIFLC staff worked to develop special courses in Washington D.C. to teach the Iraqi dialect to other Arabic linguists and a short Modern Standard Arabic course, specifically designed for branch qualified linguists who were proficient in other languages.

These unique programs were developed and applied within three months of U.S. involvement in the Middle East.

NATO approves Partnership for Peace for East and Central European countries

Use of Internet grows exponentially

Bomb explodes at World Trade Center

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

DUIFLC holds Bureau for International Language Coordination conference

Commandant, Army Col. Vladimir Sobichersky, 1993-1995, DUIFLC

Haitian-Creole course developed by DLI Washington

Fort Ord closes and Presidio of Monterey Garrison established
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U.S. peacekeeping troops withdraw from Somalia

Schools reorganized to reflect post-Cold War world

Command Sergeant Major Thomas J. Bugary 1993 - 1997

DLIFLC holds Bureau for International Language Coordination conference

Commandant, Army Col. Vladimir Sobichersky, 1993-1995, DLIFLC
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When President Bush shifted the Middle Eastern objective to pressure Iraq into withdrawing their military forces from Kuwait, DLIFLC was called upon to conduct an immediate assessment of language and training needs.

A five-man team from DLIFLC, headed by Commandant Col. Donald C. Fischer, took a thorough tour of all U.S. Army Military Intelligence units that were assigned military linguists.

Their findings identified hundreds of linguists needing language sustainment materials. The team also used their trip experience to further develop a “crash” course to help prepare deploying units.

DLIFLC’s involvement in Operation Desert Shield varied from producing linguists on a short term notice to providing language materials to existing linguists and further educating all available linguists to make U.S. forces more prepared for the mission when deployed.

Linguists from all services, especially non-cryptologic assignments, played an important role in the coalition victory over Iraqi President Saddam Hussein’s forces by serving in entry level positions and doing their jobs in negotiations between U.S. generals and top Iraqi commanders and in working Prisoners of War interrogation cases.

Operation Desert Shield created an array of challenges for DLIFLC’s training system and servicemembers who were called upon to attain and maintain a high level of language proficiency in a variety of dialects.

Members of the Bravo Company, 1st Battalion, 187th Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division, pose for a photograph in front of a water filtration plant in southern Iraq near As Samawah. Sgt. Michael Landolfi (lower right), an Arabic linguist, poses with his friends before returning to Saudi Arabia.

Capt. Scott O’Grady (center) shot over Bosnia-Herzegovina and rescued by Marines

Commandant, Army Col. Daniel Devlin, 1996-2000, DLIFLC

Serbian/Croatian department re-established and Russian linguists retrained to meet Bosnian crisis requirements

TRADOC realigns DLIFLC under CAC

Foreign Language Proficiency Pay and enlistment bonuses increased for linguist MOSs

Taliban gain control in Afghanistan

Commandant, Army Col. Ila Mettee-McCutchon, 1995-1996, DLIFLC

1995

1996
The invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein gave DLIFLC graduates an opportunity to again prove their worth. By the end of August 1990, hundreds of graduates had deployed with the largest American expeditionary force in recent history. A group of them served with the 311th Military Intelligence (MI) Battalion, “The Eye of the Eagle,” of the renowned “Screaming Eagles,” the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault). Another group left for Saudi Arabia from Utah with the Army National Guard’s 142nd MI Battalion, and another from Fort Bragg, N.C., with the 519th MI Battalion.

News releases and letters received by Arabic instructors from those graduates construct an interesting picture of linguist use during the Persian Gulf War. Capt. Robert Bush (DLIFLC 1985) wrote:

“Remember on the news about the six Iraqi prisoners of war? When they were transferred from the font and brought to the POW camp? Guess who settled them down and all in Arabic??? Yes! Little old me. Everyone said I did a good job. Very fist time with POWs…it brings it all to reality.”
With the beginning of the ground war in late January 1991, many of the initial assaults were carried out by paratroopers in UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters, with Apache Gunship helicopters flying around as air support.

In January 1991, Sgt. David Villarreal, a DLIFLC Egyptian Arabic dialect graduate, who deployed with the Bravo Company, 1st Battalion, 187th Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division, was immediately dispatched to Kuwait along with another dozen Arabic linguists.

In one of the Black Hawk air assaults, Villarreal and several other linguists rushed into the area to support combat troops and found many Iraqi soldiers walking around somewhat confused. Villarreal's company commander handed him a megaphone and told him to talk to the soldiers in Arabic.

The message they received was clear: “If you do not give up immediately, you will be annihilated.” The result was the surrender of 450 Iraqi soldiers.

Villarreal served as a Military Language Instructor at DLIFLC, from 2004 to 2007. After retirement in 2007, he took a job with the Institute and today works at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, managing DLIFLC’s translator/interpreter program for native speakers who joined the Army 09L program.

The most celebrated DLIFLC Arabic graduate during operation Desert Shield/Storm is Air Force Maj. Rick Francona. Francona went through the Arabic basic and intermediate course in the late 1970s. He later became a technical language assistant in the Arabic program, performing these duties for two years.

After becoming an officer and rising to the rank of major, Francona was assigned to Army Central Command in Saudi Arabia as one of the interpreters of Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf. Francona was often asked to brief high-ranking Arabic officers and to translate for American generals. He was present during the meetings between Schwarzkopf and the Iraqis to negotiate the cessation of hostilities.

To this day, Francona comes to visit DLIFLC and speak to Foreign Area Officers about the importance of being a linguist during wartime. He was inducted into the DLIFLC Hall of Fame in 2006.
DLIFLC meets the 9/11 challenge
By Natela Cutter, Strategic Communications

Just months before the World Trade Center was attacked, newly-appointed DLIFLC Commandant Army Col. Kevin Rice was faced with several serious challenges. There was not enough money in the budget to pay soaring electricity bills, nor was there funding for the locality pay increase freshly awarded by Congress to staff and faculty. In addition, Rice was facing severe push back by the Monterey community because of an Army order to close off all military installations nation-wide for security reasons that summer. Finally, Rice had to deal with a pending ecological disaster of an old Army building on the verge of falling into the ocean.

“Every month I had to wrestle with TRADOC (Training and Army Doctrine Command) to remind them that I was going to run out of money three or four months before the end of the year,” said Rice, in an interview with the Institute’s command historian in October 2008.

At the same time Rice was being summoned by then Mayor of...
Monterey, Dan Albert, to hold a town hall meeting with residents about the closure of the Presidio gates, the new Commandant was pondering where to find money to either save or remove Stilwell Hall, which was the size of "two huge basketball arenas, one atop another."

"I used to stare at that thing (Stilwell Hall) and think 'It'll be just the worst thing for the U.S. Army and the military community in the Monterey area if we allowed that large building that was full of asbestos and lead paint...to fall into the ocean, which was the National Marine Sanctuary of the Monterey Bay,'" said Rice.

But for faculty, diligently working in the eight schoolhouses, the lack of money to pay electricity or locality pay was completely transparent, mostly due to the skilled and tactful leadership of both Rice and then president of the Presidio Union, Alfie Khalil.

"We used to go to lunch at Fifi's and discuss many problems," said Rice, describing Khalil as a personal friend. "The problem was that DLI, prior to 9/11, to put it one way, was sort of a backwater within the Army. People at DLI all knew how important foreign language training was...but it (DLI) had not been given really any attention," explained Rice.

On 9/11 everything changed at the Presidio, as for most of America.

Complaints from the community about plans of closing the Presidio to the public immediately stopped. "The editor of the (Monterey County) Herald called me up and said 'we still have more letters but people called and asked us not to publish them any longer,'" explained Rice, with a chuckle, adding that some residents wrote that they believed he had predicted the events of 9/11.

But this was not the end of Rice's financial woes. He needed to man the gates that were closed 24 hours a day with no one but students to carry out the task. One by one, students were pulled from the classrooms for mandatory duty, until one morning, Rice received a call from a two star general who had heard that students were not in the classroom but on guard duty.

"He told me to get those students back into class. I said 'Well, Sir, there is no MP (Military Police) platoon here and you've not given me money to hire any guards to be at the gates,'" Rice said.

"I don't care. Get those students in class," the general yelled.

"I said 'Well, would you like me to pull the Army Korean students? (No) – 'Well, then, how about those who are studying Chinese?' He was getting really angry and finally said, 'Okay, Col. Rice, you've made your point. I'll get you the money for private guards at DLI's gates.'"

Not all of DLIFLC's problems were solved that easily. The task ahead of Rice was to meet the requirements of the services for less commonly taught languages such as Pashto and Dari spoken in Afghanistan, and Uzbek, Tadzik, and Georgian spoken in neighboring countries.

"Of course, after the terrorist attacks on September 11th, everybody in the Army, and other forces for that matter, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, wanted Arabic linguists right now, right away," said Rice.

"They all had to be 3/3 (reading/speaking proficiency levels)...and oh yes, they said 'Can you give me some Pashto speakers, and Dari speakers and Farsi speakers, a get some Kurdish speakers too.' So, everybody wanted 3/3 Middle Eastern linguists right away."

The transformation that ensued was a large increase in the DLIFLC budget. In FY01 the budget went from $77M to $88M in FY02, with an increase of about $20M per year thereafter. "So, we were able to transform...and begin to modernize the classrooms and do many of the things that had been neglected for years just because DLI had not been given the money," explained Rice.
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North Korea withdraws from Non-Proliferation Treaty

U.S. troops capture Iraqi President Saddam Hussein

Capt. Daniel Pick, a Middle East Foreign Area Officer, translates for Lt. Col. Walter Waltemeyer, Commander, 2nd Battalion, 10th Senior U.S. military officer in Mosul, Iraq
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Office of the Secretary of Defense directs DLIFLC to manage predeployment language and culture familiarization training for Iraq

Tsunami devastates Asia

DLIFLC takes responsibility for 09 Lima translator/interpreter program
Within days after the September 11 attacks, leadership at DLIFLC moved to support new language requirements to meet the needs of the Department of Defense (DoD) by establishing a task force on the Presidio of Monterey to meet the short-term and long-range resident language needs of Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF).

In addition, to meet the military requirement surge and a request for 1,000 Dari and Pashto linguists with South Central Asian regional expertise, the Institute immediately began seeking contract instructors through its DLI Washington Office, responsible for meeting language surge needs via a number of established contracts.

In Washington D.C., on Oct. 5, 2001, the House of Representatives passed a bill that approved funding for U.S. government intelligence agencies. Congressman Sam Farr used the occasion to offer an “expanded mission for the Defense Language Institute.”

“One of the things that this bill calls for is a dedicated language school that would enhance the unique foreign language skills of people who are trained to work in the intelligence agencies. It is important for the nation to realize that such a school already exists right in Monterey, California. There is no need to reinvent the wheel. All we need to do is enhance the mission of the Defense Language Institute,” said Farr in his statement.

As a result, in October of 2001, DLIFLC began five new unprogrammed languages to address the urgent security concerns arising from the September attacks. The plan envisioned cross-training existing linguists, who were already proficient in similar languages, or to conduct abbreviated versions of the basic course, for a quick fielding of minimal-level linguists.

Though conversion courses were an immediate solution for
the need, it became abundantly clear to DLIFLC leadership that a long-term solution was needed. The individual chosen to spearhead the new Operation Enduring Freedom Task Force (OEF Task Force) language project was Dr. Mahmood Taba-Tabai, a native of Iran and an experienced DLIFLC dean. “Taba-Tabai was able to quickly select new faculty who spoke languages that were rarely, if ever, taught and was able to start a new program from the ground up,” said DLIFLC Command Historian Dr. Stephen Payne.

“At one point they told me (DLIFLC leadership) that they have a high speed Air Force captain to give me who would help in the organization of the program,” explained Taba-Tabai.

The high-speed Air Force captain was Frank “Chip” von Heiland, who was assigned to the position of associate dean with the tasking “to get the Dari class off the ground.”

“Our number one priority at the OEF Task Force was to ensure we had the capability to provide materials and instruction for languages where we had U.S. troops on the ground and in contact,” explained von Heiland.

With no teaching materials available in Dari and Pashto from Afghanistan, a country ravaged by war since the 1979 Soviet invasion, academic materials simply did not exist. “In some cases, faculty were building tomorrow’s lesson the day before,” said von Heiland.

Within six months of the creation of the OEF Task Force in January 2002, the Institute graduated its first Dari linguists through a 16-week conversion course from Persian Farsi. The first full-fledge 47-week-long Pashto basic course was followed by Uzbek in September 2002.

By 2003, programs were also in place for Kurmanji, Sorani, Yakan, Cebuano, and Georgian, complete with testing capabilities including the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) exam, which required not only instructor language proficiency, but also skills in test writing and conducting oral exams.

“Later, with troops serving in Georgia, a former republic of the Soviet Union, the Task Force began instruction in Georgian, followed by Kurdish-Behdini, a sub-dialect of Kurdish-Kurmanji spoken in northern Iraq and suddenly made important due to the U.S. invasion of that country in March 2003,” explained von Heiland.

Some 19 other languages were considered for future training and faculty members were hired to teach Baluchi, Hindi, Urdu, Armenian, Chechen, Ilocano, and Javanese.”

Simultaneously, the OEF Task Force instruction teams began developing Language Survival Kits (LSK), small, pocket-sized booklets with a CD containing basic vocabulary ranging across 10 to 12 topics, from cordon and search to aircrew and medical terminology.

At the request of the Army, the Dari faculty also translated the U.S. Army Ranger Handbook and U.S. Army Field Manual 7-8 to be used for the training of the new Afghan National Army.

In 2003, the OEF Task Force spearheaded the first more extensive familiarization training to Marine units deploying to Afghanistan and then to Iraq. With added funding, this program would later turn into a very robust training program conducted by instructor Mobile Training Teams (MTT) and made available upon demand to requesting units of any predeploying branch of the military service. In March 2003, DLIFLC leadership broadening the mission and renamed the organization the Global War on Terrorism Task Force.

Today, the Task Force has been renamed the Multi-Language School and teaches Dari, Hindi, Indonesian, Kurdish, Sorani, Pashto, Punjabi, Turkish, Urdu, and Uzbek.
Proficiency Enhancement Program
By Dr. Stephen Payne, DLIFLC Historian

Prior to 9/11, the National Security Agency (NSA) had begun a review of the required standards for cryptologic language analysts. On April 3, 2002, that review culminated in a memorandum from Lt. Gen. Michael V. Hayden, the NSA director, specifying that linguists assigned to NSA had to possess listening and reading skills at a level 3, according to the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale. This score was to be the minimum qualification for all professional cryptolinguists on the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT).

Hayden’s memo did not require the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) to produce graduates at the L3/R3 level as it was an NSA standard and it was issued without any funding support. However, other DoD agencies, including the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), harbored similar concerns regarding the need for higher proficiency levels. The Hayden memo thus became a key factor in pushing the entire defense language community toward higher proficiency standards, at least in principle, since the military services did not establish a higher proficiency requirement than the long standing L2/R2.

In Monterey, DLIFLC leaders saw the memorandum as a challenge to improve the proficiency of their graduates, which future funding could make entirely possible. This tasking fell upon Chancellor Dr. Ray Clifford and other senior DLIFLC staff who immediately began developing a plan to increase the proficiency of military linguists.

NSA had asked DLIFLC to develop a proposal that included ways to enhance both the proficiency of graduating students as well as those already serving in the force. DLIFLC collected feedback from the services and developed a specific plan to improve student proficiency called the Proficiency Enhancement Program, a name adopted from a similar set of measures developed and employed between 1985 and 2000.

By July 2003, DLIFLC proposed a number of actions that would improve proficiency while keeping the original length of the courses. This plan included raising Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) entrance requirements by 10 points, reducing student-teacher ratios by increasing faculty by 50 percent, upgrading curricula, enhancing faculty training, and deploying cutting edge classroom technologies.

With the support of Dr. David S. Chu, under secretary for personnel and readiness, and Gail McGinn, deputy under secretary of defense for plans, Presidential Budget Decision 753 was signed and $362 million was given to the Institute to implement the five-year PEP plan.
Growth of the DLIFLC Language Training Detachments

By Natela Cutter, Strategic Communications

The first Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) Language Training Detachments (LTDs) were established in 2003 to support professional linguists in need of sustainment and enhancement training. Today, DLIFLC has 26 LTDs, supporting different types of missions worldwide.

The success of DLIFLC’s LTD platform drove an increased interest in expanding the concept in order to provide support for the growing needs of DoD that called for the equipping of servicemembers with basic language and cultural awareness skills for missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

Though DLIFLC had already been providing familiarization level language training to thousands of Soldiers through its Mobile Training Team (MTT) program, the need for Soldiers with higher proficiency was clear.

On 10 Nov. 2009, the Commander International Security Forces Afghanistan (COMISAF), Gen. Stanley McChrystal, published Counter Insurgency (COIN) training guidance that stated “everyone should learn basic language skills. Every deployed person should be able to greet locals and say thank you.” He further directed that each platoon, or like-sized organization, will have at least one leader that speaks Dari at the 0+ level with a goal of level 1 in oral communication.

In response to this guidance, the Department of the Army Headquarters published a PLANORD for Afghanistan support that included guidance to U.S. Army Forces Command and Training and Doctrine Command to establish pilot LTDs at Forts Campbell, Carson, and Drum to provide training to combat brigades preparing to deploy.

Additionally, the Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff had recently established an Afghanistan/Pakistan Coordination Cell (PACC) to work the complex mission set in Afghanistan. COMISAF directed the PACC to establish a Afghanistan/Pakistan (AFPAK) Hands program whereas senior leaders, both officer and enlisted, would volunteer to work multiple assignments in the same region, providing much needed continuity to ensure stable relationships between the Americans and the local population. A key enabler in this effort was language training provided by the DLIFLC.

These initial efforts were funded by the PACC using contingency dollars. Because of their enduring nature, on December 23, 2009, the Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, signed Resource Management Decision 700 to fund LTDs for AFPAK Hands and AFPAK General Purpose Force (GPF) LTD requirements.

Support to Afghanistan/Pakistan operations

DLIFLC played a leading role in the launching of AFPAK Hands and AFPAK GPF programs by providing contract vehicles through its Washington D.C. office that allowed for the rapid organization of the first four LTDs in 2010. DLIFLC’s existing Dari, Pashto, and Urdu curriculum was rapidly redesigned to fit the needs of the first iteration, or Phase I, of the 16-week training program. Faculty from DLIFLC traveled to Washington, D.C. to either teach or mentor instructors hired.

Instruction began barely six
weeks after the inception of the AFPAK Hands program. Nearly 400 students, who have entered the training pipeline since September 2009, have graduated from Phase I training with the objective to reach a proficiency Level of 0+ to 1 on the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale, as measured by the two-skill Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI).

Phase II of the AFPAK Hands program began in April 2010, and consists of online “self-study” instructional modules related to specific functional domains that reflect a range of possible activities and interests for those assigned to AFPAK Hands billets.

Phase III training continues once servicemembers return to home-station.

Aside from the AFPAK Hands LTD in Washington, D.C., which was officially stood up in September 2009, LTDs were established and activated in September 2010, at Tampa, Fla., and Norfolk, Va., to provide Phase I and Phase III training and additional courses for servicemembers. As of 2011, DLIFLC provides a one-month refresher course for AFPAK Hands at the beginning of their deployment in Afghanistan.

Support to the General Purpose Force

Beginning in February 2010, additional LTDs, in support of AFPAK GPF units deploying to the region, were established to provide basic instruction in Dari and Pashto.

The first classes at Forts Campbell and Carson graduated in June 2010 with nearly 350 Soldiers completing the training, some even reaching a 1+ speaking level, with the ability to exchange basic greetings, ask questions, and understand responses at road blocks, and obtain essential elements of information from a simple conversation.

“I will be a key leader engagement note-taker for the battalion commander,” said Pfc. Lauren Townsend of the 1st Special Troop Battalion, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, who graduated from the Fort Carson Dari GPF course. “My commander wants me to work with the interpreters so that they feel like they are a part of the team,” she said.

DLIFLC subsequently established several more AFPAK GPF training sites throughout 2010 and 2011, bringing the number to nine locations; Fort Drum, N.Y., Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, Fort Bragg, N.C., Fort Lewis, Wash., Fort Polk, La., Camp Pendleton, Calif., Camp Lejeune, N.C., and Vilseck, Germany. With courses also lasting 16 weeks in duration, DLIFLC again relied on its Washington, D.C. Office to provide contract instructors.

“The key to success of these Soldiers was really the way we set-up instruction,” said Mowafiq Al-Anazi, associate dean of Field Support for Continuing Education. “They are taught the alphabet, reading, and writing, with an emphasis on sentence structure word replacement, meaning that they could learn a simple sentence, then replace the subject or verb and create a new sentence.”

Since the inception of the programs, nearly 1,000 Soldiers have graduated from the GPF courses, with DLIFLC preparing to open several more LTDs in the coming year.

Rapport – language and culture predeployment training online

In May 2010, the Chief of Staff of the Army, George W. Casey, visited DLIFLC and approved the use of a new DLIFLC predeployment program called Rapport as mandatory training for all Army personnel traveling to Iraq or Afghanistan.

Following this move, DoD made the training mandatory for all DoD personnel. The online Rapport training lasts approximately 6 hours and includes cultural orientation as well as basic phrases and military terminology. The program is currently available on AKO and the DLIFLC website at www.dliflc.edu.

HeadStart2

Another DLIFLC program called HeadStart2 gained DoD-wide recognition when the self-paced 80- to 100 hour basic language course, with avatars and an emphasis on carrying out basic military survival skills, became the military’s choice of language training material.

HeadStart2 is currently available in 16 languages: Chinese (Mandarin), Dari, European Portuguese, French, German, Iraqi, Korean, Kurmanji, Pashto, Persian-Farsi, Russian, Spanish, Swahili, Urdu, Uzbek, and Brazilian Portuguese. These materials are available for download at AKO, MarineNet and www.dliflc.edu.

Spc. Kevin Chalkley, speaks with Afghan locals in the remote village of Yakatut while on patrol. Chalkley graduated from the DLIFLC Dari language course at Fort Carson, Colo.
Marine Corps Major Jose Jesus Anzaldua

Marine Corps Major Jose Anzaldua was a vital asset to the conflict in Vietnam. As a Defense Language Institute West Coast (DLIWC) trained Vietnamese linguist, Anzaldua was assigned to a Combined Action Platoon on Phu Loc 6 on a small hill outside of Liberty Bridge in the Quang Nam Province of Vietnam. Then a corporal, Anzaldua was tasked with using his language skills as an Intelligence (S2) Scout for the 2nd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment to provide security and protection for a refugee camp at the base of Phu Loc 6. On 20 January 1970, during a foot patrol, Anzaldua and a squad of scouts were captured by the Viet Cong. Anzaldua was held captive as a prisoner of war for three years. During his time as prisoner, Anzaldua was able to understand the Viet Cong’s plans and communicate them to his fellow POW’s. Anzaldua’s language training was instrumental in his survival and that of other prisoners of war held captive by the Viet Cong.

Dr. Ray Clifford

Dr. Ray Clifford came to DLIFLC in 1981, serving first as academic dean, provost and then chancellor. He is mostly remembered for introducing the proficiency-oriented instruction and for the subsequent 128 percent improvement in student results. Clifford began his academic career in 1965 as a German language teacher in an intensive language program for missionaries. He earned a doctorate degree in foreign language education and as chancellor, supervised the largest foreign language instructional program in the United States. His greatest accomplishments at DLIFLC include: seeing the Institute through regional accreditation and subsequent degree granting authority; implementing the standardization of the Department of Defense language proficiency testing program and grading practices; helping establish a merit-based faculty pay system; introducing team teaching methods as an Institute standard; and implementing the stair-stepped Defense Language Aptitude Battery qualification requirements. Clifford retired from the government in 2005 but continues his career at Brigham Young University in Utah.

Dr. Martha Herzog

Dr. Martha Herzog began working for the Department of the Army in 1974 and retired after 31 years of distinguished service in 2005. During her career at DLIFLC she served in numerous academic positions including that of testing specialist, chief of non-resident instruction, and dean of three language schools. As head of the Evaluation and Standardization Directorate, Herzog was a key player in the implementation of proficiency as the organizing principle for instruction. She developed the first-ever proficiency-oriented Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT-III) and inaugurated the assessment of speaking proficiency at DLIFLC both in the early 1980s. As dean of Romance Languages, she collaborated with the Research Division to help prevent academic failures by sensitizing faculty and students alike to the existence and importance of learning styles and learner differences. As dean of Curriculum and Faculty Development, she continued her efforts to professionalize the faculty and lengthened the Instructor’s Certification Course from two to four weeks. At Evaluation and Standardization, Herzog completed the revision of the oral proficiency testing program, leading to the deployment of the Oral Proficiency Interview 2000 with improved procedures for initial tester certification training as well as ongoing quality control.
Ms. Renée Meyer

Much of Renée Meyer’s legacy began at the Presidio of Monterey. On assignment from the National Security Agency/Central Security Service (NSA/CSS), she developed instructional programs that reflected real-life, task-based learning for cryptologic language personnel at the Institute and in the field. She later adapted this approach from classroom to computer for language and other disciplines as Cryptologic Training Manager and NSA Associate Director for Education and Training. Meyer devoted her life to improving foreign language readiness and posture. The first NSA Senior Language Authority, she articulated operational language standards for the entire cryptologic cadre, and then created the mechanisms throughout DoD and the Intelligence Community to support their implementation for the long term. She has had a profound impact on the ability of our country to meet its language challenges. Meyer currently lives in Maryland, where she directs a charitable company that brings beautiful ballet to people who otherwise might not have the opportunity to experience it.

Mr. Robert Tharp

Mr. Robert Tharp was by many accounts one of the most inspirational and best teachers of basic, intermediate, and advanced spoken Chinese at DLIFLC where he worked from approximately 1965 to the early 1980s. Tharp was born in China in 1913 of British missionary parents and grew up speaking Chinese. During WW II he was interned in Japan for a year. Following his release Tharp worked for British Intelligence in India fighting the Japanese until the end of WW II. After the war he went back to China and resumed his ministry and worked until 1949 when the communist forces were victorious over the nationalists and in short order began expelling missionaries from China. Upon successfully interviewing for a job with the Army Language School in the 1960s, and upon reporting for duty, Tharp surprised his colleagues who thought he was Chinese. Tharp died in 1994 but left a great legacy of several thousand students who are now found in all parts of the world.

Mr. Everette Jordan

Mr. Everette Jordan began his distinguished career as a DLIFLC language student in 1977 when he graduated from the Russian basic course and advanced Russian Le Fox program. Jordan was hired by the National Security Agency in 1983 and worked both as a Russian and Arabic linguist. In the late 90s, he took a posting as the Chairman of the Director of the Central Intelligence Foreign Language Committee where he oversaw the budget and funding of the SCOLA program. While with the DCIFLC, he led a group of Intelligence Community language technologists, translators, and instructors to work with the World Wide Web Consortium and other industry leaders to improve foreign language capabilities in databases, internet pages, and basic word processing programs. In 2002, Jordan was selected to be on the first House and Senate Intelligence Committee overseeing the issues that led to the attacks of 9/11. From 2003 to 2007, Jordan served as the founding director of the National Virtual Translation Center (NVTC) which was tasked with creating a cadre of language translators, transcribers, and interpreters nationwide, who would help with the backlog of untranslated material in the U.S. Government’s possession. The NVTC now has offices stretching from Monterey to Washington D.C. to Boston and to Doha, Qatar. During this time, Mr. Jordan served as a member of the DLI Academic Advisory Board from 2004-2005 and also as a board member of the DLI Alumni Association where he is still a member at large.