


★ 国防语言课程系列教材

TEXTBOOKS FOR DEFENSE
LANGUAGES COURSES

总策划 张亚非
总主编 张锦涛

美军国防语言 建设概论

主 编 张锦涛 徐 敏

 南京大学出版社

★ 国防语言课程系列教材

总主编 张锦涛

美军国防语言 建设概论

主 编 张锦涛 徐 敏

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

美军国防语言建设概论:英文 / 张锦涛,徐敏主编.

—南京:南京大学出版社,2017.12

国防语言课程系列教材/张锦涛主编

ISBN 978-7-305-19064-3

I. ①美… II. ①张… ②徐… III. ①军队—国防—
语言—美国—军事院校—教材—英文 IV. ①E712.1

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2017)第 180293 号

出版发行 南京大学出版社

社 址 南京市汉口路 22 号

邮 编 210093

出版人 金鑫荣

丛 书 名 国防语言课程系列教材

丛书主编 张锦涛

书 名 美军国防语言建设概论

主 编 张锦涛 徐 敏

责任编辑 卢湘仪 刁晓静

编辑热线 025-83686531

照 排 南京理工大学资产经营有限公司

印 刷 宜兴市盛世文化印刷有限公司

开 本 787×1092 1/16 印张 24.75 字数 587 千字

版 次 2017 年 12 月第 1 版 2017 年 12 月第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-305-19064-3

定 价 50.00 元

网 址:<http://www.njupco.com>

官方微博:<http://weibo.com/njupco>

官方微信号:njupress

销售咨询热线:(025)83594756

* 版权所有,侵权必究

* 凡购买南大版图书,如有印装质量问题,请与所购
图书销售部门联系调换

《美军国防语言建设概论》
策划编写人员

总 策 划 张亚非

总 主 编 张锦涛

编 委 张亚非 张锦涛 王传经 杨继环 田文杰
王 波 刘学政 潘建虎 张宗涛 杨 敏
毕梅冬 王 轮 朱小平 贡卫东 谢 钧

本册主编 张锦涛 徐 敏

副 主 编 郝丽华 彭艳青 王华丹

编 者 (按姓氏笔画排序)

丁晓松 王欣然 王 波 乔 良 来梦露
郑 贞 张 翮 高涪涪 顾 静 黄 珊
崇斯伟

审 校 吴 苓

前 言

当前,国际战略格局和全球安全形势正发生深刻变化,中国的和平发展面临复杂、多元的安全威胁与挑战。随着社会信息化、政治多极化、文化多元化趋势的进一步深入,西方发达国家利用自身科技信息优势,在强化军事硬实力建设的同时,不断创新军事理论,突出部队国防语言实力等军事软实力建设,增强军事行动部队把握对象国语言和文化,谋求长期在国际军事博弈中的战略主导权和主动权,以全面防范、压制、削弱对手的竞争力。

针对中国的崛起,美国的军事战略做了重大调整,美国国防部积极开展面向亚太地区的国防语言能力建设,把中国语言和文化作为其部队国防语言教育训练重点,并调动国务院、教育部、国防部、中央情报局等四个联邦机构的资源,在全国加强以国家安全为指向的外语教育训练,以期促使掌握亚太关键语种的美公民人数大幅度增加,增强军队国防语言能力建设的群众基础。

在校院各级的关心、支持和指导下,理工大学国防语言研究中心,集中研究力量,聚焦美军国防语言体系、外军文化中心战、我军改革建设发展与国防语言能力关系等重点,加大理论研究力度,取得了一批具有较高应用价值的学术研究成果,研究成果应用于外语教学,推进了具有我校特色的国防语言教学与研究体系的建设发展,研究成果应用于上级咨询,有利于准确把握美军军事战略新动向及对我国安全的影响,有助于上级机关知己知彼,采取应对之策,对准确把握美军军事软实力建设现状及特点具有重要现实价值。

《美军国防语言建设概论》旨在使学生通过阅读分析美国有关国防语言建设的相关战略文献,培养学生的英语阅读理解能力,在巩固学生英语应用能力的同时,培养学生的战略思维、国际视野和使命担当。本概论按内容由11个单元组成,包括美国国防部国防语言建设白皮书、国防部国防语言战略计划、各军种国防语言建设战略、国防语言与国家安全教育办公室报告等。每个单元由战略文献原文和课后思考题组成。

本教程在编写过程中参阅了国内外大量有关文献,谨在此致以衷心的感谢。

本教程虽几易其稿力求完善,但由于我们的水平有限,不当之处在所难免,诚望各位同行和读者提出批评和建议。

编者

2017年10月

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction | 001 |
| Language, Region, and Culture (LRC): Terminology | 005 |
| Methodology and Approach | 010 |
| Challenges | 012 |
| The Services' Approach to LRC | 019 |
| Officer Professional Military Education | 046 |
| LRC Content in the Military Academies | 072 |
| LRC Content in Other Accessions Programs | 095 |
| Enlisted Professional Military Education (EPME) and Accessions | 108 |
| Geographic COCOMs and LRC | 122 |
| The Role of the Five Regional Centers with Respect to Accession Programs and PME | 131 |
| Findings and Recommendations | 151 |
| Questions | 158 |
| A Call to Action for National Foreign Language Capabilities | 161 |
| DoD Regional and Cultural Capabilities; The Way Ahead | 174 |
| Language and Culture; Changing Perspective | 185 |
| Defense Language Transformation Roadmap | 197 |
| Strategic Plan for LRC Capabilities | 216 |
| Implementation Plan for LRC Capabilities | 231 |
| Army Culture and Foreign Language Strategy | 245 |
| U. S. Navy LRC Strategy | 343 |
| Air Force Culture, Region & Language Flight Plan | 357 |
| US Marine Corps Foreign Language and Cultural Awareness Efforts | 376 |

Introduction

A. Purpose

This report represents the culmination of research and analysis efforts conducted by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) [USD (P&R)], Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Readiness, Defense Language and National Security Education Office (DLNSEO) in fulfillment of BE - 55 - 3063, "Evaluating PME and Accession Programs—Examination of the Effectiveness of Officer and Enlisted Professional Military Education (PME) and Officer and Enlisted accession programs to meet mission requirements in the areas of language, region and culture" (LRC). This research was conducted between March 2010 and January 2011, with the primary data collection taking place prior to December 2010.

The team assembled to address the study questions was an essential element of the design of this project. The principal investigators consisted of a mixture of academics and retired military personnel, drawing on a range of Service backgrounds. The members of the team with academic backgrounds came from social science and humanities fields, with not only extensive teaching experience, but also strong emphases on regional studies, cultural issues, linguistics, and pedagogy. The team members with Service backgrounds were all formerly engaged in some aspects of military education as teachers, trainers, and linguists. Moreover, every member of the team also has been involved in IDA tasks focused on force readiness, education and training, irregular/asymmetric warfare, and other related subjects. This team structure allowed for a pairing of retired military staff with academics with relevant backgrounds, ensuring that both Service culture and pedagogical issues were understood and addressed.

B. Background

In the November 2008 report, “Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: DoD’s Challenge in Today’s Educational Environment,” the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations (O&I) reported its findings concerning the efforts undertaken by the Department of Defense (DoD) to enhance the capabilities of U.S. military forces in the areas of foreign language, cultural awareness, and regional knowledge (henceforth “Language, Region, Culture,” or LRC). The HASC O&I focused its study on how this transformation of capabilities would affect General Purpose Forces (GPF) in terms of skills and attributes needed, existing and planned training and educational programs, DoD’s vision for this transformation, as well as cost and risk tradeoffs associated. This study reflects both the long history of congressional interest in force preparedness, as well as the demonstrated concern with “[t]he critical role that foreign language skills, regional expertise, and cultural awareness capabilities play at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels.”

As an “Issue for Further Study” in this report, the HASC O&I asked the following question: “Is there a need for a robust review of language, regional, and cultural courses and requirements in officer and enlisted Professional Military Education (PME), from accessions to the War Colleges, and including the four [sic] regional centers’ contributions?” The DLNSEO requested that IDA conducted such a review, with an emphasis on evaluating the effectiveness of the PME and accession programs in meeting mission requirements.

In undertaking this task, IDA sought to provide independent and objective analyses of language, regional, and cultural content within Enlisted and Officer Professional Military Education and officer and enlisted accession programs across the Services and five DoD Regional Centers in order to assist the DLNSEO in its role as DoD’s central point of contact for LRC transformation issues. IDA also made every effort to emphasize the effectiveness of the PME and accession programs in preparing military personnel to meet mission requirements, focusing specifically on LRC courses and requirements in those programs.

IDA was contracted by the DLNSEO to do the following:

- a. Provide independent and objective analyses of language, regional, and cultural courses and course requirements in officer and enlisted Professional Military Education (PME) and officer and enlisted accession programs being carried out by the Army, Marines, Navy, and the Air Force. This assessment will augment and, as appropriate,



update/make more robust the June 2008 DLNSEO “Report on Defense Language Transformation Roadmap Task 1P: Ensure incorporation of regional area content in language training, professional military education and development, and pre-deployment training.”

b. Evaluate the extent to which the Service courses of instruction are supported by resources provided by the five DoD regional centers, and what processes are in place to facilitate or encourage Services’ and regional centers’ interaction.

c. As part of the PME/accession analysis, examine mission requirements and consideration for lessons learned as they pertain to language, regional and cultural focus areas.

d. Examine PME/Accession curriculum to determine the extent to which mission requirements and lessons learned are being considered in course development/planning. What are the learning objectives, how are they determined, and how does the language and cultural content/curriculum in the programs address the established requirements?

e. Develop a means by which to ascertain effectiveness of programs’ abilities to meet mission requirements. The sources used to ascertain effectiveness will include: interviews, surveys, test results, etc.

f. In conducting the assessments described in sections a-e, analyze how needs are projected forward and the extent to which future priorities and requirements will be met by PME.

C. Document Overview

This report consists of 12 chapters. The first four chapters include the introduction to the report, a discussion of terminology, an overview of the methodology employed, and finally the specific challenges we encountered as we sought to address the objectives the DLNSEO established for this study. The fifth chapter focuses on the Services’ respective approaches to LRC, detailing each Service’s philosophy and policies relating to the infusion of LRC into the PME provided to their Officers and Enlisted personnel.

The next four chapters examine educational programs spanning OPME, EPME, and accessions. Chapter 6 focuses on LRC in Officer PME, spanning JPME, as well as Service PME from the GO/FO to the Company grade level across the four Services. Chapter 7 examines “LRC Content in the Military Academies,” focusing on the three academies and what they have done with their curricula and their programs to provide LRC opportunities to cadets and midshipmen. Chapter 8, “LRC Content in Other Accessions Programs,” spans ROTC and OTS/OCS, focusing on the LRC opportunities available to individuals in

these categories. Chapter 9 delves into Enlisted accessions and Enlisted PME and the extent to which LRC has become part of Enlisted career development.

Chapter 10 focuses on the Geographic COCOMs and their approaches to LRC. Since the COCOMs represent the customers of the Services, their approach to LRC has implications for PME.

In chapter 11, we address “The Role of the Five Regional Centers with Respect to Accession Programs and PME.” Given that the Regional Centers are not PME providers, this chapter explores how the Regional Centers approach LRC and how they fit into the overall landscape.

As the final section of this report, chapter 12 includes the study findings and overall recommendations, spanning the full range of stakeholders.

Language, Region, and Culture (LRC): Terminology

U. S. engagement in full-spectrum operations requires Service personnel to draw on a wide range of capabilities. Central among these and essential for mission success are the ability to communicate with and understand individuals and groups spanning different cultural, socio-economic, ethnic, geographic, and religious backgrounds. Building and strengthening relationships with partner and host nations, as well as local leaders, civilians, non-governmental organization representatives, etc. is made more viable when personnel have a combination of linguistic skills, regional knowledge, and cultural awareness. Within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Defense Language and National Security Education Office (DLNSEO) has the lead in this area.

Early on in the research, IDA encountered a wide range of varying interpretations of objectives and means for pursuing enhanced LRC capabilities. Such variations are reflected in the heterogeneous terminology used across the PME institutions (PMEI.) The variations, not only in terms of definitions, but even the very terms of art and expressions in use, are almost overwhelming. It is widely known that each Service has its preferred terms and acronyms for LRC; indeed there is some variation even within some Services as to which terms they use.

The implementation of PME initiatives designed to pursue enhanced LRC also reflects differences in interpretation of the functional purpose for LRC capabilities. In particular, the alignment of LRC capabilities with missions and end-user communities is problematic due to the fact that the definitions of these key drivers are not well developed either in doctrine or official DoD policy. As such, in order to move forward with the study a common lexicon was developed with which to convey issues and findings.

A. General Purpose Forces

While the phrase “general purpose forces”, or GPF, is commonly in use, a precise definition is nowhere available. Originally employed synonymously with “conventional forces” —non-nuclear forces—today’s realities have led to its application to an even more

restricted subset of military units. For the purposes of this paper we define GPF as: Military combat and supporting units organized and equipped for employment worldwide to engage, primarily kinetically, U.S. adversaries in conditions ranging from desert to jungle, tropics to arctic, without regard for the human terrain encountered. GPF can also be used for nonkinetic missions but they are not designed for that purpose. Geographically oriented units, such as Special Forces and regionally-focused intelligence activities, would therefore be excluded from this definition of GPF, among others.

B. Mission Requirements

Formal mission requirements for LRC, similar to the definition of GPF, are also nowhere to be found. In lieu of such requirements the Services are generally responding to what may best be described as guidance from senior Service and/or DoD leaders.

C. Different Flavors of Language, Region, and Culture in DoD

The variant most frequently used to refer to the domains of culture, foreign language, and regional studies is “LREC”, the acronym for Language, Regional Expertise, and Culture. The Services have developed and adopted a number of other terms and acronyms relevant to this study. The most prominent examples are:

- LREC: While LREC is generally regarded as the Navy’s acronym for these associated domains, LREC is also the term generally used in many DoD offices and even by many Army civilians, for example, the Army Culture and Foreign Language Management Office (ACFLMO) staff.

- “Cross Cultural Competency (3C)”: The Air Force emphasizes developing 3C in all Airmen. In addition, targeted Airmen will develop and/or maintain language and regional skills on the basis of either existing proficiency or Air Force Specialty Code.

- “Operational Culture”: The Marine Corps’ Center for Advanced Operational Culture Learning (CAOCL) is implementing the “Region, Culture and Language Familiarization (RCLF) Program”. As with the Air Force, the Marine Corps also emphasizes culture, but the term they use is “Operational Culture”.

- LRC: At the January 2011 DoD “Language and Culture Summit: A Strategic Imperative”, “LRC” was the acronym used to refer to Language, Regional, and Cultural issues.



In order to avoid any one Service bias, in this report we use “LRC” to refer to the mix of domains spanning language, regional, and cultural issues.

Beyond LRC, there are some additional definitions central to this undertaking. The below definitions were drawn from the referenced DoD authorities.

- **Professional Military Education:** The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 1800.01D (“OPMEP”) defines PME as follows: “PME conveys the broad body of knowledge and develops the habits of mind essential to the military professional’s expertise in the art and science of war.”

- **Culture-general:** The forthcoming DoD Cross-Cultural Competence White Paper (DoD3CWP) defines Culture-general as referring “to the common aspects and domains of culture that provide individuals with knowledge (concepts, theories, processes, etc.) and skills that offer broadly applicable general principles and serve as a framework for culture-specific learning”.

- **Cross-Cultural Competence (3C):** The DoD3CWP describes Cross-Cultural Competence (3C) as “based on a set of knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes (KSAAAs) developed through education, training and experience that provide the ability to operate effectively in any culturally complex environment”.

The next set of terms is best portrayed in two overview tables. Table 2-1 depicts the Officer PME levels as described in the CJCSI 1800.01D, students, schools, emphases, and finally a statement about the extent to which LRC is infused at that level overall. Table 2-2 depicts Enlisted PME levels as described in the CJCSI 1805.01A, students, schools, emphases, and finally statements about the extent to which LRC is infused in EPME by Service overall.

Table 2-1 O - PME LRC Overview

| PME Level | Target audience | Schools | Emphasis | LRC infusion |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|
| Pre-Commissioning/ Accessions | Officer candidates | Service Academies, ROTC, OCS/OTS | Service; foundations of leadership, ethics, management | Overall infused throughout the curriculum at the Academies; in ROTC LRC is an element of their education at this level |
| Primary/ Company-grade | O - 1 through O - 3 | Branch/ Specialty Schools | Service; tactical | Huge variations across the Services |
| Intermediate | O - 4 | Service & Joint Intermediate-level Colleges (i. e. Command and Staff College) | Jointness; Operational and Tactical | Huge variations across the Services |



(续表)

| PME Level | Target audience | Schools | Emphasis | LRC infusion |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|
| Senior | O-5 or O-6 | Service & Joint Senior-level Colleges (i. e. War Colleges; NWC, ICAF, JFSC) | Strategic leadership; JIIM; Regional Studies | LRC are considered “warfighting enablers”; emphasis on Regional and Cultural |
| General/Flag Officer (GO/FO) | GO/FO | CAPSTONE, PINNACLE | Strategic, JIIM, Executive | Emphasis on Regional and Cultural |

Source: CJCSI 1800.01D Officer Professional Military Education Program (“OPMEP”), 15 July 2009; as well as information gathered through site visits

Table 2-2 E - PME LRC Overview

| EPME Level | Target audience | Schools | Emphasis | LRC infusion |
|--------------|-----------------|--|--|---|
| Introductory | E-1 through E-3 | Initial Entry and Branch/Specialty Schools | Service | Huge variations across the Services WRT EPME. <u>Army EPME</u> : emphasis on “self-development”, some Regional and Cultural content; <u>Army EPME</u> is being revamped overall; <u>Navy EPME</u> : at lower levels it's all via NKO, at more senior levels there is some “LREC” content; <u>Air Force NCOs</u> attend in residence EPME, which includes Regional and Cultural content <u>Marine Corps EPME</u> : is undergoing changes in accordance with RCLF |
| Primary | E-4 through E-6 | Service Branch/Specialty Schools | Service and Tactical; Small Unit | |
| Intermediate | E-6 / E-7 | Service Branch/Specialty Schools | Service and Tactical; Midsized-Unit; Leadership; Tactical, introduction to Operational | |
| Senior | E-8 / E-9 | Service Branch/Specialty Schools | Operational, Introduction to JIIM | |
| Executive | E-9 | Seminars, Conferences, Events; EJPME in SEJPME and at KEYSTONE | Leadership, Strategic JIIM | |

Source: CJCSI 1805.01A, Enlisted Professional Military Education Program (“EPMEP”), 1st October 2010; as well as information gathered through site visits

D. Metrics

Finally, throughout the following report, references are made to language proficiency



ratings and language categories. The language proficiency scale currently widely used throughout foreign language education communities in the U.S. is the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) proficiency scale. This scale, depicted in Table 2-3, contains both a numerical rating and a description of the proficiency levels.

Table 2-3 ILR Language Proficiency Scale

| Rating | Proficiency Level |
|--------|--|
| 5 | Functionally Native Proficiency |
| 4+ | Advanced Professional Proficiency Plus |
| 4 | Advanced Professional Proficiency |
| 3+ | General Professional Proficiency Plus |
| 3 | General Professional Proficiency |
| 2+ | Limited Working Proficiency Plus |
| 2 | Limited Working Proficiency |
| 1+ | Elementary Proficiency Plus |
| 1 | Elementary Proficiency |
| 0+ | Memorized Proficiency |
| 0 | No Proficiency |

Source: Language proficiency scale comparison chart

http://spinner.cofc.edu/globalscholars/files/comparison_chart.pdf; see also History of the ILR Scale, <http://www.govtilr.org/Skills/IRL%20Scale%20History.htm>

The Defense Language Institutes' set of language categories is depicted in Table 2-4. According to the DLI, the higher the category, the more hours of language instruction are required to achieve proficiency.

Table 2-4 DLI's Language Categories

| Category | Languages |
|----------|---|
| I | French, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish |
| II | German and Indonesian |
| III | Dari, Hebrew, Hindi, Persian, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Tagalog, Thai, Turkish, Urdu and Uzbek |
| IV | Modern Standard Arabic, Iraqi Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Pashto |

Source: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center General Catalog, 2009–2010, p. 19 http://www.dliflc.edu/file.ashx?path=archive/documents/DLIFLC_Catalog_2009-2010.pdf

Methodology and Approach

Following a thorough literature review and examination of on-line resources, IDA embarked on a series of site visits and interviews, primarily conducted in person, but augmented with video-and teleconferences, and e-mail exchanges. We began our line of inquiry at the Service training directorate/policy level, speaking also to five of the COCOM Senior Language Authority offices; we then visited the Service culture centers and school houses for curricula development, finally engaging with instructors at classroom level, observing classes when possible. The inputs we gathered were primarily qualitative, via interviews, classroom/exercise observation, and careful examination of classroom materials and tools.

The approach IDA took in order to assess the infusion of LRC in PME involved several layers of inquiry. We examined three aspects of PME: the inputs that influence the presence of LRC-related content in PME, LRC-content in PME in practice, and the factors that drive curriculum shifts relating to LRC-content (for example, self-assessments, metrics, and senior Leader support).

Because PME is not a uniform monolithic entity across the Services, we avoided to the greatest extent possible making comparisons across the Services. There is also no ideal example of the infusion of LRC in PME against which to compare the Service realities. In the absence of a baseline, we took as a starting point the inputs that influence PME content, design, and practice. First, we sought to determine the DoD/Service-level requirements/senior-level guidance regarding LRC-related content in the curricula of the organizations and institutions providing officer and enlisted PME and accessions. We sought to ascertain PMEIs' stated objectives with respect to language/culture content within PME and to determine to what extent these objectives can be mapped against DoD/Service requirements/guidance/objectives. Another layer in our examination involved determining whether there is a process in place to revisit objectives in light of changing requirements, guidance, and needs. One factor we also considered involved whether there is a mechanism for COCOMs/engaged commanders, as the ultimate consumers of the products, to provide inputs regarding PME.

Subsequently, we examined the existing LRC content within Enlisted and Officer PME and accession programs. We inquired as to the inputs that feed into course development/curriculum related to language/culture. We spoke with curriculum



developers about learning objectives and pedagogical techniques. We inquired about best practices in PMEI LRC content and the extent to which the PMEIs reach out both within and across the Services and relevant educational communities. We examined teaching materials, syllabi, and elements of curriculum design. To the greatest possible extent, we observed courses and interacted with relevant working groups.

In order to get a sense of the dynamism of the infusion of LRC in PME, we inquired about the institutional history of the relevant courses, programs, and departments. We also asked about PMEIs' practice of self-assessing, both in terms of frequency and methods employed, as well as inquiring about what is done with inputs of any self-assessments gathered. We asked about assessment techniques, metrics used, whether there were other forms of feedback collected, and how these inputs would influence the curriculum over time. We sought to determine whether individuals participating in these programs are able to meet mission requirements and whether the content available in PME and accession programs meets identified LRC-related needs.

Finally, we examined the role of the five Regional Centers with respect to PME, inquiring about the extent to which there is interaction between PMEIs and regional centers. We also sought to gain insights into LRC-related aspects of their outreach programs and efforts.