Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého

Development of Military Interpreting in the United States Army in the Afghanistan and Iraq Wars

(Bakalářská práce)

2016 **Jiří Stratil**

Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Development of Military Interpreting in the United States Army in the Afghanistan and Iraq Wars

(Bakalářská práce)

Autor: **Jiří Stratil**
Studijní obor: **Angličtina se zaměřením na komunitní tlumočení a překlad**
Vedoucí práce: **PhDr. Veronika Prágerová, Ph.D.**
Počet stran: **40**
Počet znaků: **73 393**
Olomouc 2016

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně a uvedl jsem úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne 24. 4. 2016 **Jiří Stratil**

Děkuji vedoucí mojí bakalářské práce, paní doktorce Veronice Prágerové, za neocenitelnou pomoc a rady při zpracování této bakalářské práce. Také bych chtěl poděkovat U.S. Army Europe Public Affairs za poskytnutí zdrojů, které byly v této práci použity.

V Olomouci dne 24. 4. 2016 **Jiří Stratil**

Abstract

The aim of this descriptive paper is to chart the development of military interpreting in the U.S. Army in the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan between 2001 and 2016.

Special attention will be paid to the two types of interpreters, or language specialists in general, the U.S. Army employs. These are Interpreters/Translators – soldiers with the 09L military specialty and contract interpreters – civilian interpreters hired by the military to complement the work of Interpreters/Translators. The way these groups are organized will be examined as well as well as their recruitment and training.

Regarding the interpreters/translators, the most important subject will be the 09L Military Occupational Specialty and the origin of the first "language" companies in the U.S. Army – 51st and 52nd Translator and Interpreter Companies.

The part dedicated to contract interpreters will primarily focus on the reasons for their use as well as on relative advantages and disadvantages thereof.

The result of the paper should be a clear overview of the developments in U.S. Army interpreting in the period examined, filling the gap that currently exists in the field.

Key Words:

Military Interpreting, U.S. Army, Interpreter/Translator, 09L MOS, Contract Interpreters, Afghanistan War, Iraq War, Ethics of Interpreting

Abstrakt

Cílem této popisné práce je zmapovat vývoj vojenského tlumočení v americké armádě v konfliktech v Afghánistánu a Iráku v letech 2001 až 2016.

Zvláštní pozornost je věnována dvěma typům tlumočníků, či obecně jazykových specialistů, které americká armáda v těchto konfliktech nasadila. Jde o takzvané Interpreters/Translators, tedy vojáky s vojenskou specializací 09L na jedné straně, a o tlumočníky-kontraktory, což jsou civilní tlumočníci najatí armádou, kteří doplňují práci Interpreters/Translators. V práci bude popsán způsob organizace vojenských tluočníků, jejich nábor a výcvik.

Co se týče Interpreters/Translators, hlavním tématem je již zmíněná specializace 09L, následně pak vznik dvou prvních "jazykových" jednotek v americké armádě – 51. a 52. rota tlumočníků a překladatelů (TICO).

V části věnované kontraktorům se zaměříme především na důvody jejich využívání a s tím spojené výhody a nevýhody.

Výsledkem práce by měl být jasný přehled vývoje amerického vojenského tlumočení v uvedeném období, což by mělo přispět k vyplnění mezer, které ve výzkumu tohoto tématu existují.

Klíčová slova:

Vojenské tlumočení, americká armáda, Interpreter/Translator, 09L MOS, tlumočníci-kontraktoři, válka v Afghánistánu, válka v Iráku, etika tlumočení

1 Introduction

This paper examines the work of military interpreters in the United States Army since 2001 during the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, special attention being paid to the development and key trends in the use of military interpreters between the years 2001 and 2016.

As the U.S. Army recruitment page states, military interpreter is an individual "primarily responsible for interpreting and preparing translations between (in the U.S. case) English and a foreign language" (U.S. Army 2016). Rosado defines military interpreter as "a commissioned officer who interprets and/or translates to facilitate military operations" (2014).

Rosado also postulates that historically, military interpreters have played an essential role in most historical events and may have been the first bilingual profession (Rosado 2014).

Brooks (2015) suggests that military interpreters have been used through the 20th century and they played a very important role, especially during the Second World War. In conflicts of the 20th century, interpreters were mostly used to interpret intercepted enemy communication, interrogate prisoners and negotiate with enemy leaders.

The role of military interpreters has begun to change together with the nature of conflicts in late 20th and early 21st century. Wars like the both world wars generally saw two opposing, clearly identifiable, uniformed sides. However, conflicts like the Vietnam War and the more recent conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan saw a conventional military force fighting insurgents who are often hard to distinguish from the civilian population. Brooks comments that in war, interpreters have become a "vital intelligence asset" (2015) as their services are needed to help communicate with the local civilian population. Hopper adds that they are also necessary to develop a close relationship with the civilians (2011).

Despite the importance of military interpreting in recent conflicts, this branch of language services seems to be on the edge of both public and scholarly interest.

Authors who have dealt with the topic of military interpreting mainly include Rebecca Tipton who, in her article "Relationships of Learning between Military Personnel and Interpreters in Situations of Violent Conflict" (2011) uses the field of military interpreting as a basis for research on learning in the context of interpreting studies.

Interpreting in military environment has also been featured in the work of Julie A. House. Her paper, "Conference Interpretation in the Military Environment of Francophone West Africa" (2014) presents an overview of her experience as an interpreter in military circles in Africa. She also proposes creation of new training methods for conference interpreters in the military environment based on the Theory of Sense. Her work however focuses on conference interpreting, not interpreting used in military operations.

Aside from these scholarly works, this paper is also partly drawing from a number of journalist articles, namely those which inform about use of contractors as interpreters by the U.S. Army. It is not surprising that a large part of the journalist articles mentions a more controversial side to military interpreting – the fates of interpreters recruited locally who are left in their home country after their service is over and their lifes are in danger. As interesting as this topic may be, it is not the primary focus of this paper.

As mentioned in the beginning of this introduction, this paper's primary aim is to provide an overview of the development in military interpreting in the context of the U.S. Army between 2001 and 2016.

The key points examined include:

- a rise in demand for speakers of Middle-Eastern and Central Asian languages with the oubreak of wars in Afghanistan and Iraq

- creation of a new Military Occupational Specialty in the U.S. Army: 09L (for interpreters and translators

- the increasing reliance on outsourcing interpreting serivces to private contractors, as well as issues and problems connected to this phenomenon.

Also examined will be the question of ethics in military interpreting and specifcs in the methods and types of interpreting used. Finally, new technologies that may be used in the field of military interpreting in future will be presented.

The result of this paper should be a clear picture of the development of U.S. Army interpreting in the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts up to 2016.

1.1 Definition of Key Terms

1.1.1 Interpreter/Translator/Linguist? Are the Differences (in Military Context) Menial and Fuzzy or Crucial?

As is stated in the Introduction section of this paper, its focus is the development of military interpreting in the United States Army between 2001 and 2016. As the U.S. Army official website (2016), as well as Hooper (2011) and Rosado (2014), among others, point out, the nature of work of U.S. military interpreters mean that they also perform translating tasks. This problem of them performing the roles of both interpreters and translators is further complicated by the fact that some sources use incorrect terminology and refer to interpreters as "translators." Therefore, before looking at the nature of military interpreters' work itself for the U.S. Army, it is important to try to find and set appropriate definitions of the key terms that this document works with.

The key terms used in this document are interpreters/translators (soldiers with language training and specialization in interpreting and translating) as well as contractors (civilians hired to perform language-related tasks for the military). Before we proceed to these two terms however, the use of more basic terms will be examined: translator versus interpreter versus linguist in order to establish basic terminology that will be used in this paper.

In the different sources used for the purpose of this work, all three terms appear frequently together and are sometimes treated as if they were interchangeable. The common error of interpreting being mistakenly called "translating" or believed to be some sort of sub-category of translating does indeed appear in sources written by authors who most likely aren't experts on the topic of language services. Unsurprisingly, this is the case of some of the journalist articles, such as

“Translators at War” by Richard Brooks, where the author uses the term translator correctly to describe the work of translators during the Second World War:

> Associated with breaking the highly complex German Enigma code, they also went on to break the Lorenz cipher used for messages between the leading members of the Nazi regime and army. The work of the translators and codebreakers at Bletchley Park was classified as “Ultra” secret, a new category above the traditional Top Secret. (Brooks 2015)

However, Brooks also uses the term referring to what is actually interpreting, not translating. For example:

> Today, the US Government is the world’s largest employer of translators through its various intelligence agencies. It hires skilled linguists able to not only translate, but to read the nuances in the voice of the vast array of tapped communications they have access to in the climate of fear in the post-9/11 world. (Brooks 2015)

Although it can be argued that here, the author may have referred first to translating and then, when he mentions “reading the nuances in the voice” to interpreting, the use of one term, translator, for both professions is, in any case, incorrect and misleading. To make matters more complicated, Brooks also once uses the term translators/interpreters – which adds to the confusion, as it may easily be mistaken for interpreter/translator, a term used by the U.S. Army for soldiers with language training (U.S. Army 2016), tasked with interpreting and translating (more information in the “interpreter/translator“ section further below). Therefore, Brooks’ article, due to the confusing terminology, has little value in helping to establish terminology for this paper.

Similarly, these terminological mistakes appear in several other journalist articles, for example:

> Also in harm's way is the smaller -- yet vital -- army of translators, such as Noorullah, who live and patrol side by side with American troops” (Wartenberg 2009).

Here, the problem is similar to Brooks. Again, the term translator is being used instead of interpreter. What's interesting, however, is that the article contains a quote by an U.S. Army officer, where another term, linguist (contract linguist) appears.

This term, linguist, at first sight seems to be more suitable than translator as it can also include the activity of interpreting (which the term translator excludes), however, the term also carries certain ambiguity, as there is also a position (or specialization, MOS) in the U.S. Army, called Linguist. This specialization is a different one than the interpreter/translator mentioned above. The definition of the position is as follows:

> As a linguist in the active Army or Army Reserve, you will be deployed to duty stations around the world, where you will translate highly classified documents and information for military troops and allied forces. Depending on your area of expertise, you'll be assigned to either a strategic or tactical position. Strategic linguists tend to work from an office, while tactical linguists work more from the field (U.S. Army 2016)

From this description, it is apparent that linguists perform translating tasks, not interpreting. Therefore, the term "linguist" will not be used in the context of soldiers with language training to avoid colliding with skilled linguist as it is the U.S. Army term for its own translators and translators are not the topic of this paper. Instead, the term interpreter/translator will be used to denote the soldiers specialized in providing language services.

One might argue that it would be a viable option to simply use the term interpreter instead of interpreter/translator, which, admittedly, seems rather clumsy, however, the problem with the term interpreter is that it is too general and will therefore be used to denote interpreters in the most general sense (in the context of the U.S. Army), both soldiers and contractors.

In the case of contractors, the demands for terminology are arguably less strict. Most sources containing information on them are articles written by journalists and the problem with labeling interpreters as translators appears again, such as in the

aforementioned articles by Brooks or Wartenberg and so these sources have a lesser value in providing the appropriate terminology and should not be considered reliable in this respect.

However, in the blog post Military Interpreting: For many interpreters the least known part of the profession (Rosado 2014), which is an article written by an expert on the field and which also includes information on contractors, the author uses no special term to label them. He uses "language services contractor" to denote the companies which provide the services, other than that, he labels the individuals simply as "interpreters." For the purpose of this work, the term contract interpreters will therefore be used to refer to civilian interpreters hired to provide linguistic services for the military.

1.1.2 Interpreters/Translators

Having defined the very basic terminology used in this paper, we shall now elaborate on the two sides of U.S. army interpreting in 2001-2016, that is the soldiers with language training and specialization in interpreting/translating (interpreters/translators) and the contract interpreters.

The first group examined will be interpreters/translators. Primarily, an overview of how language specialists are organized in the Army will be presented.

California Military Department website says that the 223rd Military Intelligence Battalion is responsible for providing "interpreters, translators, counter-intelligence, interrogation, and signals intelligence support" as well as operating "a center for language training and development" (2015).

The website Study.com (2016) supports our previous claim that language specialists in the U.S. Army are divided in two main groups: "Linguist" and "Interpreter/Translator." The website also adds that linguists are further divided into "regular" Linguists and Cryptologic linguists. The source states the primary mission of the first group primary task being translating documents and that linguists operate on both strategic and tactical level.

The source states the Cryptologic Linguists' mission being intercepting communication and relaying the information to army intelligence. Cryptologic

linguists are also tasked with "screening local-level media" and "providing translations."

Soldiers with interpreter/translator specialization are, together with contract interpreters, the main focus of this paper. Interpreter/translator is one of Military Occupational Specialties (MOS) in the U.S. Army, its code being 09L (MOS). The official U.S. Army web page (2016) defines this MOS as follows:

> The interpreter/translator is primarily responsible for interpreting and preparing translations between English and a foreign language. (U.S. Army 2016)

The page Study.com further adds:

> Their task is to function as the interlocutor between the members of local communities and military personnel, as well as to translate local-level media (newspapers, radio, pamphlets) into English for the Army's Public Affairs Office. (Study.com 2016)

U.S. Army official web page (2016) says that potential Interpreters/Translators are required to have proficiency in Persian, Pashto or at least one variety of Arabic as a target language. As for the training of Interpreters/Translators, they need to pass nine weeks of basic combat training, however, some are required to pass English language training first. Cook (2015) says that there are two units in the U.S. Army that specialize in interpreting and translation: the 51st and 52nd Translator and Interpreter Companies. These units, as well as the 09L Military Occupational Specialty, will be discussed in detail further on in the "Development" section of this paper.

1.1.3 Contract Interpreters

Aside from providing language training for soldiers and using them for language-related tasks in military operations, such the Interpreters/Translators or linguists, the U.S. Army has also come to rely on outsourcing interpreting and translating activities to private contractors. This section will provide a short summary of how contract interpreters are organized. It's largely based on the article "Lend Me Your Ears: US Military Turns to Contractor Linguists" (Defense Industry Daily 2013),

as this article, from the sources used, provides the most complete, as well as in-depth, information on the subject of contract interpreters.

The article refers to the U.S. Army page on interpreter/translators (2016), stating, that the contract interpreters perform similar tasks. Moreover, the tasks assigned to contract interpreters also depend on what class of contractors they are. There are three classes or categories contract interpreters are divided to:

> CAT 1: local national hires with security screening but no clearance;
>
> CAT 2: US citizen hires with Secret level clearance;
>
> CAT 3: US citizen hires with TS/SCI clearance. (Defense Industry Daily 2013)

The article further states that the contracts are overseen by the U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM). It further present the fact that only categories 2 and 3 (i.e. contractors with U.S. citizenship) "are permitted to work on sensitive intelligence functions." (Defense Industry Daily 2013). This may suggest that contract interpreters who fall into these two categories may possibly also complement the work of Skilled Linguists, not only interpreters/translators.

More information on contract interpreters, including their recruitment, deployment and issues associated with their use will be provided further on in the "Development" part.

2 Development

2.1 History

2.1.1 History of military interpreting before 2001 – Second World War

The phenomenon of military interpreting seems to be a rather unassuming one. The sources available on the subject are scarce, military interpreting as a whole has not yet been thoroughly examined by scholars. It is also an area of military that seems to be largely unknown, or ignored, by general public and journalists, save for the

controversy surrounding the use of native contract interpreters, which has, in recent years, aroused some attention of press

Yet despite this lack of attention the field of military interpreting has received, it is a service without which a modern military force could hardly function. This is especially true in the case of the U.S. Army, which is deployed in more than 150 countries, few of which are English-speaking countries (Defense Manpower Data Center 2015). Naturally, the need of interpreters is necessary, both for peacetime assignments such when communicating with allies, even more so in war, and its history doesn't begin with the War on Terror. The following section will briefly present the key point of the U.S. Army interpreting during the 20th century, before the period examined (2001-2016).

During the Second World War, the U.S. military recognized the vital importance of interpreting and translating for military intelligence purposes and, on September 19th 1942, founded ATIS – Allied Translator and Interpreter Section (or service[1]) – a joint American and Australian unit (Brooks 2015). The unit was originally intended "to translate seized Japanese materials and provide interpreters for interrogations of prisoners (ATIS 1999)." As the source further states however, "ATIS' mission also included analysis of Japanese military objectives and capabilities and political and psychological interpretations of Japanese military and civilian activities." The unit was disbanded on April 30th 1946 (ATIS 1999).

Although translators and interpreters were, of course, used in the European theatre of war as well, "the War in Europe required three times as many interrogators as translators. But in the SWPA[2] the ratio was reversed" (Dunn 2006). Two thousand Americans served in the unit, most of them *Nisei* (second-generation Japanese Americans).

[1] See Dunn (2006)
[2] South West Pacific Area

2.1.2 History before 2001 – Asymmetric Conflicts, Vietnam War

Although interpretation and translation are necessary in any conflict where the sides speak different languages, their role is even more important in asymmetric conflicts, where one side is hard to distinguish from the civilian population.

Asymmetric warfare is:

> Warfare in which opposing groups or nations have unequal military resources, and the weaker opponent uses unconventional weapons and tactics, as terrorism, to exploit the vulnerabilities of the enemy (Dictionary.com n.d.).

A notable conflict whose asymmetric nature would resemble the later conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan is the Vietnam War. In this conflict, the U.S. forces had often fought against an opponent, which was often hiding among civilians, much like in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Unfortunately, a lack of sources hampers the effort to describe the activities of interpreters in the Vietnam War, even in a brief manner. Interpreters must have been a necessity, as the U.S. forces fought alongside South Vietnamese troops.

As with the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars, a theme which has gained attention are the fates of native interpreters, who supported the American troops, however, it is not an aim of this paper.

2.2 Specifics, Ethical Considerations, Methodology, Importance of Interpreting in the Context of Military Operations,

The following chapter will explain the importance of interpreters and other language specialists in the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, including the assessment of the work of interpreters by U.S. Army personnel.

In the previous section, the importance of interpreting for military purposes was foreshadowed. This section will further elaborate on that by presenting assessments of military interpreters' work by military servicemen and others who have an experience with the use of interpreters in the context of military operations to illustrate the need for interpreters in modern armed conflicts. First, however, differences between military interpreting and other interpreting professions, as well as specifics, ethical principles and methodology thereof will be presented.

Note that this section deals with issues of military interpreting in general, i.e. it does not differentiate between interpreters/translators and contract interpreters. Also, despite being based on information on military interpreting in U.S. Army context, the general principles and facts are applicable to the profession of military interpreter in general, regardless of the armed force in question.

2.2.1 Specifics and Ethical Principles of Military Interpreting

In its core, the mission of military interpreters is the same as that of other interpreting professions, or other bilingual professions in general – to convey communication between parties in a setting where each of the parties is using a different language. However, "the way the services are rendered and the environment where they are provided are very different from other types of interpreting" (Rosado 2014).

Perhaps the most striking feature of military interpreting, one that sets it apart from other interpreting professions, is the relationship of the interpreter and the parties he is interpreting for. In other types of interpreting, the interpreter is an impartial element in the communication process, whereas in military interpreting environment, military interpreters are "partial and serve one side" and "are not neutral communicators" (Rosado 2014). This factor of partiality and non-neutrality reaches an extreme level in the case of military interpreting:

> It is important to understand that military interpreters are the only interpreters who work in an environment where one of the parties may be the enemy, and may want to kill him. Other interpreters, even court and diplomatic interpreters work in scenarios where there is an adversarial situation, but never with an enemy. Military interpreters are the only ones who hold a weapon while doing their rendition, and the only ones who, if necessary, have to be prepared to shoot one of the persons they are interpreting for. (Rosado 2014)

Another important factor regarding military interpreting is that military interpreters work as a part of a military hierarchy and within a chain of command, which may lead to situations where the interpreter's language-related duties have to give

priority to other tasks. Rosado provides examples of a military interpreter's subordination in the military hierarchy:

> A military interpreter's top priority and obligation is to his country and to his fellow soldiers, sailors, marines, or airmen. His rendition can and should suffer when he must take care of other priorities such as cover a fellow soldier, take cover himself, assist a wounded soldier, or comply with an order from a superior officer. Their loyalty is to their platoon or battalion. (…) Military interpreters are required to interpret everything that the enemy or counterpart says, but they should only interpret back what they are told to interpret. If a superior officer tells them not to interpret to the counterpart either a portion of a speech or a paragraph of a letter, they must remain silent. (Rosado 2014)

The relationship of the parties and the interpreter in a military context is also a subject of the paper by Monacelli and Punzo; in chapter 6, titled "The military interpreters role," the authors present another of the specifics of military interpreting, a situation where the interpreter's position towards the parties differs from the one in non-military interpreting:

> In the military environment, where hierarchy is a functional relationship, the military interpreter could be a 'superior' (in rank) of the 'client', whereas non-military interpreters are accustomed to being 'subordinated' to a client (Monacelli and Punzo 2001).

As a truly thorough analysis of the position of military interpreters in the military hierarchy is beyond the scope of this paper, those interested in the topic are encouraged to read Monacelli's and Punzo's paper as it goes into great detail about ethics of military interpreting in general (in the context of Italian army).

2.2.2 Methodology, Modes of Interpreting Used

This section seeks to present the types of interpreting used in military context. Surprisingly, sources available on the subject are very scarce and it is therefore necessary to refer to video recordings of military interpreting. From the sources examined, only Rosado's article elaborates on the methodology of military interpreting; this section will therefore be, for the most part, based on the article.

The reason for this is most like the fact that the methodology of interpreting used by military interpreters is sensitive.

Rosado (2014) presents that one notable feature of military interpreting is the importance of sight translation. Rosado lists two "subcategories" of sight translation: the "traditional" sight translation, "used primarily for strategic and intelligence purposes" and a so called "summary sight translation," used during missions where the interpreter is accompanying soldiers. Rosado explains:

> This type of sight translation is used during house searches, enemy searches and searches of local civilian population. The interpreter looks at the document, skins through it, and summarizes its contents for his superior officer. Then the superior officer decides, based on the information provided by the interpreter, if the document merits a more detailed sight translation or even a written translation. (Rosado 2014)

The reason behind use of this type of sight translation is therefore most likely time efficiency, as a thorough sight translation of a document could take too much time during the mission. Rosado emphasizes that summary sight translation is vital when interacting with cultures which use different alphabetic systems, where it may be nigh-impossible to recognize even the type and purpose of a written document.

Military interpreters use both simultaneous and consecutive translation, or rather a combination of both:

> When negotiating with the local elders or with enemy forces, interpreters often simultaneously interpret to their superior officer what the counterpart is saying. They do this by whispering into the superior officer's ear; next, they interpret the superior officer's words (questions and answers) to the counterpart using a consecutive rendition. Of course, this can vary depending on the number of officers the interpreter is interpreting for; if there are several, then the interpreter will do everything consecutively. (Rosado 2014)

However, this mode of interpreting (a combination of simultaneous and consecutive interpreting) is not always used, as can be seen in a short film by McHugh (2008),

where the interpreter is seen interpreting both the commander's questions and the village elder's response consecutively[3].

2.2.3 Importance of Military Interpreters

Many authors reflect on the important role which military interpreters play, especially in the context of asymmetrical, counterinsurgency operations in Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts. For example, Hopper claims, that in these conflicts "the U.S. military has rarely been able to fire a shot without bringing along bilingual soldiers (Hopper 2011)." In such conflicts, establishing a positive relationship with local population is critical in order to encourage support for American troops and American-supported central government of the given country.

Therefore, aside from overcoming the language barrier between foreign soldiers and local citizens, military interpreters also serve the role of "cultural liaisons" (Brooks 2015) or "intermediaries" (Hajjar 2014). Rosado points out that "this requires a certain knowledge of the culture and social structure of those whose trust the interpreter needs to gain" (Rosado 2014). In an interview by Allen and Olsen with Robert Ham, a veteran and filmmaker who has had an experience with military interpreters' work, Ham speaks about importance of interpreters' helping to develop friendly ties with the civilian population:

> There were many situations I was in where a trustworthy interpreter was critical. If you understand what we were trying to do strategically in Afghanistan, counterinsurgency, then you understand that winning the hearts and minds of the local people and connecting them to the national government is impossible to do if you can't communicate with them. At every phase of the war in Afghanistan we needed interpreters. We needed them to communicate with the Afghan soldiers, with the Afghan locals, we needed them to talk with the politicians and the local leaders. There was no end to our necessity of a skilled interpreter (Allen and Olsen, This Is Our Chance to Support Afghan and Iraqi Interpreters 2015).

[3] This can be seen in 1:39 to 2:00 and 3:22 to 6:15

Hopper (2011) and Rosado (2014) add that military interpreters also fulfill important tasks in the fields of logistics and diplomacy when acquiring goods from local suppliers or interpreting for dignitaries.

One field of military operations that is of vital importance to the United States in both Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts and that would be nigh-impossible without military interpreting is the field of military advising. A paper "What Lessons Did We Learn (or Re-Learn) About Military Advising After 9/11?" (Hajjar 2014), analyzes the work of U.S. military advisors in Iraq and Afghanistan. In his paper, Hajjar emphasizes the role of interpreters (albeit incorrectly referred to as "linguists"), in the "Major Advisory Lessons Learned or Re-Learned Since 9/11" section, for military advising.

As their name suggests, military advisors provide training to friendly forces, such as the Afghan National Army or the Iraqi Army. Being in contact with servicemen from a country where a very different language is used, most advisors have to rely on interpreters. Hajjar remarks:

> Thus, the overwhelming majority of U.S. advisors had to use linguists, many of whom lacked the vocabulary and cultural understanding of both sides to provide translations beyond a basic level. This presented a special problem because without effective communications advisory missions are doomed to failure. Therefore, successful advisors developed special skills to effectively lead, build rapport with, and make full use of their linguists' talents. (Hajjar 2014)

Hajjar (2014) stresses that military advisors should learn to work effectively with interpreters. He also suggests that military advisors should work to develop "solid relations" and "form bonds of trust" with their interpreters, while also pointing out that it is necessary for a military advisor to know their interpreter's background, i.e. if the interpreter is a soldier with the 09L specialty (interpreter/translator) or a contract interpreter, and also to know the interpreter's language proficiency category.

For interpreters, Hajjar suggests that they should instruct advisors about local "cultural details" and the "language of polite protocol," and that they (the interpreters) should not be allowed to "assume a dominant or lead role" while serving as "full advisory team members." Interpreters also sometimes have to coin new terms in languages which lack some technical terms used by the U.S. Army.

In this rather theoretical section, we have covered the factors which make military interpreting unique among other types of interpreting, namely the ethical considerations and methodology. We have also introduced the importance of military interpreting in today's military context, as foreshadowed in the History section. The next section, more practically focused will chart the key points in development of interpreting in the U.S. Army in the War on Terror.

2.3 Interpreters/Translators and Contract Interpreters in the War on Terror

The following section is meant to chart factors which have shaped U.S. military interpreting in the time period examined (2001-2016) in the Afghanistan and Iraq wars. As stated in the "Introduction" section of this paper, the topic of military interpreting will be viewed as two interwoven, yet distinctive sides of the phenomenon of military interpreting:

1.) Interpreters/Translators (or 09L), i.e. U.S. Army servicemen with the 09L Military Occupational Specialty, who have undergone training in translating and interpreting and are tasked with performing interpretation (as well as translation) to facilitate U.S. military operations.

2.) Contract interpreters, i.e. civilians hired to perform language-related tasks and complement the work of interpreters/translators

The primary focus of this paper shall be the first group (Interpreters/Translators), as they can be considered "interpreters (and translators) proper" – they receive an interpretation and translation training and are therefore professional interpreters. Also, the private enterprise nature of contract interpreting means that the available sources are less coherent and prevent getting a unifying picture of the field, as opposed to the better-arranged and more centralized system of Interpreters/Translators that U.S. Army uses, which hampers an effort to conduct

an objective research on the subject. Therefore, the section dedicated to contract interpreters will rather seek to compare their relative advantages and disadvantages with Interpreters/Translators.

In the context of this paper, development means key events, phenomena and trends related to U.S. Army interpreting in the time period examined. This paper does not provide an exhaustive and complete view on the subject, the reason being a relative scarcity of sources available to the public. Also, such a detailed overview would be well beyond the range of this paper.

2.3.1 Interpreters/Translators

First group examined will be soldiers with interpretation and translation training. In the context of the U.S. Army, that means soldiers with the 09L Military Occupational Specialty (Interpreter/Translator).

This section will first describe the state of U.S. Army interpreting before the establishment of the 09L MOS, presenting some of the reasons that have eventually led to establishing the 09L Military Occupational Specialty. Further on, greatest emphasis is put on tasks, function, training of, and requirements for, the 09L MOS. Finally, an assessment of O9L performance, as well as the MOS's drawbacks and proposed corrections will be summarized. Also covered will be the two U.S. Army Interpreter/Translator companies – 51st and 52nd TICO.

As an Associated Press (2003) article mentions, Interpreters may have played a role in the very beginning of the Afghanistan conflict and indeed, in the beginning of the War on Terror as a whole, when the shortage of capable Middle-Eastern language specialists may have been a factor in intelligence services' failure to discover and thwart the 9/11 attacks.

Rosado (2014) points out that immediately after the events of 9/11, the United States military as well as intelligence agencies began to recruit speakers of languages that were expected to be necessary in the War on Terror, primarily Arabic, Farsi and Pashto. The Associated Press reported, that, in spite of the effort, as of November 2003, the number of interpreters with the language combinations in demand was still insufficient. For example, as of November 2003, there were

approximately 1,300 active duty soldiers in the U.S. Army with some skills in Arabic (The Associated Press 2003).

Aside from the lack of interpreters (and language specialists in general), the U.S. Army also struggled with managing its language specialists effectively. An article "Lost in Translation: How the Army Wastes Linguists like Me" by Rosenthal (2011), a U.S. Army cryptologist, comments on the problem, giving several examples of the mismanagement, such as deploying language specialists to locations where their language combination cannot find use or tasking them with activities not related to their language duties. Note, however, that the author uses the term "linguist," making it unclear whether he refers solely to his specialty (cryptologic linguist), "regular" linguists or language specialists in general (see the "Definition of Terms" section of this paper).

The U.S. Army response to the lack of skilled Middle-Eastern languages specialists was an increase in the recruitment of native speakers of the languages in demand, something which the Associated Press called "an aggressive effort" (The Associated Press 2003). However, there was a need for a more comprehensive solution:

> In February of 2003, a shortfall in the U.S. military's ability to communicate in languages other than English caused senior military leaders to reevaluate the command language program. Most U.S. in the Middle East could not communicate with the populations they hoped to influence because few spoke any of the languages and dialects native to the region. Moreover, the language deficit hindered operations and the ability of U.S. military personnel to form deep and lasting relationships with friends and allies from countries such as Jordan, Qatar, and the Sultanate of Oman. Potential solutions for overcoming the military language barrier were to teach soldiers the languages needed or to hire native speakers and train them as soldiers. Neither solution would be quick or easy; both would have their merits and pitfalls. However, because language is intricately tied to culture—both best taught through immersion and experience—and nonnative speakers need many years of study to reach fluency in the languages and cultures they study, the Army's preferred

> solution was to enlist bilingual (or multilingual) native speakers of other languages to train as soldiers, translators, interpreters, and cultural emissaries. Therefore, in 2003, the Department of the Army directed the creation of the military occupational specialty (MOS) 09L, translator and interpreter. (Cook 2015)

Cook further adds that in 2003, "the Department of the Army directed the creation of the military occupational specialty (MOS) 09L, translator and interpreter" (2015, p. 66). Before the development of 09L will be explained in greater detail, a short introduction to the MOS system that the U.S. Army uses will be presented.

The MOS (Military Occupational Specialties) are the approximately 190 "enlisted jobs" (Powers 2014) available to U.S. Army soldiers. The 09L MOS (interpreter/translator), belongs to the "Intelligence and Combat Support" category (U.S. Army 2016). Some of the sources also list an MOS called "Translator/Interpreter" with a code name 97L[4] and also "Army Translator-Interpreter," code name 04B (AMLOT n.d.), however, the official U.S. Army webpage lists no such specialties neither for active duty nor for army reserve (U.S. Army 2016).

The most likely reason for this confusion is that the 97L specialty and the 04B specialty are older than the 09L specialty and are no longer in use but some of the sources list them only by accident or negligence. This claim is supported by the fact that the 04B specialty is listed among MOSs from the Vietnam War times (The American War Library 1988). As for the 97L specialty, it is discussed in a 2002 article "MOS 97L, Translator/Interpreter: The current situation. (Leadership Notes)." The article mentions a "critical need to understand the enemy's capabilities in this new age of asymmetrical warfare" as well as saying that "elimination of the 97L MOS would deprive the Army and Department of Defense of trained translators and interpreters." The article also makes reference to the aforementioned 04B specialty, stating that it was eventually transferred to an "Interrogator" specialty and that "over the years lost its translator and interpreter skill set" and warns that "a similar situation would occur with 97L" (Shaver 2002). In any case,

[4] For example AMLOT (n.d.)

it seems that soldiers with interpreting (and translation) training and capabilities in the U.S. Army are grouped under the 09L MOS and that the 97L MOS (and, naturally, the older 04B) are no longer in existence as they both appear predominantly in sources pre-dating the year of foundation of the 09L specialty and the U.S. Army no longer lists them among current Military Occupational Specialties.

The 09L MOS is therefore the only interpreter specialty in the U.S. Army (as of 2016). The U.S. Army Posture Statement (2009) says that the 09L became one of the U.S. Army's Military Occupational Specialties in February 2006. However, the source also says that before the actual establishment of the 09L MOS, the pilot of the 09L program was launched in February 2003 "by recruiting native speakers of Arabic, Dari, and Pashtu directly into the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR)[5]."

The Army Posture Statement also mentions that "two MTO&E companies are scheduled to activate in October FY08 and October FY09 (fiscal years) at the National Training Centers. These two companies will source 09L Interpreter / Translators to train deploying forces and support OCONUS missions with language and cultural capabilities." These two companies would become the 51st and 52nd Translator and Interpreter Companies (TICOs). Cook (2015, p. 66) states that these companies "were activated to train and deploy nearly three hundred active duty 09Ls in support of contingency operations and joint exercises around the world."

Mission of 09L MOS

There are several definitions of the 09L MOS available. For example, while the U.S. Army official site refers to 09L MOS's task being both interpreting and translating without emphasizing either translation or interpretation, and indeed, the MOS is called Interpreter/Translator, a different source stresses the primary task of the 09L MOS being interpreting:

> The mission of interpreter/translator is to interpret the spoken word from their native language to English and from English to their native language. The interpreter/translator also translates simple written documents. The

[5] Compare Cook (2015) p. 66 (quoted on p. 24 of this paper)

> interpreter/translator mission extends across the tactical battlefield. This MOS supports Army operations by providing foreign language capability and foreign area expertise to commands at all echelons, thereby enhancing cultural awareness of Army personnel. (Recruiters Never Lie 2016)

From this source, it is also apparent that Interpreters/Translators perform not only tasks of interpreting and translating, their role as cultural advisors (or cultural liaisons, as presented in the "Importance of Military Interpreters" section) seems to be equally important, as other sources often point out to this side of Interpreter/Translator's role. For example, the website Army Cool (2016) states that, aside from providing interpretation and translation, the 09L also "supports language familiarization and cultural awareness training." The role of Interpreters/Translators as cultural advisors is also stressed by the AMLOT web page, which, in its definition of the the 09L MOS, puts great emphasis on the advisory aspect and says that the 09L MOS "provides guidance to subordinate soldiers; supervises the maintenance and development of English and foreign language skills as well as MOS skills; provide advisory support in utilization of linguist assets" (…) provides "support by assisting in language and cultural awareness familiarization" (AMLOT n.d.). The specific tasks Interpreters/Translators are assigned are also dependent on their "skill level" (Army Portal 2011). The Army Portal web page lists these levels as well as introduces requirements and duties linked to each skill level:

> MOSC 09L1O. Perform low- and mid-level interpretation. Conducts sight translations of foreign language material into English. Briefs supported element on interpreter/translator utilization. Support by assisting in language and cultural awareness familiarization. Verifies low-level interpretation.
>
> MOSC 09L2O. Performs duties as shown in preceding skill level and provides guidance to subordinate Soldiers. Supervises the maintenance and development of English and foreign language skills, as well as MOS skills. Prepare written translations from a foreign language (ILR level 1+) to English. Provides and conducts language familiarization and cultural awareness training. Verifies mid-level interpretation.

MOSC 09L3O. Performs duties as shown in preceding skill levels and provides guidance to subordinate Soldiers. Require a minimum foreign language reading proficiency rating of R2, as measured by the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) or an alternate reading proficiency test validated by the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). Verifies documents and performs translations. Performs duties as high level escort as interpreter and translator. Soldier requires a SECRET security eligibility.

MOSC 09L4O. Performs duties as shown in preceding skill levels and provides guidance to subordinate Soldiers. Supervises the maintenance and development of English and foreign language skills, as well as MOS skills. Soldier requires a SECRET security eligibility.

MOSC 09L5O. Performs duties as shown in preceding skill levels and provides guidance to subordinate Soldiers. Provide advisory support in utilization of linguist assets. (Army Portal 2011)

Training and Requirements

The skill levels acquisition is closely tied to training. Like all soldiers in the U.S. Army, those will the 09L MOS are required to pass through Basic Combat Training (BCT) which lasts nine weeks (U.S. Army 2016). After completing their Basic Combat Training, a potential Interpreter/Translator has to complete the Advanced Individual Training (AIT), lasting six weeks (US Embassy Iraq 2006, p. 4;5), where they are trained in interpretation and translation.

The information paper by the United States Embassy in Iraq (2006, p. 4;5) also provides more information on the Advanced Individual Training. The AIT (as well as BCT) takes places in Fort Jackson, South Carolina. Subjects in which potential Interpreters/Translators are trained in include:

Low, and mid level interpretation

Translate a document to English

Translate a document to a foreign language

Prepare translated notes

Perform sight translation

Learn military terminology

Field training exercise (US Embassy Iraq 2006, p. 5)

However, it may happen that an applicant for the 09L MOS lacks necessary skills in English as Interpreters/Translators are preferably recruited from native speakers of the languages in demand (see the cited segment by Cook (2015). The document by the United States Embassy in Iraq (2006, p. 4) notes that if that is the case, the applicant needs to pass "English Language Training" at the DLIELC (Defense Language Institute English Language Center) before Basic Combat Training.

The U.S. Army lists the only requirements being proficiency in the languages in demand (variants of Arabic, Pushto, Farsi and Dari[6]). However, this list doesn't include a number of other requirements that an applicant has to fulfill to become an Interpreter/Translator. Army Portal (2011) website presents a more extensive list of requirements. These are for example "no record of conviction by court-martial" or counterintelligence screening, also, the website mentions that only U.S. citizens (or permanent residents) may become Interpreters/Translators in the U.S. Army. Lopez (2008) states that as of 2008, 75 percent of Interpreters/Translators were green card holders. This is, however, a departure from the practice of the early days of the program, as Cook (2015, p. 66) states that "Recruitment for the program began with program managers scouting out local civilians already providing translation services as contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan."

The 09L program has been rated positively by the U.S. Army and has been considered beneficial for her efforts:

> The 09L Interpreter / Translators have raised Army language and cultural skills. They have been significant force multipliers to commanders within the theater of operations. By being native speakers of foreign languages in uniform, they are able to hear what is being said around them. Additionally,

[6] (U.S. Army 2016)

> they can analyze their environment by reading the body language, nuances, and traditional customs within their area of responsibility and build bridges between cultures and break through language barriers. In short, 09L Interpreter / Translators have saved lives in theater. (Army Posture Statement 2009)

However, the 09L MOS program has also been plagued by some problems. The flaws in the 09L program are the main topic of the paper on the 09L MOS by Cook (2015), whose heading is "Army Translator and Interpreter Companies: A Wasted Resource." Although she acknowledges 09L's "many accomplishments" (2015, p. 66), the author lists several issues that degrade the program's performance.

Cook criticizes the location on the two units of soldiers with the 09L MOS (51st and 52nd TICO) being limited to just two bases – Fort Polk in Louisiana and Fort Irwin in California – as Interpreters/Translators, being largely limited to life in these locations, may lack sufficient social contact with American culture, which may hamper their performance in translating and interpreting. (2015, p. 66; 67). Cook also ads that these locations are unsuitable as they do not fulfil some of the needs of the families of Interpreters/Translators stationed there, namely religious as well as medical needs. (2015, p. 66). Cook suggests to "station translators and interpreters at locations with facilities and units capable of supporting their training and deployment needs. Fort Lewis, Washington, and Fort Bragg, North Carolina, would be good candidates for locations to which 09Ls and their families could be assigned" (2015, p. 68)

Cook also call for creating additional "skill identifier codes that would give Human Resources Command managers, recruiters, commanders, and operations and exercise planners more control over matching operational language needs with recruiting and staffing[7]" (2015, p. 68).

Cook also suggests "to create one centralized staff support element to manage and coordinate all aspects of training, funding, sourcing, recruiting, and deploying 09Ls" (2015, p. 68).

[7] Compare Rosenthal (2011)

Despite these setbacks, the 09L seems to have been a success, as the U.S. Army plans "to expand from the existing CENTCOM program to the PACOM and AFRICOM Areas of Responsibility[8]" (Army Posture Statement 2009).

In this section, we have covered the topic of Interpreters/Translators – soldiers interpretation and translation training in the U.S. Army. We have revealed that the most likely reason for the establishment of the 09L MOS was the need for a more systematic interpretation and translation program in the U.S. Army. Despite setback, the program appears to be functional as the plans for its expansion suggest. We have also covered the requirements and training an applicant for the 09L MOS has to fulfill. The next section will focus on the other group that provides interpretation and translation services for the U.S. Army – contract interpreters.

[8] Central Command, Pacific Command and Africa Command, respectively.

2.3.2 Contract Interpreters

In the previous section, we have foreshadowed that one of U.S. Army's responses to the lack of language specialists with Middle-Eastern and Central Asian languages was to outsource language-related services to private contractor that would complement the work of an insufficient number of U.S. Army's own specialists – the Interpreters/Translators:

> Of late, the U.S. Army has also been relying more and more on outsourcing its translation needs to private contractors. These contractors fly in translators from around the world, or they may recruit English speakers from the local population. It's a big business: In 2007, one of the largest translation contractors in Afghanistan was paid $700 million to provide about 4,500 translators. That's about $150,000 per translator. But while translation may seem lucrative, it's also extremely dangerous. Translators may be killed by explosives or gunfire while on an operation, or, if they're members of the local population, they may be targeted by insurgents. In Iraq, one translating contractor had more than 200 employees killed in only four years of the war. (Hopper 2011)

In this quoted segment, the author refers to two main sources of contract interpreters – speakers of the languages in demand from abroad (immigrants with Afghani/Iraqi background) and locals with a knowledge of English willing to help U.S. forces as interpreters. This was mentioned in the introduction of this paper, where the contract interpreters are divided into three categories, based on their background and security clearance.

A useful source of information regarding the use of both types of contract interpreters is an article called "Language of War." (Wartenberg 2009). The article is basically a profile of MEP (Mission Essential Personnel), one of the key contractors providing U.S. Army with language services specialists.

Wartenberg (2009) states that the company employs both "local nationals" as well as speakers of the required languages who live in the United States. In this context, the source mentions problems connected with the recruitment of interpreters from

civilians living in the United States. These interpreters are sometimes met with distrust from the local population and "are tested if they are still Afghani[9]." In the article, it is also mentioned that sometimes, contract interpreters have to be sent back to the United States as they prove to be unable to handle the terrain and climate of Afghanistan. However, as Defense Industry Daily (2013) shows, local nationals are not trusted with sensitive information (see introduction – the section on contract interpreters).

Contract interpreters hired among local nationals naturally have an advantage in being familiar with the environment they work in. However, their use is not without drawbacks. There seems to be an occasional lack of trust from the side of the U.S. Army towards local national contract interpreters, as can be deduced from the fact that, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, they are not given the clearance for sensitive information. This distrust is also illustrated in an article where the benefits of the 09L MOS compared to contract interpreters are mentioned:

> That 09Ls wear the Army uniform is a plus to commanders as well. Contracted translators and interpreters are not actually in the Army. But an 09L who wears the Army uniform is subject to the same operating schedules as other Soldiers and is also subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, something commanders appreciate, said Brig. Gen. Richard C. Longo, director of training in the Army's Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, G-3/5/7. (Lopez 2008)

This distrust may also be manifested in the fact that, as Wartenberg (2009) mentions, contract interpreters do not carry weapons despite operating in a combat zone.

One aspect of military interpreting that has attracted attention of the public and press and that is closely tied to contract interpreters is the problem contract interpreters hired among local nationals face at home due to their work as they live in a conflict-plagued, polarized environment, where a part of the population may

[9] Wartenberg's article focuses on MEP's presence in Afghanistan

consider them enemies and traitors, and also on their (often vain) effort to get to the United States.

One can find a very large number of articles and posts on this subject. It has, for example, been covered by the Vice News agency, when Anderson (2014) made a documentary movie, accompanied by a book on the same subject, about fates of several contract interpreters who were left by the U.S. authorities in Afghanistan. This phenomenon has also been reflected in literature, namely by a contact interpreter under the pseudonym "Johnny Walker" and De Felice (2014).

Hardships of contract interpreters and the subsequent coverage thereof by the press may lead to significant legal steps in the future. An effort has appeared to bring into existence a "United Nations Resolution to Protect Civilian Translators/Interpreters in Conflict Situations" (Allen 2015).

The website InterpretAmerica promotes a petition that would help to establish this resolution:

> Linguists working for the military are kidnapped, tortured and beheaded as traitors; prison camp translators are prosecuted as spies; court interpreters receive death threats; fixers are persecuted for doing their job; and literary translators are incarcerated for content. The simple practice of our profession makes thousands of us vulnerable to loss of life, limb and liberty.
>
> Currently, translators and interpreters are not specifically protected by international legislation. As a professional category, we fall through the cracks in the Geneva Conventions and, unlike journalists, we are not covered by a resolution. This must change. A UN Resolution would be a first step toward ensuring our protection under international law, and it would mandate member states to prosecute crimes perpetrated against us. (Allen 2015)

The field of military interpreting could therefore have a significant impact on the entire interpreting profession.

In this section, we have outlined the basics of the phenomenon of contract interpreters deployed by the U.S. Army. We have mostly highlighted the major issues that are connected to contract interpreters. Despite the problems the field of

contract interpreters faces, it is unlikely that the U.S. will refrain from hiring contract interpreters in the near future. The main cause would simply be numbers – as shown in the section on Interpreters/Translators, the U.S. Army has only two companies with nearly 300 men and women, which would be a hardly sufficient number for the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan.

3 Conclusion

Having covered all the aspects of military interpreting presented in the introduction of this paper, we shall now reflect on the findings made and summarize the results. It was stated in the introduction that we shall focus on two groups providing interpreting services to the U.S. Army. These groups are soldiers with interpretation and translation training on one side, and contracted civilians on the other.

First, we have examined the terminology used by sources quoted in this paper to establish a terminological basis. We have found out that the sources often use incorrect terms. They often treat the terms "interpreter" and "translator" as synonyms. This is further complicated by the fact some sources also use the term "linguist." When examining these terms, we have found out that the term "linguist" cannot be used in this paper to refer to interpreters, as it is a term used by the U.S. Army for one of her MOSs (Linguist), and that soldiers with this specialty are primarily concerned with translation, not interpretation. Soldiers with interpretation and translation training are those with the 09L MOS, which is called Interpreter/Translator. For the purpose of this paper, we have therefore decided to use the official term (Interpreter/Translator) to denote soldiers with interpretation and translation training. As for the external, non-army contractors we have decided to use the term "contract interpreters."

In the development section, which is the main part of this paper, we have first briefly outlined the history of U.S. Army interpreting before 2001, focusing on WWII and pointing out the similarities of the asymmetric nature of the Vietnam War and the War on Terror.

Another section of this paper is focused on military interpreting as a whole, not distinguishing between Interpreters/Translators and contract interpreters. The has section presented specifics that define the field of military interpreting and which set it apart from other types of interpreting. Here, we have mostly mentioned the ethical factors, including the non-neutrality of military interpreters, as well as their relation to the parties in the context of military hierarchy. We have also covered the modes and methods of interpreting used in the field. Finally, we have mentioned the importance of military interpreting in the conflicts examined and stressed the importance of interpreters for military advising specifically.

The next section is a core of this paper, providing an outline of how military interpreting in the U.S. Army developed between 2001 and 2016. Here we have largely focused on Interpreters/Translators and their MOS – the 09L. First, we have presented the state of military interpreting before the 09L was established and revealed some reasons that led to its establishment. We have then defined the 09L MOS, proving that it's the only Interpreter MOS in the U.S. Army (as of 2016). Next, we have presented the requirements for this MOS and the training process. We have then focused on the assessment of the 09L MOS program and on the program's setbacks and proposed correction thereof.

The last section has been dedicated to contract interpreters. Although the subject is not covered as well as the Interpreters/Translators subject, we have presented a basic outline thereof, focusing on key issues the use of contract interpreters faces and comparing it to the use of Interpreters/Translators. We have focused on the problems of trust (or distrust) towards local contract interpreters as well as on disadvantages connected to hiring contractors among civilians not native to the country where they will be deployed.

Although this paper doesn't have the ambition to be considered an encyclopedia of U.S. Army interpreting, it nevertheless provides a basic overview of the field and could serve as a basis for further research on the field.

Suggested topics for further research would be the topic of contract interpreters examined in greater detail. This paper has only scratched the surface of the phenomenon, mainly due to reliance on journalist articles and publicly available

sources. A future research could attempt to obtain information from the companies that provide interpreters to the U.S. Army, to compare the information and chart the development of the military contract interpreting market that has developed, to create profiles of major companies in the field, or to present an insight into what training contract interpreters are given.

An interesting research topic would also be a description of training methods used by the U.S. Army (i.e. the training of 09L MOS). Also, a topic which is covered only in its basics in this paper, the methodology of military interpreting, would deserve a more thorough research, however, such an effort may be hampered by the sensitive nature of this type of information. Regardless, the author hopes that this paper may serve as a basis for research on this fascinating, yet often overlooked field.

4 Bibliography

Allen, Katharine. "It's Time Translators and Interpreters Be Protected by International Legislation." *InterpretAmerica.* October 23, 2015. http://www.interpretamerica.com/interpret-america-blog/topic/military-interpreting (accessed December 9, 2015).

Allen, Katharine, and Barry S. Olsen. "This Is Our Chance to Support Afghan and Iraqi Interpreters." *InterpretAmerica Blog.* August 11, 2015. http://www.interpretamerica.com/interpret-america-blog/this-is-our-chance-to-support-afghan-and-iraqi-interpreters (accessed March 30th, 2016).

AMLOT. *U.S. Army MOS List.* n.d. https://www.amlot.org/u-s-army-mos-list/# (accessed April 12, 2016).

Anderson, Ben. *The Interpreters.* New York: VICE News, 2014.

Army Cool. *MOS 09L Interpreter/Translator.* March 29, 2016. https://www.cool.army.mil/enlisted/09l.htm (accessed April 19, 2016).

Army Portal. *Army Portal - MOS 09L—Interpreter / Translator.* March 15, 2011. http://www.army-portal.com/jobs/interpreter-translator.html (accessed April 19, 2016).

Army Posture Statement. "Interpreter/Translator Program." *The Official Homepage of the United States Army.* May 7, 2009.

http://www.army.mil/aps/09/information_papers/interpreter_translator_program.html (accessed December 5, 2015).

ATIS. "Wartime Translations of Seized Japanese Documents: Allied Translator and Interpreter Section Reports, 1942-1946." *King's College London Webiste.* July 1999. http://www.kingscollections.org/catalogues/lhcma/collection/w/xw25-001 (accessed March 14, 2016).

Brooks, Richard. "Translators at War." *K-International.* August 4, 2015. http://www.k-international.com/blog/translators-at-war/ (accessed December 26, 2015).

Cook, Jessica L. "Army Translator and Interpreter Companies." *United States Army Combined Arms Center.* September - October 2015. http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview_20151031_art012.pdf (accessed December 31, 2015).

Defense Industry Daily . "Lend Me Your Ears: US Military Turns to Contractor Linguists." *Defense Industry Daily.* August 22, 2013. http://www.defenseindustrydaily.com/lend-me-your-ears-us-military-turns-to-contractor-linguists-05934/ (accessed March 8, 2016).

Defense Manpower Data Center. "Total Military Personnel and End Strength by Service, Regional Area, and Country." *DMDC.* September 15, 2015. https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/appj/dwp/index.jsp (accessed March 13, 2016).

Dictionary.com. *Asymmetric warfare. Dictionary.com.* n.d. http://www.dictionary.com/cite.html?qh=asymmetric-warfare&ia=luna (accessed March 14, 2016).

Dunn, Peter. "Allied Translator and Interpreter Section (ATIS)." *Peter Dunn's Australia @ War.* January 14, 2006. http://www.ozatwar.com/sigint/atis.htm (accessed March 14, 2016).

Hajjar, Rami. "What Lessons Did We Learn (or Re-Learn) About Military Advising After 9/11?" *United States Army Combined Arms Center.* November-December 2014. http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview_20141231_art013.pdf (accessed April 3, 2016).

Hopper, Tristin. "How to Become an Army Interpreter or Translator." *HowStuffWorks.* March 30, 2011. http://science.howstuffworks.com/military/army-careers/how-to-become-army-interpreter-translator (accessed May 20, 2015).

House, Julie A. *Conference Interpretation in the Military Environment of Francophone West Africa.* October 2, 2014. http://www.ieee.es/Galerias/fichero/docs_marco/2014/DIEEEM13-

2014_Military_Environment_of_Francophone_West_Africa_Julie-House.pdf (accessed December 10, 2015).

Lopez, Todd. "Language company first in Army." *The Official Homepage of the United States Army.* October 22, 2008. http://www.army.mil/article/13503/language-company-first-in-army/ (accessed January 13, 2016).

Afghanistan: Lost in translation. Directed by John D McHugh. Performed by John D McHugh. 2008.

Monacelli, Claudia, and Roberto Punzo. "Ethics in the Fuzzy Domain of Interpreting: A 'Military' Perspective." *The Translator: Volume 7, Number 2, 2001. Special Issue. The Return to Ethics: 265-282*, 2001: 13.

Powers, Rod. "Army Enlisted Job (MOS) Descriptions." *About.com.* December 16, 2014. http://usmilitary.about.com/od/enlistedjobs/tp/armyenlistedjobs.htm (accessed April 4, 2016).

Recruiters Never Lie. *Army Military Occupational Specialties.* 2016. http://www.recruitersneverlie.com/army-military-occupational-specialties/ (accessed April 16, 2016).

Rosado, Tony. "Military Interpreting: For many interpreters the least known part of the profession." *The Profesional Interpreter.* November 10, 2014. https://rpstranslations.wordpress.com/?s=military (accessed May 5, 2015).

Rosenthal, Max. "Lost in Translation: How the Army Wastes Linguists Like Me." *Wired.com.* August 25, 2011. http://www.wired.com/2011/08/lost-in-translation-how-the-army-wastes-linguists-like-me/ (accessed December 5, 2015).

Shaver, Peter A. "MOS 97L, Translator/Interpreter: The current situation. (Leadership Notes)." *The Free Library.* April 1, 2002. http://www.thefreelibrary.com/MOS+97L,+Translator%2FInterpreter%3A+The+current+situation.+%28Leadership...-a084903385 (accessed April 13, 2016).

Study.com. *Army Linguist: Career Information and Education Requirements.* 2016. http://study.com/articles/Army_Linguist_Career_Information_and_Education_Requirements.html (accessed February 19, 2016).

The American War Library. "U.S. Army Military Occupational Specialties Vietnam War Era." 1988. http://www.americanwarlibrary.com/vietnam/vwamos.htm.

The Associated Press. "Lack of Arabic Translators Hurting U.S." *Campus Watch.* November 19, 2003. http://www.campus-watch.org/article/id/882 (accessed December 5, 2015).

The California Military Department. *PROGRAM - 223rd Military Intelligence Battalion.* 2015. http://www.calguard.ca.gov/223MI?LeftNav=No (accessed February 19, 2016).

Tipton, Rebecca. "Relationships of Learning between Military Personnel and Interpreters in Situations of Violent Conflict." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer,* 2011: 15-40.

U.S. Army. *goarmy.com.* 2016. http://www.goarmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/intelligence-and-combat-support/interpreter-translator.html (accessed January 11, 2016).

—. *goarmy.com.* 2016. http://www.goarmy.com/linguist/about/linguist.html (accessed February 16, 2016).

US Embassy Iraq. *MOS 09L (Interpreter / Translator) Information Paper.* November 2006. http://iraq.usembassy.gov/root/pdfs/mos-09l-translator-program.pdf (accessed April 20, 2016).

Walker, Johnny, and Jim De Felice. *Code Name: Johnny Walker: The Extraordinary Story of the Iraqi Who Risked Everything to Fight with the U.S. Navy SEALs.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2014.

Wartenberg, Steve. "The Language of War." *The Columbus Dispatch.* November 8, 2009. http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/business/stories/2009/11/08/Mission_Essential.ART_ART_11-08-09_D1_FCFIUBU (accessed May 5, 2015).