Robert Blake, Director
University of California
Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching
http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu

I wish to situation my comments about the Title VI programs within the context of my present responsibilities to the University of California system as director of the UC Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching since its inception in 2000. Our consortium is charged with promoting: (1) the articulation of language teaching throughout the UC system, with particular attention paid to sharing recourses dealing with the instruction of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs), (2) research on second language acquisition, (3) professional development, and (4) outreach. We do not make policy, but influence it working from within the ranks of the language teaching profession through the Office of the President and the humanities deans on each campus.

The challenges facing the promotion of foreign language study are fundamentally different in the U.S. than for the rest of the world. Outside the United States, the question "what second language should I study?" is readily answered with "English." In the U.S., where only 8.6% of undergraduates study foreign languages, the question, "Which foreign language should I study?" becomes more problematic. The answer depends on many factors. The large consumer market, obvious diplomatic realities of our neighbors to the south, and Hispanic presence in the U.S (12.5% of all US citizens) would all suggest Spanish and, maybe, Portuguese. The rapidly rising fortunes of China and the eastern trade connection—especially from a Californian perspective—might suggest Chinese. Our UC students already sense this and are voting with their feet: UC Chinese enrollments are bursting at the seams, for both heritage and non-heritage students. (Heritage students have learned a language other than English at home, but might lack the more formal registers as well as literacy skills.) Strategic concerns, a code word for national security, might point to Arabic, Farsi, or Korean—at least, for the present moment. Hindi should not be left out of the picture considering it is the language of the world's largest democracy. Let us not forget Punjabi, which is the language common to one of the most potentially explosive regions of the world between Northern India and Pakistan. And I have not even begun to consider the linguistic complexities presented by Africa: Amharic, Hausa, Shona, Swahili, Twi, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, Zulu, to name only a few of the most prominent ones.

Faced with this bewildering panorama, most Americans run off in a panic, hide their heads in the sand, and intone the politically popular mantra "let them all speak English." But recent events show quite clearly that using only translated sources to construct the reality of what other people are thinking can often result in flawed conclusions. It is entirely appropriate, then, that the Congress and the President are turning their attention to increasing the national linguistic capabilities, for which I laud their efforts.

However, the present political stage is hampered by conflicting national priorities: on the one hand, an urgent and justified call for language readiness coming from the governmental and military spheres; and, on the other hand, a more local, state-based

concern for passing "English-only" statutes and a call for building fences to keep the others out. It might be prudent to remember that Robert Frost's famous refrain "good fences make good neighbors," which is often cited as justification for this activity, is really a poem arguing against building walls and fences:

> Something there is that doesn't love a wall . . .
> Before I built a wall I'd ask to know
> What I was walling in or walling out,
> And to whom I was like to give offence."

We should view our lack of language expertise in this country as another type of fence we are building--with the concomitant negative effects Robert Frost has warned us about.

When government agencies call for a step-up in world language preparedness, they are really talking about advanced proficiency—level 3+ or higher—in order to have direct (not translated) intelligence expertise. We, as a nation, sorely need this. This is why the University of California's new NFLRC for heritage languages located at UCLA, along with other initiatives such as the Flagship Language Program and Flagship pipeline K-16, are so timely and important to the nation.

In the push toward advanced proficiency, much emphasis is being placed on heritage students, who clearly are on a fast track to reach advanced proficiency. Ironically, most of the heritage speakers in this country will be unable to obtain security clearances, which diminishes the value of exclusively pursuing this strategy. Others need significantly more language training in order to obtain the requisite academic varieties that educated native speakers possess. The idea that the increase in immigrant populations has eliminated the need for the Title VI centers does not take into account these factors and is fundamental uninformed. In order words, immigrants populations in the U.S. do not provide immediate off-the-shelf language expertise.

What about non-heritage students? What about the nation's long run linguistic preparedness? Linguistic priorities shift with the political winds: for instances, lack of interest in Punjabi today, may change to emergency status tomorrow. How does we build now to be in a position to confront the new linguistic challenges of tomorrow? A long-term strategy to developing linguistic preparedness will have to drawn on the university's resources.

But in this quest to bring both heritage and non-heritage students to advanced proficiency, many feel the university and their Title VI centers have failed to deliver what the nation so badly needs: instant linguistic expertise in Pashto, Arabic, Farsi, and Korean. However, the university exists for many reasons and serves many different needs. Given the amount of time it takes to bring someone up to advance proficiency—**five years, at the minimum**!—we do a pretty good job, especially since we rarely have students for that much time either as undergraduates or graduates. The Defense Language Institute (DLI) can do it in a more concentrated fashion because they have a captive audience, **although the total amount of time to reach advanced proficiency**

remains the same, with a substantially higher price tag in order to maintain 6:1 student/teacher ratios. What the DLI is not equipped to offer their students is the full array of historical, anthropological, economic, and political science studies that are part and parcel of what the Title VI area study center deliver, essential knowledge that completes the cultural picture of learning a language, even if some of that information conflicts at times with current public policies. Do not forget that the role of the university has always been and will continue to be one of questioning everyone and everything all the time.

Some have suggested that we should concentrate all our efforts on K-12 and cut out Title VI altogether. Second language acquisition research informs us that learning languages early is highly recommended; and we just might have the will to carry it off in the case of Chinese (although it remains to be seen how effective the Pipeline grants will be in the long-run). But can we do the same on a national scale for Arabic, Farsi, Korean, Punjabi, Hindi, and all the other possible strategic languages? I seriously doubt it, no matter how many Pipeline grants you give out. That leaves us with a two-pronged approach: (1) bring heritage learners along as quickly as possible (hence, the rationale for a new UC NFLRC dedicated to heritage language issues); and (2) increase support for the Title VI centers, which stand out as the only bulwark against the complete loss of language expertise in this country with respect to certain LCTLs. These centers produce new leadership that will flow not only into government but also into international agencies and business, as was the case with Russian over 50 years ago when the program was first funded. When Russian was funded through Title VI (the National Defense Education Act, 1958), it produced a highly trained cadre of international leaders. Some went into government, some into the CIA, some into the military, some into business, others into international foundations. Today's push for language readiness or what some have called *Sputnik II* needs to be more diversified than Sputnik I because we live in a much more complicated world. The Title VI centers need renewed and vigorous funding because they are presently stretched way too thin as it is.

Not to do so will remove the last bastion for language expertise and leave us with nothing. How do I know? As director of the consortium, I am struggling right now with my two largest African studies programs at UCLA and Berkeley that did not received NRC funding. Although the history and political science side of the curriculum will survive, the repercussions for the African language programs are proving disastrous. Programs with problems made weaker by pulling the rug out from under them. This is not to say that the UC system does not bear great responsibility for rectifying this situation and investing more institutional resources in African languages, but the plain fact is there are no other sources of funding for the LCTLs such as the African languages.

Second-language adults learners, while not as good as children at acquiring native-like pronunciation as a rule of thumb (there are many of us who are exceptions), are still powerful language learners, especially if you give them five years or more of language instruction. The Title VI centers have an important role to play in our national language policy, which faces a much more daunting task in today's world than during the Sputnik I phase. These centers do a terrific job in preparing students in both language and cultural

background. Their graduates then exercise they own career choices, in many cases by going into government service or the security agents, but also international businesses and foundations. The time is right for not only for continuing to invest in the Title VI centers but also to increase its budget, which is relatively modest by military budget standards. As in the case of Russian and Sputnik I, this investment will pay off in real terms, as an investment in university education always does. It creates a democratic society capable of responding to changing world situations. Not to do so leaves an infamous legacy of fence builders.