

It was surprisingly evident that no American group followed the interlingual approach. However, it was adopted at Cambridge Language Research in England as well as at Milan by Silvio Ceccato. Not very much different from the intense research in the US, research was vigorous in the Soviet Union where both empirical and theoretical approaches were followed. In mid 1960's different groups from different parts of the world were established including most European countries, Japan, Mexico, and China.

Explicitly, MT research showed high expectations in the 1950's. It was predicted that many inventions were imminent and the world would witness a fully automated systems. Unfortunately this was not the case. Bar-Hillel (1960) criticized the assumption that the goal is to create a fully automated system which can produce excellent quality translations. He stated that MT should adopt less ambitious goals. Large grants from government, military and private sources had been awarded. In the USA, \$12 to \$20M was spent on MT research. As a result, the famous committee ALPAC (Automatic Language Processing Advisory Committee) was formed by the government sponsors of MT in the US to figure out if its money had been well spent.

In its negative report in 1966, it stated that MT was slower, less accurate, and twice as expensive as human translation and there is no immediate or predictable prospect of useful MT. The report's effect was immense on MT with very damaging consequences; it brought research in the US to a grinding halt for more than a decade and MT was recognized as a complete failure. Somers (2003) states that the conclusions of the ALPAC report should not have been surprising. The translation process by computers was hampered by primitive technology and the under-estimation of the difficulty by the researchers who are mostly mathematicians and electrical engineers, rather than linguists.