LANGUAGE: A SKILLFUL WEAPON IN CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS

Ndamnsah Benice Ringnu, Ph.D
Department of French,
Faculty of Arts,
Taraba State University, Jalingo
zionistchildren@gmail.com
08163781170

And

Antonio Jang, Ph.D
Department of French,
Faculty of Arts,
Taraba State University, Jalingo
toniojee@gmail.com
+2348167584053

ABSTRACT

This study examined language as a skillful weapon in conflict resolution. It established the most effective ways words may be skillfully used to manage and resolve conflicts. It investigates the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of words and the reactions of leaders/mediators and the conflicting parties during conflict resolutions. Selected samples of conflicts for this study include; a physical family conflict, Israel-Palestine Conflict, the Cameroon-Nigerian border conflict and the Malian coup. The main objective therefore is to establish how the choice of words in language use and communication could help in resolving conflict. This study used the hypothesis that verbal strategies used by leaders and mediators defer rather than resolve conflicts, and time is a valuable factor in conflict resolution. Data for this work was collected from magazines, newspapers, internet, and documented proceedings of conflict resolutions. We used context analysis and competent and performance theories. Findings from this study indicate that litigant's coin and produce words according to their views in order to achieve their desired effects. Findings also show that, certain conflicts cannot be resolved but gradually die down with time and that, the choice of words used by leaders and organizations can either restore or mar peace during conflict resolutions. From the findings above, we recommend that, leaders should study rhetoric, avoid communication that can cause or intensify conflicts, healthy dialogue be used in conflict resolutions, ensure objective consideration of controversial issues, leaders should be upright and corruption free, people should learn to tolerate each other, if all these and more are well implemented, conflicts will greatly reduce in our communities and the world at large.

Keywords: Words, Skilful Weapon, Conflict Resolution

Introduction

Language, the foundation of human communication, is a potent tool that can shape perceptions, influence emotions, and even incite violence. In times of war and conflict, language plays a particularly crucial role, serving as a weapon of war, a tool for peacebuilding, and a means of narrative control. Since the beginning of time, the words or language used have always played a crucial role in all cases of war. People often underestimate the power of words. We often express ourselves through words. T**he words we use are powerful enough to influence, inspire, and innovate.** Most of the time, other people tend to misunderstand our intentions. We may also use offensive words to provoke a defensive response. When this occurs, conflict usually sets in, thus impeding progress in the society. Annan (1997:5) is then not wrong when he says, "There is no higher goal, no deeper commitment and no greater ambition than preventing and resolving armed conflicts." Both the sender and the receiver must reach a compromise to resolve this conflict, often through language. Although the positive role of language and communication in the management and resolution of conflict seems so obvious, it deserves serious attention. Human language is inseparable from human communication. This inseparability of language and communication does not make them synonymous. Both of them may exist independently. The import of this statement is that language is neutral until it becomes communication. "Language, though a product of the need for communication, facilitates communication." (Alexander, 2016). Communication is language in motion from the sender to the receiver. However, conflict emerges when the recipient fails to understand the sender's intended message. Implicitly, language alone does not generate conflict until it transforms into communication. This paper examines language, communication, and conflict management/resolution to ascertain interconnectivity and its effects on productivity. The paper aims to identify the most effective methods of using language and communication to manage and resolve conflicts as they arise. In essence, this paper emphasises conflict management and resolution through the effective use of language and communication.

Conflict has become an inevitable reality in our coexistence as humans. It is almost impossible for people to interact without disagreeing in any way. From existing literature, it appears that the relationship between language, communication, conflict, and its resolution is complex. This relationship is described as "double-edged" in the sense that language, as a viable means of communication, most of the time misinforms, especially when it is not effectively used. Hence, conflict arises. Without the effective application of language in the communication process, we cannot resolve this situation (conflict). Thus, language and communication's role in conflict management and resolution is to reduce conflict's destructive aspects and multiply the benefits of the "functional aspect in the transactional sharing of meaning between the parties involved in a given conflict" (Njoku, 2017). The import of the above statement is that improper handling of conflict can lead to loss of life and property and can contribute to low productivity. On the other hand, its effective and proper handling can lead to freedom, reduced tension, and minimal stress. Naturally, people must differ in their opinion and actions.

The world today is experiencing a serious amount of tension and anxious moments simply because so many people believe (perhaps ignorantly) that it is better to suppress conflict instead of managing and resolving it. Unfortunately, this belief has led to a lot of scheming from the leaders and political elites to either deny or ignore any opposing view. This kind of attitude

produces explosive bottled-up frustrations and anger, which further causes damage/destruction. The main goal of conflict management and resolution, therefore, is to create and maintain peace and order in society. The use of non-violent methods achieves this. So, using language and communication to manage and resolve conflict is a nonviolent way to settle disputes. Language itself is nothing without the substance of communication. In what follows, therefore, this paper shall look at the concepts of language, communication, conflict and conflict resolution/management and how these were effectively employed to avert war in Mali.

Language is conceived as a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, desires, and emotions through a system of voluntarily produced symbols. Sapir (1963) asserts that a people's heart lies in their language. Language is a system of signs and symbols through which a speech community communicates. It also serves as a tool for disseminating information within a specific group of individuals. Dada (2007) defines language as an arbitrary vocal system of communication among members of a speech community. It's a set of contextual codes that only those who share them can understand. Human experience "communicates through language" the functional knowledge of language symbols it has acquired in dealing with various situations (Adejimola, 2009). The implication of this assertion is that language does not operate independently of culture. Sapir's (1963) definition of language captures its communicative function and cultural experience/expression.

Adejimola (2009) argues that language may be used to address burning issues, to declare war, to incite, provoke, oppose ideas, intentions, and actions, to influence personalities, to scatter, condemn, blackmail, insult, destroy, falsify, despise, and abuse, and to generate violence. He further added that language can function to produce positive results or purposes, especially "to entertain, appeal, inspire, comfort, amuse, appreciate, build, enlighten, educate, settle disputes, establish a cordial relationship and make peace with people." Other functions include resolving conflict within and among various groups in society. Arising from the illustrative explanation (definitions), one appreciates the function of language as the catalyst which speeds up certain reactions in the person who receives the content of the encoders' message through certain communicative signals. In the same vein, Moulton (1974) defines language as a wonderful and rich vehicle of communication; that is, the expression of ideas, wishes, and commands that conveys truths and lies, etc. This implies that only humans possess the ability to use language in its complex form, making it a species-specific skill. Language can be verbal or non-verbal. By verbal, it refers to its manifestation in speech, while the non-verbal feature may be gestural and semiotic. Gestural language simply refers to the use of gestures, facial expressions, posture, voice modulation, pitch, stress, and intonation to decode the intent of the messenger. For example, while the word yes is literally used to show that one has given his consent or agrees on a particular thing, the same word could be used to mean 'doubt' when the intonation of the utterer is used in a way that assigns a question mark to the word. Semiotic language, on the other hand, involves the use of iconic (specialised) symbols or signs to convey messages. Semiotics is more evident in religious, scientific, and social symbols and traffic signs.

There are different levels of language, and each of these levels could determine the communicative function that language plays. For instance, one can use language either literally

or metaphorically. Literal meaning refers to the surface meaning that is not characterised by connotations and undertones, while metaphoric language is imbued with connotations, allusions, referents, nuances, and underlying sub-terranean meanings. Unlike in the literal use of language, knowledge of context and extra-linguistic factors are instrumental to understanding the metaphoric use of language. In other words, while literal language focuses on what you say, metaphoric usage focuses on how you say it. When a speaker uses a word literally and the hearer understands it metaphorically, misunderstanding is bound to happen. While not all misunderstandings result in conflict, misunderstandings almost always trigger conflict. Thus, the use and interpretation or otherwise of any of the levels of language will determine the successful management/resolution of conflict.

Words/language

We cannot discuss the use of words in conflict resolution without mentioning power and/or leadership. Nida quoted in Hekman (1999:18) defines power as the ability to effect, to accomplish something, and this has to do with words and actions.

Conflict

This is evidence of a communication flaw. Conflict occurs when there is an apparent misunderstanding or misinterpretation of one's message which results in the opposition of the intentions of the sender. Even the refusal to communicate is already a communication. Huntington (1996) defines conflict as 'contentions involving real or apparent fears, interests, and values in which goals of the opposing group must be opposed or at least neutralised to protect one's own interest— prestige, employment, and political power'. It is also seen as "the process in which one party perceives that its interest is being opposed or negatively affected by another" (Alexander, 2016). All three definitions above agree that conflict is the dissonance between the encoder's intention in a message and the decoder's interpretations of the same message. It entails the presence of an object of contention that brings about a division— division—from the offender (on the one hand) to the offended/defender (on the other hand). Conflicts, unfortunately, are inevitable in all human relationships—individually or corporately. In most cases, our unwillingness to accede to the desires and wants of others is what instigates conflict. This was supported and captured more aptly by Devito (2008, p. 67) when he noted that interpersonal conflict occurs when there is 'a disagreement between connected individuals who each want something that is incompatible with what the other wants'.

There are various forms and classifications of conflicts. These include gender conflict, civil conflict, industrial, international, ethnic conflict, power, etc. This paper, however, focused on how language/words were used to resolve the civil conflict in Mali following the August 18, 2020, coup. Inasmuch as it is true that not every major conflict which confronts humans is caused by a breakdown in communication as occasioned by improper and ineffective language usage, this paper posits that inadequate (ineffective) communication frequently contributes to a large extent to the failures of both personal and social relationships which often eventually result in conflict.

Language as a Weapon of War

In the hands of skilled manipulators, language can be transformed into a weapon of war, capable of inciting hatred, demonising opponents, and justifying violence. Inflammatory rhetoric, dehumanising language, and propaganda can all serve to fuel conflict and undermine the prospects for peace (Allcott, Gentzkow, & Taber, 2019).

Historical examples abound of the destructive power of language in wartime. The infamous slogan "Kill the Chinese and take their land", widely disseminated during the Second Sino-Japanese War, played a significant role in dehumanising the enemy and encouraging atrocities (Iriye, 1981). Similarly, the use of racial slurs and dehumanising language during the Rwandan genocide dehumanised the victims, making it easier for perpetrators to carry out mass atrocities (Destexhe, 2005).

Language as a tool for peacebuilding

Language can also be a powerful force for peacebuilding, fostering understanding, promoting empathy, and facilitating dialogue (Piotrowski & Walker, 2006). Reconciliation efforts in the aftermath of conflict often depend on effective communication to mend wounds, rebuild trust, and prevent future violence.

The use of inclusive language, respectful dialogue, and narratives that promote healing can help to bridge divides and pave the way for a more peaceful future (Humphrey, 2005). For instance, peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict societies often emphasise the use of shared language and symbols to foster a sense of common identity and belonging (Humphrey, 2005). The Colombian peace process, for example, placed a strong emphasis on the use of language to promote understanding and reconciliation between former adversaries (Guzman, 2016).

Language and Narrative Control

In times of war and conflict, governments and other actors often engage in a struggle for narrative control, seeking to shape the public's understanding of events and justify their actions (Cotterell, 2003). This process can involve the use of euphemisms, manipulation of facts, and the suppression of dissenting voices (Cotterell, 2003).

The control of language can be a powerful tool for maintaining power and legitimising actions, even when they are morally questionable (Chomsky, 2002). For example, governments may use euphemisms like "collateral damage" to downplay civilian casualties (Shaw, 1998) or employ labels like "insurgents" or "terrorists" to demonise opponents (Chomsky, 2002). More recent examples include the use of social media by governments to manipulate public opinion, spread disinformation, and suppress dissent (Benkler, 2016). Similarly, the rise of fake news and deepfakes has made it increasingly difficult to distinguish between truth and fiction, further complicating the struggle for narrative control (Van der Linden, Leenknecht, &Roozenbeek, 2019).

Some causes of conflict

The causes of conflict may include misinformation, disinformation, greed, overzealousness, complex or psychological abnormality, and so on. This study argues that when any or a combination of these traits are manifested in any social group, a collision of interest and conflict is bound to occur. When this conflict occurs, concerted efforts must be made to stop it; otherwise, the continued existence of the group would be at risk. It is this stage, or the process of trying to stop and settle issues that arise as a result of the collision of interests, that we refer to as 'conflict resolution or management. Deutsch (1973), a well-known German scholar, gave a perspective on the conflict that has remained relevant to this day. He claimed that the negative or positive nature of conflict really is determined by people's behaviours; it is not itself an intrinsic quality. While some behaviours produce dysfunctional, destructive, and unproductive responses, other behaviours produce functional, constructive, and productive responses. Deutsch further categorised conflicts into destructive and constructive. On the one hand, destructive conflict reveals behaviour that intensifies a conflict until it seems to have a life of its own. No one is satisfied with the outcome of this type of conflict. Possible gains are not realised, and the negative taste leftover at the end of one conflict eclipsed the next one; thus, creating a degenerating or negative spiral. On the other hand, the constructive conflict shows behaviours that are adaptive to a situation, person, and problem of the moment. In constructive conflicts, the interests of both parties are balanced to maximise the opportunities for mutual gains. Constructive conflicts contain an element of creative adaptation born from a realisation that one must know both one's own and the other's interests and goals to be able to find a road both parties are willing to walk to discover a mutually acceptable outcome. (Deutsch, 1973: 79)

Conflict Resolution versus Conflict Management

A popular conflict scholar, Lulofs (1994, p. 4), once said that "the way we think about conflict has important implications for the way we act in situations where conflict exists." Conflict resolution stems from an obligation to fulfil human psychological needs. Theorists in conflict resolution claim that conflict mediation alone does not fulfil the underlying psychological needs required for sustainable well-being. Conflict resolution aims to reach an agreement and fix the current issue causing the crisis by using methods like bringing in a third party to help end the crisis (Lederach, 2003). In a given case or situation, it could mean reducing and eliminating conflict (Lulof, 1994). The word 'resolution' may be interpreted in this context to mean the dissolution, solving, and settlement of disputes/differences, etc. The implication of this is that all the parties involved in this process must be seen to possess the will, zeal and commitment to ending such disagreement. According to Njoku (2017), resolution can be brought about in two ways: by force (i.e., forcing the parties to fall into line) and by persuasion (wherein all the parties involved are brought on board the negotiating table). It should be noted, however, that despite the effectiveness that brute-force resolution offers, it does not seem to solve any problem; rather, it leads to some sort of bottled-up anger/frustration which will erupt like a volcano someday. Hence, the second part of Njoku's suggestions, where all parties to the conflict are brought on board the negotiating table, seems the most effective and long-lasting. This is because the parties will see the result as their project in the resolution process and are obligated to protect it and

make it work. In a partnership where conflict appears, conflict resolution is usually more short-term and content-focused, and based on solving immediate problems. Conflict management, on the other hand, is "the positive and constructive handling of difference and divergence" (Bloomfield and Reilly, 1998) by implementing strategies that limit the occurrence of negative aspects of disputes and emphasise positive ones. Conflict management does not attempt to remove all conflict from a situation; it focusses on minimising the "negative" conflicts and accentuating the "positive ones." In other words, it adopts a pragmatic approach to conflict by developing agreements and practices that allow people to collaborate effectively despite their differences and disagreements at all levels: interpersonal, intergroup, or systemic. The term "conflict management" was deliberately chosen by communication scholars because it evokes a perception of the mechanism of the decisions and actions that occur during conflicts. Since some conflicts are lasting, the best we can do is to control their degree of manifestation such that we are still able to maintain a positive working relationship with other parties. Thus, communication scholars generally agree that conflict is (1) part of life, (2) a process, and (3) neither good nor bad. This study focused on conflict resolution, considering the inevitability of conflict and its continuous nature in all interpersonal and systemic relationships (in-person or virtual).

Previous Studies

Many works have examined the role language or words play in conflict resolution or management. Adegbite (2017), for example, affirms that the existence of a conflict in every society is made possible via varied variables: class, gender, and culture. Language exclusively expresses each of these variables, underscoring its crucial role in conflict resolution and management. The study also argues that the culture of a people determines their language, gender, views, and approach to conflict resolution. This argument could suggest that both conflict initiation and resolution/management may be culturally specific. In other words, certain cultures may tend to always express conflict, while others may not. Similarly, Amuseghan (2009) examines how effective communication can promote the peaceful resolution of conflict. He argues that all forms of conflict can be resolved via negotiation, dialogue, and mediation adjudication if the parties focus on the root causes. Although Adegbite, for instance, discussed the concepts of language, culture, gender, and conflicts in literature very elaborately, his work seems to pay less attention to the details of the conflict and the exact roles these concepts play in the resolution and management of conflict. This study will, however, show, with examples, the role language played in managing the conflict in Mali and how its initial use almost jeopardised the peace bargain.

Opara (2016) argues that English must embrace Nigeria's cultural and linguistic diversity before it can be used to resolve conflicts in an L2 setting. He further argued that since the English language may not fully capture the heartfelt mores of the Nigerian people, it may be difficult to achieve meaningful resolution with such a medium. Opara (2016) believes that using the Nigerian indigenous language to negotiate during conflict can produce better results. Unfortunately, there is a dearth of scholarship that affirms this notion. One major criticism against this belief is that it only focuses on internal conflict management or resolution cases (i.e., conflicts that occur within the same speech community). English has become a global language,

and when inter-ethnic conflicts occur, both groups may resort to a language that appears neutral and understood by both parties, which in most international conflicts is the English language.

Njoku (2017) explores how communication can be used to resolve conflicts, however and wherever they occur. He argues that in so much as language and communication are critical in the lives of people and nations, the functionality or otherwise of conflict depends on communication skills and their applicability by parties involved. The paper argued that effective communication in conflict resolution depends on understanding the dynamics of conflict and its communication in the application.

Nwagbara and Brown (2014) looked at the often troubled relationship between companies and communities in Nigeria's oil industry and argue that open and shared communication can help manage conflicts in this challenging sector. Their paper gives a historical background to the discovery of oil in commercial quantity and its attendant conflict occasioned by many factors and considerations. The paper suggests moving away from this problem by discussing and understanding each other better, based on teamwork and shared leadership, to address frustrations. The paper succeeded in shedding light on conflict as an inevitable phenomenon that confronts organisations. However, they posit that the effective management of the same conflict could facilitate a better relationship between the oil and gas companies and the host communities.

Since the advent of technology, language use has transcended physical boundaries; in other words, technology has been able to neutralise space and time differences and has even allowed humans to develop new language forms that otherwise may not have been created. In this context, Chebii (2015) examines the media's role in managing electoral conflict in Kenya. The double role of the media includes conflict escalation and de-escalation. Adopting the conceptual framework developed from the libertarian theory and social responsibility theory of media reporting, the study affirmed that the conflict escalation role is more prevalent with vernacular (local) media stations, while the de-escalation role is predominant with nationwide mainstream stations. The paper also reveals that human variables such as age, gender, and social status influence people's response to conflict coverage. It suggests creating and following a consistent way to report on conflicts to reduce misunderstandings, especially in countries with weak democracies. This approach, according to the paper, includes, among other things, the enforcement of stringent regulations and control of vernacular (local) stations, which are prone to manipulation by the political elite; the training of journalists on conflict reporting; and the development of a standard conflict reporting procedure.

The role of words/language in conflict resolution Irrespective of the effective use or otherwise of language, a conflict that emanates from communication seems unavoidable. This is why Dada (2007) believes that "language is not neutral". The import of the statement is that language always takes a position, has a perspective, and a perception. It also bears a hint, clue, suggestion, etc. Thus, it is not out of place to say that language has certain elements/factors that engender communication conflict.

Mojaye (2014) says, "Language does not always precipitate conflicts, but its use or misuse does because language is not an end in itself but a means to an end." He compares language to a crucial tool in resolving all types of conflicts, particularly domestic ones. This, he maintains, occurs usually when the language used during intimate or casual communication is not good enough. Based on this premise, we shall list some of the possible factors in language that trigger conflict in communication. These factors include but are not entirely limited to cultural miseducation, decoding error, encoding ambiguity, lack of shared background, literary level, etc. The effective handling of these factors leads to the peaceful coexistence of parties in a given socio-cultural setting. The role of communication via language is compelling as one of the positive methods that aim at containing or resolving conflict. Conflict resolution as a concept, according to Miller (2003), is "various approaches aimed at terminating conflicts through the constructive solving of problems distinct from the management transformation of conflicts". On their part, Miall et al. (1999) indicate that "it is expected that the deep-rooted sources of conflict are addressed and resolved, and behaviour is no longer violent, nor attitude hostile any longer, while the structure of the conflict has been changed". The overall development signifies the establishment of peace. The lack of communication or ineffective communication, most often, aggravates already strained relationships between the parties involved in conflict situations. Clearly, the resolution of conflict relies heavily on communication. Communication, as mentioned earlier (in this context), is the process of sharing and exchanging a piece of information between individuals or groups who are involved in a conflict situation. It is the interaction and relationships with people or parties involved in a conflict situation as well as those engaged in conflict. The requirement of communication through the use of linguistic and other paralinguistic channels is very essential in the effective resolution of conflict. Therefore, the presence or absence (or near absence) of conflict in a given context is crucial.

According to Adejimola (2009), "effective communication is therefore central in negotiation, which is a different process of dialogue or discussion taking place between at least two parties who are faced with a conflict situation or a dispute. He further provided some of the non-violent methods of conflict management and resolution, which are directly connected with the use of language and communication. Negotiation and dialogue are among these methods of conflict resolution, but they are not the only ones. Others include what he calls "third—party interventions", and they are mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and adjudication. These methods are all non-violent ways to resolve conflicts, except for arbitration, which is done in court, where the decisions are binding and enforced by state apparitions. This position matches Shedrack's (2004) view that "there is no exclusivity in these methods of conflict management." Most of them share traits with other methods; for example, negotiation, mediation, and arbitration all rely on communication. Arbitration has several properties of mediation and adjudication. Note that language plays a crucial role in any resolution efforts, regardless of the methods used. Interpreters are also used to create a conducive atmosphere where everyone can share and exchange information, but the common language of the parties in conflict is usually the language of the conflict resolution.

It is a fact that communication plays both a causal and remedial role in conflict resolution. It is imperative to appreciate certain strategies that lead to an effective resolution of conflict. One of

the strategies, according to Njoku (2017), is the use of supportive communication. This strategy helps the parties feel safe and increases the likelihood of opening up, which leads to positive communication and results. Another strategy is the "interest-based approach.". This approach has been adjudged one of the most successful means of resolving conflict through communication. This strategy is effective and successful because it identifies the issues at stake and defines the various interests. It further involves brainstorming sessions. In this scenario, the parties involved have the freedom to propose ideas or suggestions that address the identified issues. Another aspect of the interest-based strategy is the application of criteria and the arrival/reaching of consequences. Reaching a consensus is akin to arriving at a workable solution, which the parties can live with. Note that consensus in this context pertains to what the parties can agree upon. This is the end or result of mediation, dialogue, arbitration, adjudication, conciliation, and negotiation as nonviolent/adversarial methods of conflict resolution. Language and communication alone do not resolve disputes; they are tools used in the processes that lead to successful facilitation and settlement of conflicts in every society.

Methods and theoretical foundations

 The study adopted a qualitative approach to data collection and analysis. Qualitative research involves the collection and analysis of non-numerical data such as texts or videos with the view to understanding concepts, opinions, or experiences (Bhandari, 2020). We specifically collected the data for this study using a purposive sampling technique. This method was preferred since only utterances that either condemn the coup and appeal to the coup leaders to relinquish power to a democratic government were considered relevant for the study. We further collected these utterances from various online sources and analysed them using the pragmatic presupposition theory. Stalnaker (1974) suggests that instead of looking at what words or sentences assume, we should focus on what people think or believe when they talk. When a statement is said, a pragmatic presupposition linked with it is a condition that a speaker would typically expect to hold in the common ground between conversation participants.

Conclusion

Language has the power to both provoke violence and foster peace. The words we choose during times of war and conflict significantly influence the course of events (Piotrowski & Walker, 2006). By understanding the power of language, we can better recognise its potential for both good and harm and strive to use it as a force for peace and reconciliation.

References

Allcott, H., Gentzkow, M., & Taber, J. S. (2019). Social media and fake news in the 2016 US election. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 33(2), 211-236.

Benkler, Y. (2016). Network propaganda: Manipulation, disinformation, and the radicalization of the American public. Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, N. (2002). Power and terror. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Cotterell, B. (2003). Narrative control in peacebuilding. In S. Humphreys (Ed.), Narratives and the making of peace (pp. 19-33). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Destexhe, A. (2005). The words of Rwanda: The genocide through the eyes of the perpetrators. New York: Verso Books.

Guzman, E. (2016). The role of language in the Colombian peace process. International Studies Review, 18(2), 364-383.

Iriye, A. (1981). Power and culture: The Japanese-American war, 1941-1945. Harvard University Press.

Piotrowski, C. H., & Walker, G. R. (Eds.). (2006). War and language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shaw, K. (1998). Civilians in the line of fire: Collateral damage in modern warfare. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Humphrey, M. (Ed.). (2005). Narratives and the making of peace. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van der Linden, S., Leenknecht, D., &Roozenbeek, N. (2019). Countering online misinformation: A guide for journalists, fact-checkers, and citizens. Routledge.

UN. (2018). Report of the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar. New York: United Nations.