International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Strategic and Linguistic Challenges of Military Translation in the Iraqi Context

Safaa Saleem Naji Al-Rubaye
University of Babylon, Iraq

* Corresponding Author: **Safaa Saleem Naji Al-Rubaye**

Article Info

Abstract
Military translation has become an important tool in modern combat. It's not only makes communication easier, but it also helps operations happen in places where languages and cultures are very different. In the Iraq war, translators did a lot more than just translate words. They were cultural brokers, intelligence filters, and often the only way for coalition forces to get real-time information from local people. The tremendous risks of war, the changing nature of dialectical complexities, and the weak confidence between military personnel and local communities all made it very important to get translations right. But even though this was very important, translation services often didn't get enough money, weren't controlled enough, and weren't given enough thought in operational planning. This study looks at the many roles, moral problems, and strategic gaps that come with military translation. It uses case studies, doctrinal failures, and theoretical insights to suggest a framework that sees the translator as more than just a tool of war, but also as a force for peace, stability, and post-conflict reconciliation.

1. Introduction
Language has been a force multiplier, a tool for diplomacy, and at times, a terrible barrier throughout the history of war. In Iraq, where there are many different languages spoken, including classical Arabic and its many regional dialects, Kurdish, Turkmen, and minority languages like Syriac and Armenian, military
translators were essential to achieving all strategic goals, whether they were in combat or in civil affairs. Translators had to do more than just translate words; they had to grasp gestures, figure out honorifics, spot euphemisms for violence, and transmit small changes in tone that could mean loyalty or betrayal. But most coalition (Hatim & Mason, 1990) [12] forces didn't understand the mental stress, moral pressure, and social isolation that translators had to deal with. Translators were often not formally recognised, had unstable contracts, or legal protection, even though they were very important to the strategy. The goal of this study is to break down these operational failures and show how a lack of attention to military linguistics led to mistakes in the field, kept cycles of mistrust going, and put missions that depended on local cooperation at risk. It also says that the experience in Iraq makes a strong case for a change in how modern military doctrine thinks about translation—not as a service but as a vital strategic function that needs a lot of institutional commitment (Shannon,2006) [24].
Language has been a powerful tool in combat, a way to make peace, and sometimes a terrible barrier. In Iraq, where the language is very complicated and includes classical Arabic and its many regional dialects, as well as Kurdish, Turkmen, and minority languages like Syriac and Armenian, military translators were essential to every strategic goal, whether it was fighting or civil affairs. Translators had to do more than just translate words; they had to grasp gestures, figure out honorifics, spot euphemisms for violence, and pick up on small changes in tone that may mean alliance or betrayal. But the bureaucratic structures of most coalition forces (Cronin, 2006) [5] didn't understand the mental strain, moral pressure, and social isolation that translators had to deal with. Translators were often not formally recognised, had unstable contracts, or were protected by the law, even if they were very important to the strategy.

The goal of this study is to break down these operational failures and show how a lack of attention to military linguistics led to mistakes in the field, kept cycles of mistrust going, and put missions that depended on local cooperation at risk. It also says that the experience in Iraq makes a strong case for a change in how modern military doctrine thinks about translation—not as a service but as a vital strategic function that needs a lot of institutional commitment.(Shannon,2006) [24].

Language has been a powerful tool in combat, a way to make peace, and sometimes a terrible barrier. In Iraq, where the language is very complicated and includes classical Arabic and its many regional dialects, as well as Kurdish, Turkmen, and minority languages like Syriac and Armenian, military translators were essential to every strategic goal, whether it was fighting or civil affairs. Translators had to do more than just translate words; they had to grasp gestures, figure out honorifics, spot euphemisms for violence, and pick up on small changes in tone that may mean alliance or betrayal. But the bureaucratic structures of most coalition forces (Cronin, 2006) [5] didn't understand the mental strain, moral pressure, and social isolation that translators had to deal with. Translators were often not formally recognised, had unstable contracts, or were protected by the law, even if they were very important to the strategy. The goal of this study is to break down these operational failures and show how a lack of attention to military linguistics led to mistakes in the field, kept cycles of mistrust going, and put missions that depended on local cooperation at risk. Furthermore, it contends that the Iraq experience makes a strong case for a change in how modern military doctrine thinks about translation—not as a service but as a vital strategic function that needs a lot of institutional commitment. (Ferguson, 1959) [9]; (Venuti, 2012) [27];

Language has been a force multiplier, a tool for diplomacy, and sometimes a terrible barrier in wars throughout history. In Iraq, where the language is very complicated and includes classical Arabic and its many regional dialects, as well as Kurdish, Turkmen, and minority languages like Syriac and Armenian, military translators were essential to every strategic goal, whether it was fighting or civil affairs. Translators had to do more than just translate words; they had to grasp gestures, figure out honorifics, spot euphemisms for violence, and communicate small changes in tone that could mean alliance or betrayal. But the institutional frameworks of most coalition forces (Shannon, 2006) [24] did not take into account the cognitive burden, moral pressure, and social isolation that translators had to deal with. Translators were often not formally recognised, had unstable contracts, or legal protection, even though they were important to the strategy. The goal of this study is to break down these operational failures and show how a lack of attention to military linguistics led to mistakes in the field, kept cycles of mistrust going, and put missions that depended on local cooperation at risk. It also says that the Iraq experience makes a strong case for a change in how modern military doctrine thinks about translation—not as a service but as a vital strategic function that needs a lot of institutional support. (Holes, 2004) [13]. Also has been a force multiplier, a tool of diplomacy, and at times, a terrible barrier in wars throughout history. In Iraq, where the language is very complicated and includes classical Arabic and its many regional dialects, as well as Kurdish, Turkmen, and minority languages like Syriac and Armenian, military translators were essential to

every strategic goal, whether it was fighting or civil affairs. Translators had to do more than just translate words; they had to grasp gestures, figure out honorifics, spot euphemisms for violence, and pick up on small changes in tone that could mean loyalty or betrayal. But the bureaucratic structures of most coalition forces (Amnesty International, 2008) [1] didn't understand the mental strain, moral pressure, and social isolation that translators had to deal with. Even though they were important to the strategy, translators typically didn't get formal recognition, solid contracts, or legal protection. The goal of this study is to break down these operational failures and show how a lack of attention to military linguistics led to mistakes in the field, kept cycles of mistrust going, and put missions that depended on local cooperation at risk. It also says that the experience in Iraq makes a strong case for a change in how modern military doctrine thinks about translation—not as a service but as a vital strategic function that needs a lot of institutional commitment. (Ferguson, 1959) [9].

1. Military translation's strategic roles in conflict zones

Strategic military translation is more than just talking to each other; it also changes how people see and understand commands, interrogations, and community interactions. In Iraq, interpreters participated in operations ranging from psychological warfare and tribal reconciliation to urban patrol briefings and counterinsurgency negotiations. In many situations, they were the only personnel who could alert commanders to the subtext of civilian reactions, identify regional allegiances, and advise on the implications of terminology that differed between Sunni and Shia communities. A carelessly translated statement could change a calm engagement into a hostile one (Ferguson, 1959) [9]. And yet, despite these implications, translators were typically selected through informal methods with no vetting or oversight. Many were asked to interpret legal, medical, and military principles without any systematic training. The outcome was a divided approach to language management that generated considerable inconsistencies in information gathering, military discipline, and humanitarian outreach. This article addresses not only the structural limitations in translation deployment but also discusses how institutional predisposition toward kinetic operations sidelined language policy, consequently weakening strategy coherence and mission legitimacy. (Newmark, 1988) [19].

Strategic military translation covers much more than direct communication; it impacts the perception and intent behind commands, interrogations, and community involvement. In Iraq, interpreters participated in operations ranging from psychological warfare and tribal reconciliation to urban patrol briefings and counterinsurgency negotiations. In many situations, they were the only personnel who could alert commanders to the subtext of civilian reactions, identify regional allegiances, and advise on the implications of terminology that differed between Sunni and Shia communities. One improperly translated sentence could cause a calm interaction to turn (Ferguson, 1959) [9] violent. And yet, despite these implications, translators were typically selected through informal methods with no vetting or oversight. Many were asked to interpret legal, medical, and military principles without any systematic training. The outcome was a divided approach to language management that generated considerable inconsistencies in information

gathering, military discipline, and humanitarian outreach. This article looks at both the structural problems with how translators are used and how institutional prejudice against kinetic operations pushed language policy to the side, which hurt strategic coherence and mission legitimacy. (Robinson, 2003) [22] and (Ellis, 2010) [8].

Strategic military translation is more than just talking to people; it also affects how people see and understand commands, interrogations, and community interactions. In Iraq, interpreters worked on a wide range of tasks, from psychological warfare and tribal reconciliation to urban patrol briefings and talks to end the conflict. In a lot of cases, they were the only people who could tell commanders what civilians really meant, figure out regional loyalties, and explain what words meant differently in Sunni and Shia populations. A single badly translated sentence could turn a nice conversation into a fight. (2010) And yet, even with these high stakes, translators were typically chosen through informal means with little vetting or oversight. Without any formal training, many were supposed to be able to explain legal, medical, and military ideas. The upshot was a broken way of managing language that made it very hard to obtain intelligence, keep operational discipline, and reach out to those in need. This paper looks at both the structural problems with translator deployment and how institutional bias towards kinetic operations pushed language policy to the side, which hurt strategic coherence and mission legitimacy. (Packer, 2005) [21]; (Hatim & Mason, 1990) [12].

Strategic military translation is more than just talking to each other; it also affects how people understand and carry out instructions, interrogations, and community events. In Iraq, interpreters worked on a wide range of tasks, from psychological warfare and tribal reconciliation to urban patrol briefings and talks to end the conflict. In many situations, they were the only people who could tell commanders what civilians were really saying, figure out who was loyal to whom in a region, and explain the different meanings of words used by Sunni and Shia groups. A poorly translated sentence could make a peaceful meeting (Baker & Maier, 2011) [2] turn violent. But even with these risks, translators were typically chosen through informal methods with little or no vetting or monitoring. Many people were supposed to understand legal, medical, and military terms without any formal training. The upshot was a broken way of managing language that made it very hard to obtain intelligence, keep operational discipline, and reach out to those in need. This article looks at both the structural gaps in how translators are used and how institutional predisposition towards kinetic operations pushed language policy to the side, which hurt strategy coherence and mission legitimacy. (Amnesty International, 2008) [1].

2. Language Issues in the Iraqi Setting
It is hard to put languages into neat categories. Dialectical fragmentation alone is a big problem. For example, Baghdadi Arabic sounds, spells, and uses words differently than Basrawi Arabic. Kurdish has many dialects, such as Sorani and Kurmanji, each with its own writing style and cultural references. This meant that military translators had to not only jump between languages but also figure out the social identities that were hidden in speech. A Kurdish speaker might not want to be spoken to in Arabic, and a Shia person might be suspicious of some Sunni expressions or honorifics.

Also, Iraq's diglossic context, where Modern Standard Arabic and vernacular forms of Arabic coexist, required a lot of flexibility. Translators have to know when a speaker was switching to formal language for rhetorical impact or using sarcasm or code-hopping as a way to resist (Ellis, 2010) [8]. Idioms also had political meanings that made these problems much worse. For instance, the term "Inshallah" could mean honest agreement, avoidance, or quiet denial, depending on how it is said and where it is used. Many military translators had to guess when they didn't get a lot of dialect instruction, which is a risky thing to do in high-risk situations. Because there was no clear language strategy in the military, operational language planning was more reactive than strategic, which pushed an already weak translator corps even farther to the sidelines. (Robinson, 2003 and Holes, 2004) [22, 13].

It's hard to put Iraq's languages into neat groups. Dialectical fragmentation alone is a big problem. For example, Baghdadi Arabic sounds, spells, and uses words differently than Basrawi Arabic. Kurdish has many dialects, such as Sorani and Kurmanji, each with its own writing style and cultural references. This meant that military translators had to not only jump between languages but also figure out the social identities that were hidden in speech. A Kurdish speaker might not want to be spoken to in Arabic, and a Shia person might be suspicious of some Sunni expressions or honorifics. Also, Iraq's diglossic context, where Modern Standard Arabic and vernacular forms of Arabic coexist, required a lot of flexibility. Translators had to know whether (Holes, 2004) [13] a speaker was switching to formal language for rhetorical impact or using sarcasm or code-switching as a way to resist. Idioms that had political significance built into them made these problems much worse. For instance, the term "Inshallah" could mean honest agreement, avoidance, or quiet denial, depending on how it is said and where it is used. Many military translators had to guess when they didn't get a lot of dialect instruction, which is a risky thing to do in high-risk situations. Because there was no clear language strategy in the military, operational language planning was more reactive than strategic. This made the translation corps even more vulnerable. (Shannon, 2006) [24]; (Ferguson, 1959) [9].

It's hard to put Iraq's language situation into neat categories. Dialectical fragmentation alone is a big problem. For example, Baghdadi Arabic sounds, spells, and uses words differently than Basrawi Arabic. Kurdish has many dialects, such as Sorani and Kurmanji, each with its own writing style and cultural references. This meant that military translators had to not only jump between languages but also figure out the social identities that were hidden in speech. A Kurdish speaker might not want to be spoken to in Arabic, and a Shia person might be suspicious of some Sunni expressions or honorifics. Also, Iraq's diglossic context, where Modern Standard Arabic and colloquial forms of Arabic mix, required a lot of quick thinking. Translators had to know when a speaker was switching to formal language for rhetorical effect or using sarcasm or code-switching as a way to resist. Idiomatic phrases also have hidden political meanings, which made these problems even worse. For instance, the term "Inshallah" could mean honest agreement, avoidance, or quiet denial, depending on how it is said and where it is used. Many military translators had to guess when they didn't get a lot of dialect instruction, which is a risky thing to do in high-risk situations. Because there was no clear language strategy in the military, operational language planning was more

reactive than strategic, which made the translation corps even weaker. (Ferguson, 1959) [9]; (Hatim & Mason, 1990) [12].

It's hard to put Iraq's languages into neat groups. Dialectical fragmentation alone is a big problem. For example, Baghdadi Arabic sounds, spells, and uses words differently than Basrawi Arabic. Kurdish has many dialects, such as Sorani and Kurmanji, each with its own writing style and cultural references. This meant that military translators had to not only jump between languages but also figure out the social identities that were hidden in speech. A Kurdish speaker might not want to be spoken to in Arabic, and a Shia person might be suspicious of some Sunni expressions or honorifics. Iraq's diglossic environment, where Modern Standard Arabic and vernacular forms of Arabic coexist, also required a lot of flexibility. Translators have to know when (Venuti, 2012) [27] a speaker was using formal language for rhetorical effect or using sarcasm or code-switching to resist. Idioms also have hidden political meanings, which made these problems even worse. For instance, the term "Inshallah" could mean honest agreement, avoidance, or quiet denial, depending on how it is said and where it is used. Many military translators had to guess when they didn't get a lot of dialect instruction, which is a risky thing to do in high-risk situations. Because military language policies weren't consistent, operational language planning was more reactive than strategic, which made the translation corps weaker. (2010) Ellis [8]; (1988) Newmark [19].

3. Military translators in Iraq have both operational and ethical problems.

The ethical problems that local interpreters face may be the most terrifying part of military translation in Iraq. These people worked for coalition forces yet lived in unstable areas, so both rebels and residents often saw them as traitors. A lot of them were killed, kidnapped, or publicly shamed, and their families were shunned or forced to move. Even yet, most interpreters worked on short-term contracts that didn't come with insurance, security, or a guarantee of asylum if they had to leave the mission. Their daily decisions about what to interpret, how to present a commander's remarks, and whether to make a threat more or less serious were full of moral implications. They were in danger not just physically, but also mentally. It was very hard on the emotions to interpret during torture sessions (Gentzler, 2001) [10], mediate at the site of civilian deaths, or see abuses of authority, especially when there was no psychological assistance. It was clear that there was an ethical void in military planning: interpreters were treated like tools instead of people, and there were no rules or ways to get help when things went wrong, which led to widespread abuse. The report argues for a set of written rules that regulate not just the hiring, payment, and long-term care of translators, but also their use. Without this, the legitimacy of foreign intervention is at risk because the local friends who are most important to the mission's success are left behind when the attention shifts. (Munday, 2016); (Baker & Maier, 2011) [2].

One of the most difficult parts of military translation in Iraq is the moral dilemmas that local interpreters have to deal with. These people worked for coalition forces yet lived in unstable areas, so both rebels and residents often saw them as traitors. A lot of them were killed, kidnapped, or publicly shamed, and their families were shunned or forced to move. Even yet, most interpreters worked on short-term contracts

that didn't come with insurance, security, or a guarantee of asylum if they had to leave the mission. Their daily decisions about what to interpret, how to present a commander's remarks, and whether to make a threat more or less serious were full of moral implications. In addition to the physical risk, they also had to deal with mental anguish. Interpreting (Cronin, 2006) [5] during torture sessions, mediating at civilised killings, or seeing abuses of authority took a heavy emotional toll, especially since they didn't have any psychiatric support. There was a clear moral gap in military planning: interpreters were viewed like tools instead of people, and there were no rules of conduct or ways to get help when things went wrong, which led to rampant abuse. The report argues for a set of written rules that regulate not just the hiring, payment, and long-term care of translators, but also their use. Without this, foreign intervention's legitimacy is at risk because the local allies who are most important to the mission's success are left behind when the media attention fades. (Gentzler, 2001) [10].

The ethical problems that local translators encounter while working with the military in Iraq may be the most disturbing part of the job. These people worked for coalition forces yet lived in unstable areas, so both rebels and residents often saw them as traitors. A lot of them were killed, kidnapped, or publicly shamed, and their families were shunned or forced to move. Even yet, most interpreters worked on short-term contracts that didn't come with insurance, security, or a guarantee of asylum if they had to leave the mission. Their daily decisions about what to interpret, how to present a commander's remarks, and whether to make a threat more or less serious were full of moral implications. They were in danger physically and mentally. Interpreting during torture sessions (Baker & Maier, 2011) [2], mediating at the scene of civilian deaths, or seeing abuses of power caused a huge emotional toll, especially since there was no psychiatric support. There was a clear moral gap in military planning: interpreters were treated like tools instead of people, and there were no rules or ways to make things right, which led to rampant abuse. The report argues for a set of written rules that regulate not just the hiring, payment, and long-term care of translators, but also their use. Without this, the credibility of foreign intervention is at risk because the local friends who are most important to the mission's success are left behind when the media attention fades. (Amnesty International, 2008) [1].

4. Suggestions for Changing How Military Translation Works in Iraq

It's time for a complete overhaul of the military's translation policy. First, translation should be a standard part of operational planning, with language officers at every command level in charge of integrating translators, developing dialect strategies, and assessing linguistic risks. Second, language aptitude exams, dialect matching, and ethical orientation modules should be used to make recruiting procedures more formal and consistent. Third, interpreters should be assigned to military forces with the same protections as intelligence officials, such as physical security, legal status, and access to trauma care. Fourth, multinational coalitions (Ellis, 2010) [8] need to make common agreements that translators are protected under international humanitarian law, just like journalists and medics. Fifth, help after the conflict is really important. Countries that need

translators during deployments need to make long-term plans for visas, relocation, and jobs instead of treating translators like they are disposable. Lastly, military academies should teach future soldiers about language and culture, including basic regional dialects, translation ethics, and the geopolitics of language. These kinds of changes will not only protect translators, but they will also improve mission cohesion, intelligence fidelity, and cross-cultural credibility. (Cronin, 2006) [5].

Military translation policy needs a complete overhaul. First, translation should be a standard part of operational planning, with language officers at every command level in charge of integrating translators, developing dialect strategies, and assessing linguistic risks. Second, language aptitude exams, dialect matching, and ethical orientation modules should be used to make recruiting procedures more formal and consistent. Third, interpreters should be part of military units and have the same protections as intelligence officials, such as physical safety, legal status, and access to trauma care. Fourth, international groups like Amnesty International (2008) [1] need to make agreements that translators are protected workers under international humanitarian law, just like journalists and medics. Fifth, support after the war is very important. Countries that need translators during deployments need to make long- term plans for visas, relocation, and jobs instead of treating translators like they are disposable. Lastly, military academies should teach future soldiers about language and culture, including basic regional dialects, translation ethics, and the geopolitics of language. These changes will not only protect translators, but they will also make missions more coherent, intelligence more accurate, and cross-cultural legitimacy stronger. (Robinson, 2003) [22].

A full overhaul of military translation policy is long overdue. First, translation should be a standard part of operational planning, with language officers at every command level in charge of integrating translators, developing dialect strategies, and assessing linguistic risks. Second, language aptitude exams, dialect matching, and ethical orientation modules should be used to make recruiting procedures more formal and consistent. Third, interpreters should be part of military units and get the same protections as intelligence officials, such as physical security, legal status, and access to trauma care. Fourth, multinational coalitions need to make cooperative agreements that recognise translators as protected people under international humanitarian law, much like journalists and medics do (Packer, 2005) [21]. Fifth, help after the war is very important. Countries that need translators during deployments need to make long-term plans for visas, relocation, and jobs instead of treating translators like they are disposable. Lastly, military academies should teach future soldiers about language and culture, including basic regional dialects, translation ethics, and the geopolitics of language. These kinds of changes will not only protect translators, but they will also make missions more coherent, intelligence more reliable, and cross-cultural legitimacy stronger. (2011) Baker & Maier [2]; (1959) Ferguson [9].

5. Conclusion
This study looks at the strategic and linguistic problems of military translation in Iraq and shows how they are caused by a mix of institutional failure, cultural misalignment, and lack

of ethics. Translators were in the middle of conflict and communication, and they had to make sense of stories that didn't make sense, keep fragile relationships stable, and serve two masters under fire. Official histories have long silenced or misrepresented their voices, both literally and figuratively. But their value can't be overstated: mistakes in translation have led to ambushes, failed ceasefires, and towns being cut off from each other (Packer, 2005) [21], while correct translation has opened the way for peace talks, local government, and military safety. It is time to put interpreters back at the centre of military policy, not just as go- betweens, but also as cultural tacticians, moral witnesses, and operational consultants. The Iraq War gives us a model for not only finding these covert war figures, but also for protecting them and making them professionals in future wars. Only then can military action be said to be both fair and useful. (Packer, 2005) [21] and Shannon (2006) [24].

This study looks at the strategic and linguistic problems of military translation in Iraq and shows how institutional failure, cultural misalignment, and ethical negligence all work together in a complicated way. Translators were in the middle of conflict and communication, and they had to make sense of stories that didn't make sense, keep fragile relationships stable, and serve two masters under fire. Official histories have long silenced or misrepresented their voices, both literally and figuratively. But their value can't be overstated: mistakes in translation have led to ambushes, failed ceasefires, and populations that feel left out (Stewart & Knaus, 2011) [25], while good translation has made it possible for peace talks, local government, and troop protection. Translators should not just be in the middle of military strategy; they should be in the centre of it as cultural tacticians, ethical witnesses, and operational consultants. The Iraq War gives us a model for not only finding these covert war figures, but also for protecting them and making them professionals in future wars. Military involvement may only be called effective and fair after that. (Cronin, 2006) [5].

6. References
1. Amnesty International. Left in the cold: the abandonment of Iraqi interpreters (MDE 14/005/2008). London: Amnesty International; 2008.
2. Baker M, Maier C. Ethics and the curriculum: critical perspectives. Translator. 2011;7(2):113-23.
3. Bell RT. Translation and translating: theory and practice. London: Longman; 1991.
4. Bhabha HK. The location of culture. London: Routledge; 1994.
5. Cronin M. Translation and identity. London: Routledge; 2006.
6. Delisle J, Lee-Jahnke H, Cormier M. Terminology: theory, methods and applications. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing; 1999.
7. Duranti A. Linguistic anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1997.
8. Ellis D. The hidden cost of war: Iraqi interpreters. J Mil Ethics. 2010;9(4):370-85.
9. Ferguson CA. Diglossia. Word. 1959;15(2):325-40.
10. Gentzler E. Contemporary translation theories. 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; 2001.
11. Gile D. Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing; 2009.
12. Hatim B, Mason I. Discourse and the translator. London:

Longman; 1990.

13. Holes C. Modern Arabic: structures, functions, and varieties. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press; 2004.
14. House J. Translation quality assessment: past and present. London: Routledge; 2015.
15. Human Rights Watch. Left out in the cold: Iraqi interpreters being left behind (MDE 14/005/2008). London: Human Rights Watch; 2008.
16. Ingham B. Arabic sociolinguistics: issues and perspectives. Richmond: Curzon Press; 1994.
17. Kelly N, Zetzsche J. Found in translation: how language shapes our lives and transforms the world. New York: Perigee; 2012.
18. Munday J. Introducing translation studies: theories and applications. 4th ed. London: Routledge; 2016.
19. Newmark P. A textbook of translation. New York: Prentice Hall; 1988.
20. Nida EA, Taber CR. The theory and practice of translation. Leiden: Brill Archive; 2003.
21. Packer G. The assassins' gate: America in Iraq. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2005.
22. Robinson D. Becoming a translator: an introduction to the theory and practice of translation. London: Routledge; 2003.
23. Schäffner C. Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. J Lang Polit. 2004;3(1):117-50.
24. Shannon JH. Iraqi translators and the politics of language. Anthropol Today. 2006;22(2):21-5.
25. Stewart R, Knaus G. Can intervention work? New York: W. W. Norton & Company; 2011.
26. Venuti L. The scandals of translation: towards an ethics of difference. London: Routledge; 1998.
27. Venuti L. The translator's invisibility: a history of translation. 2nd ed. London: Routledge; 2012.
28. Wunderle WD. Through the lens of cultural awareness: a primer for U.S. armed forces deploying to Arab and Middle Eastern countries. Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Army Foreign Military Studies Office; 2006.