



ISRAELI MEDIA REPORTING OF THE ISRAEL– PALESTINE CONFLICT: AN ECO- LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

Dr. Saiqa Siddiq Danish
saiqasadiq@gu.edu.pk

Associate Professor, Dept. of English Language and Literature, GU,
D.I.K.

Muhammad Mueed Khan
abdulmueed1255@gmail.com

MPhil Scholar, Dept. of English Language and Literature, GU, D.I.K.

Mudassir Saleem
mudasirktk663@gmail.com

Lecturer, Dept. of English Language and Literature, GU, D.I.K.

Abstract

The researchers use Arran Stibbe's eco-linguistic approach, for analysing the coverage of the Israeli–Palestinian war from 7 October 2023 to 31 March 2025 in two Israeli English-language newspapers: The Jerusalem Post and The Times of Israel. The analysis of some 200 news reports and opinion reveal a clear trend: When the Israelis die or when Israelis are threatened, the language is vivid, emotionally charged, and agent-centred; when Palestinians die, they are generally represented in passive, nominalized or generalized constructions. However, the destruction in Gaza and the West Bank including the destruction of farms, contamination of groundwater, destruction of olive trees and estimated 39 million tons of rubble, are largely missing from media coverage. This damage is offered as “collateral” and “inevitable” rather than “ecological damage.” The rhetoric in the newspapers further dehumanise, sanitise the environment and effects of violence, using metaphors such as surgical strikes, precision operations, mowing the lawn. These linguistic selections further exacerbate and influence public perception and validate the ongoing destruction of Palestinian society and its ecological basis. As such, the Israeli media discourse in the occupation, as it appears, has become normal in the context of ecocide, and eco-centric counter-discourses have to be developed in conflict journalism.

Keywords: *Eco-Linguistics, Environmental Destruction, Erasure, Israel-Palestine Conflict, Media Bias, Metaphor, Salience.*

Corresponding Author: Dr. Saiqa Siddiq Danish (Associate Professor; Dept. of English Language and Literature, GU, D.I.K.)
Email: saiqasadiq@gu.edu.pk

1. Introduction

The warfare in the modern world, with all its fancy guns and protracted battles, destroys the ecosystems using airbursts, chemical dumping, logging, soil slick-away and polluted rivers, and exterminated species. They are not mere side-effects, but components of strategy and remain decade's long, disrupting post-war recovery and sustainability policies of the world. The historical survey of the wars also reveals how detrimental their effect had been on the delicate balance of the environment. The U.S. used an herbicide called Agent Orange that contained dioxins and sprayed 4.5 million plus acres of forest and farmlands during the Vietnam War (1955-1975), destroying mangrove systems and contaminating the soil and water. The consequences resulted in massive areas of crop-killed generations (Westing, 2013). This shows how explosives and chemical weapons used in the wars became the source of ecological and environmental destruction.

The similar tendencies continue to appear in more recent wars and become even stronger when it comes to climate change. Taking the lives of half a million people and destroying a fifth of farmland, drained aquifers, and polluted air with bomb factories, Syria increased the severity of droughts and the ecosystem was put out of condition (UNEP, 2023). Deforestation and soil erosion were colossal and 13million displaced persons were pressed on the biodiversity of the coast. Wars spawn pollution, trash and destruction of ecosystems which spill out into food security, water, health and the economy, a fact thumped by UNEP Executive Director Inger Andersen.

Consider the case of Israel- Palestine conflict, it is a classic example of how history, land based issues and power imbalances can turn into a decade long crisis. The military retaliation at the time by Israel resulted in more than 43,000 Palestinians deaths (Gaza Health Ministry), massive displacement, and what UNEP describes as unprecedented environmental deterioration. By the end of July 2025, 86 percent of agricultural land was destroyed in Gaza, 1.5 percent remained accessible and untouched, and tree cover had dropped as far down to 80 percent by January 2025. The soil was trampled, polluted with munitions, massive bombardment, and demolitions and bulldozers packed the ground, which threatened to decertify the ground. In the West Bank, settler attacks and military action have killed or destroyed over 50,000 olive trees since October 2023 as monitored by Palestinian observatory units. That is not collateral damage; it is systematic ecological violence that undermines food security, the health of the people, and the viability of future generations. It destroys the pre-war Gaza self-sufficiency in veggies, eggs, milk, poultry and fish by an enormous 90 percent (FAO, 2025).

The media coverage is critical in the way we perceive armed conflicts. In a nutshell, it determines what components of reality human, political or ecological, are emphasized or neglected. These prejudices in the Israel-Palestine conflict are even larger due to the historical imbalance and issues of access. The intercept, analysing U.S. media, NYT,

WaPo, CNN, between October 2023 and September 2025, found that the death of Israelis is much more frequently characterized with emotional terms, such as tragic or heartbreaking, but the situation in the occupation is not mentioned in 85 percent of the stories (Greenberg, 2025). A 2024 Al Jazeera Media Institute report found that 70 per cent of Western outlets rely on Israeli sources to include stories that portray Palestinian resistance as terrorism with no historical context (Zaffar and Thakur, 2024). In 2024, a CPJ report indicates that 70 percent of the journalists assassinated that year were Palestinian, which was mostly unnoticed by Western media and erased witness to ecocide.

Angles concerning the environment are particularly under-reported. Media discourses render non-human life and environments invisible to normalize ecocide as an element of human rights violations into the category of the destructive stories we live by (Stibbe, 2015). The 2025 data provided by UNEP indicates, of the 2024-2025 articles of major outlets, it is only 2.00 per cent that reference the ecological collapse in Gaza, in a scan conducted by Media Matters (Berkowitz, 2025). More than 50,000 olive trees in the West Bank were destroyed by the Israelis but this act was not defined as an ecocide but as agricultural damage, a scenario that ignores the cultural and biodiversity losses (OCHA, 2025). This is all compounding the problem of misunderstandings, dislodging ecological narratives and debilitating eco-justice.

Ecolinguistics would perhaps allow us to bridge this divide. Arran Stibbe (2015, 2021) introduced this concept to examine the effects of language in determining the relationship between humans, other species and the environment and this impacts us back in the way we think and behave with ecological systems. The framework by Stibbe consists of eight tools, and three of them are particularly applicable salience (as moving some objects closer and others further away), erasure (leaving some things or perspectives out), and metaphor (how we map things to form our perception and justification). Through these tools, we see that discourses make the stories we live by, some of which are life sustaining, ambivalent and destructive.

1.1. Research Questions

1. How is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict represented in Israeli newspapers?
2. What lexico-grammatical choices are used to highlight or erase different aspects of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in media reports?
3. In what ways does the Israeli media's representation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict reflect an ambivalent, beneficial, or destructive attitude towards the environment

1.2. Literature Review

Past research on discourse has emphasized on war rhetoric but did not put much emphasis on Eco-linguistics as applied in Israel-Palestine. In a critical discourse analysis of the topic of language of conflict and peace, Chilwa (2024) describes how the language conceptually supports the initiation and resolution. The current CDA study provides

scholarly research on the role of discourse in creating social and political reality which shapes the problem of interpersonal conflicts and international security. It presents the position that CDA offers powerful approaches to analyzing war-peace discourses, analyzing special issues topics and linguistic strategies in contexts, and developing the role of language in conflict and peace (Chiluwa, 2024).

Based on textual analysis and CDA of war speeches, Chiluwa and Ruzaita (2024) evaluate the political speech of Vladimir Putin and Volodymyr Zelensky. They explore discursive schemes that make language structures historical, cultural and political agenda, influencing the relations between Russia and Ukraine, as well as Eastern Europe (Chiluwa and Ruzaita, 2024).

Oddo (2011) discusses the rhetoric that promotes war, comparing the strategy of legitimation used by Roosevelt (imitative/thematic) in the case of WWII with the one to Iraq used by George H. W. Bush. Through the analysis of the lexical items that are polarizing and take the form of us/them, Oddo demonstrates how leaders shape the mind of the populace, discard competitors and justify violence against those who are not aggressive (Oddo, 2011).

In a study of the framing of the Russian- Ukrainian war in the global media, Pawliszko (2025) uses metaphors, nominalization, and appraisal language to study how the war was framed in global media. Based on the analysis of the headlines published in The New York Times, The Moscow Times, and The Guardian (Feb–Mar 2022), he examines how editorial positions, socio-political backgrounds and ideologies influence the coverage. The perceptions are shaped by metaphors (e.g., economy, story, journey, game) and appraisal; the Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Systemic Functional Linguistics demonstrate that political and cultural aspects shape the creation of media memories, suggesting a combined approach to comprehending popular opinion and international relations (Pawliszko, 2025).

Kareem (2018) explores the process of how Saddam Hussein was created in the US media during the Iraq-Iran War. Kareem examines discourse using DHA (corpus linguistics and CDA) to respond to the following question: How was Saddam Hussein discursively constructed (1980-1988)? The US media presented Saddam by cashing on the Arab-Persian animosity to unite the Iraqis, developing a personality cult through blackmail and media, and pursuing the Gulf hegemony analogous to Stalin/Kim Il-Sung. The US media did not perceive either Iran or Iraq as a winner, portraying Saddam as an aggressive state on Israel/Arab countries and Iran as a Shiite expansionist (Kareem, 2018).

Cap (2023) analyses episodes of geopolitical presentation to the Russia Ukraine war discourse (Journal of Pragmatics). He refers to the global/local spatial representations schemas, circling around Global Conflict Reality (GCR: expanding international repercussions) and Local Conflict Reality (LCR: sub-narratives to audience like Russians,

Ukrainians, the West, the Global South) with critical cognitive discourse and narrative tools (Cap, 2023).

The current research is based on the discourse of war and conflict in various perspectives (CDA, political analysis). Nevertheless, none of them dwell upon the Israel-Palestine dialogue and implement Eco-linguistics to the environment, which creates the gap that the research in question will bridge by examining the representations within the framework provided by Stibbe.

Despite extensive documentation of both media bias in Israel–Palestine coverage and the unprecedented environmental devastation caused by the current war (UNEP, 2025), no scholarly work has yet applied an eco-linguistic lens to Israeli English-language media discourse.

3. Methodology

In the current research work, the researchers have studied the selected newspaper through Arran Stibbe's *Ecolinguistics: Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By* (2015). Along with Eco-linguistics, the researchers used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to unearth the narratives related to the environment embedded into news text. The approach in eco-linguistics shows how environmental concerns depend upon word choices (Stibbe, 2015). The researchers also reveal the underlying eco-sophism in the news text. The research paradigm, approach, data collection, and data analysis are discussed in the chapter.

3.1. Research Paradigm

Meanings are relative, context-dependent and culturally, historically and ideologically framed in ecolinguistic studies. The researchers have an interpretivist perspective, namely, the idea that reality is socially and discursively constructed. Interpretivism is different from positivist approaches, which aim to uncover universal laws. Interpretivism is grounded in the issue of subjectivity, context and reflexivity, which are not the features of positivist approaches searching for generalisable laws. Thematic analysis is also used in the study in this paradigm, which lets us identify and analyze general themes and patterns in the main media texts of Israel. The researchers consider how representations of the conflict are created in media discourse, while excluding non-human actors and ecological harm. Ecolinguistic patterns are grouped together by themes through the analytical process of thematic analysis, with an emphasis on salience, erasure and metaphor. With this method the researchers can investigate the ideologies and eco-linguistic assumptions that are embedded in the politically driven discourse in media, and how language influences perceptions of the human and environmental impacts of the conflict.

3.2. Research Approach

The researchers use a mixed methods approach: quantitative and qualitative methods are used to analyse Israeli media coverage of the Israeli Palestinian conflict. The primary data for analysis are from selected newspapers, The Jerusalem Post and The Times of Israel. The quantitative part has been analysed based on the frequency, distribution, collocations and patterns of keywords that are relevant for the analysis using corpus-based techniques with the program AntConc. This offers tangible proof of the media's attention to certain issues or not. The qualitative analysis is based upon the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Arran Stubbe's ecolinguistic analysis. The analysis is directed towards three concepts: salience, erasure, and metaphor. These ideas can be used to determine the emphasis, exclusion and representation of certain elements in the language. The quantitative results can be triangulated with the qualitative interpretation, thereby enhancing the analysis and giving a wider picture of the media discourse.

3.3. Corpus

The researchers have created a corpus of 200 news articles which are randomly chosen in both newspapers during the given time period. The articles were of the English-language versions of The Jerusalem Post and The Times of Israel, dated between 7 October 2023 and 31 March 2025.

The articles have been collected via purposive sampling, i.e., by searching the official websites and archives of the newspapers with the help of the keywords (ex: Gaza, Hamas, IDF, airstrike, West Bank, olive trees, ground operation).

3.4. Data Analysis

The researchers qualitative technique is based on the eco-linguistic framework described through Stubbe (2015) and guided through the essential discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2010). The analysis consists of three major steps:

Close reading and preliminary coding: The researchers read both articles repeatedly in order to identify regular linguistic occurrences concerning the manner in which human actors, military actions, casualties, and environmental outcomes were represented.

Use of the fundamental tools of Stubbe:

Salience: The researchers look at such aspects as Israeli security, Palestinian suffering, ecological destruction, etc. and adopt which elements are foregrounded by position, repetition, and detail.

Erasure: The researchers present systematic deletion, especially of non-human life, ecosystems, and ecological harm within the long time.

Metaphor: The researchers examine conceptual metaphors (e.g., surgical strikes, mowing the lawn) which normalize or naturalize violence and also observe additional trends of transitivity, nominalization as well as the appraisal in case there are any.

Interpretation with regard to stories we live by: linguistic patterns are assessed on

the basis of whether they encourage constructive, indifferent or destructive attitudes to the living world.

3.5. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework established in this study is the eco-linguistic framework by Arran Stibbe (Stibbe, 2015). The framework examines how our language use is a reflection and formation of relationships with the larger more-than-human world. Central to it is the concept of stories-we-live-by, which are narratives that are culturally embedded that guide our behavior and attitudes towards ecological systems. Stibbe divides discourses into three groups including beneficial and ambivalent and destructive discourses, depending on whether they can contribute to the well-being of humans, other species, and the ecosystems which support us.

Stibbe model employs three core tools that are used in the course of this paper:

Salience: This examines the process by which some items (such as the Israeli security issues versus the destruction of the environment) are put in focus using placements, repetitions, and description.

Erasure: This is concerned with the methodical exclusion or marginalization of things like non-human life, ecosystems and long-term ecological damage, which ecologically speaking ought to exist.

Metaphor: This examines the conceptual mappings (like calling military violence surgery or mowing the lawn) which are used to make the destruction be invisible and its effects on living systems be softened.

Such tools are supplemented, when necessary, with other linguistic patterns, such as transitivity, nominalization, and appraisal, which were provided by the systemic-functional linguistics (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014) and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2010). Collectively, they enable an analytical evaluation of either the presence of the corpora supporting destructive anthropocentric and nationalist narratives that disregard Palestinian land and ecologies or the presence of vestiges of advantageous eco-sophism. The framework presented by Stibbe is particularly helpful in this case since it provides clear normative standards (eco-sophism) to evaluate discourse based on the well-being of living systems and there we find ourselves extremely above description and into critique and the potential of resistance in the form of counter-discourses.

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1. Salience: Security, Military Action and Israeli Victimhood

The first major discovery relates to the salience of military and security discourse. The word "strike" appeared 1,842 times in the corpus and the word "terror" appeared 1,156 times in the corpus. The analysis of the thesis argues that this vocabulary has prioritised military action and security concerns in the representation of conflicts. The linguistic salience of military action is important because it sets the conceptual frames in which

readers are introduced to the conflict. If striking, terror, operation, target and related words are used more often than others, it becomes a story mostly about military actors and security threats. In contrast, ecological language has minimal discursive space. Forest and farming references, water pollution, birds and other biodiversity aspects seem to be mentioned only sporadically and are usually not spoken for in the newspapers' own voice but rather in quotes from outside sources. This pattern is used to illustrate Stibbe's concept of salience, where focusing on one dimension of reality to the fore, the other is to the background.

Peace activism can be the discourse of life as it offers an alternative to military confrontation. The detailed corpus analysis, however, reveals only six occurrences of the term "peace activists" and many of these are in the background, in the non-hard news part of the corpus. The word "peacemaker" is used in only nine of the 39,000 verses in the Bible, most of which refer to external situations, not specific actors in Israel or Palestine. From an ecolinguistic point of view, it is significant that only a small portion of peace activism is salient. From an ecolinguistic point of view, it is important that only a small part of peace activism is salient. Peace-oriented discourse opens up opportunities for a shared land, coexistence, restoration and environmental recovery. However, these kinds of stories are still subordinate to military language. The analysis further shows that the discourse of the ceasefire is not strongly represented. The term "humanitarian ceasefire" is only mentioned 14 times, mostly in connection with Russia, China, and Arab states, and is not considered an internalised language. So, the militaristic narrative is more prominent than the peaceful narrative.

The most robust ecolinguistic result is regarding environmental erasure. While the corpus does have some mention of environmental destruction, this is unevenly reliant on the outside voices of UN reports and experts. In the case of water pollution or poisoned water + Gaza, there were only seven such instances recorded, and in all instances the water pollution or poisoned water is mentioned in a quotation from UN or experts, not from the voice of the newspapers. In the same manner, references to wastewater and sanitation are mostly limited to the quoted wording. This is an important difference between saying something about the ecological damage and discursively attributing the ecological damage. Environmental destruction is not just absent from the corpus. On the contrary, environmental damage is usually: 1. infrequent; 2. backgrounded; 3. placed outside headlines; 4. assigned to other bodies; and 5. expressed through passive or agentless constructions. This is, for instance, the case with terms related to dirty water and ruined sanitation, where the agent is not clearly identified. A CDA perspective identified these grammatical structures as lowering agency. From an ecolinguistic point of view they serve to cause erasure since the ecological effect is separated from the human and political process that has created it.

An additional crucial space of erasure is agricultural devastation. 17 mentions of forests, shrubland or trees and damage, nine mentions of olive trees and 14 mentions of farmland/cropland destruction are recorded in the corpus. The analysis of the theses also reveals that these terms do not occur frequently in the headlines and that agency is not always mentioned or present in the background. What is especially striking is the mutability of the ecological damage in relation to the linguistic visibility of it. Although environmental assessments suggest high losses of agricultural land and trees, these losses are not given the same emphasis in the corpus as military operations. The olive tree is particularly significant because it is an ecological, economic and cultural element. The loss is thus more than a loss in agriculture. With an ecolinguistic approach, the link between environmental destruction and livelihood and cultural identity is made visible.

One of the most obvious instances of ecological erasure is the treatment of birds. The literal terms bird/birds are used only three times in the corpus while the phrase kill two birds with one stone is used nine times. More important, there are no instances of bird combined with words used in conjunction with death or habitat/migration. This makes an important contrast between the two languages, from the ecolinguistic point of view. While there are representations of birds in an idiomatic expression that represents the pursuit of strategic goals, there are no representations of non-human victims of environmental destruction. This is double erasure from Stibbe's point of view. Non-human life is erased as a 'material object of war' while its 'lexical object' remains a human metaphor for war strategy. Non-human life erased as 'material object of war', its 'lexical object' remains a human metaphor for war strategy. The discovery is testament to the anthropocentric architecture of conflict reporting: life systems are important for human discourse, but not for their own demise.

The third major finding concerns the recurrent use of military, medical and natural-disaster metaphors.

There are 312 instances of the word surgical or precision strike, or both, and the frequency of the word surgical, precision, or both is about 1.79 per thousand words. 73% of such occurrences are in a headline or lead, with the most potent evaluative collocate being associated with successful or targeted. Only some 3% of cases are directly challenged or contradicted in the corpus. The metaphor is compelling because in most cases surgery is seen as precision, expertise and intervention. For when the attack by the military is mimicked in the metaphor of a surgical operation, destruction can be perceived as a controlled medical operation in contrast to violence against civilians, infrastructure and ecosystems. The ecolinguistic problem cannot simply be the presence of the metaphor. It is because the metaphor creates a conceptual context in which destruction looks like being technically managed and morally required. There is an identified related cluster: clean, accurate, eliminate and neutralise. This is a reinforcement of the link between

military action and purification. This medical metaphor excludes the environmental impacts of bombardment on the ruined soil, rubble, polluted water and destroyed ecosystems. What happens is that the war is divorced from the actual physical and ecological impacts on the planet.

In addition, 189 times the cluster root out/eradicate terror is recorded in the corpus. Medical terms like cancer and metastasise have the closest collocational connection. The metaphor is a creation of terror as a disease that must be eliminated. This can be a way of making military violence seem like medical treatment. An ecolinguistic point of view has the potential to treat complex political and social entities as a disease. It also veils material aspects of the treatment, buildings, agricultural land, water systems and ecosystems are secondary to the imagined elimination of the “disease”. Therefore, the metaphor performs some sort of ideological function, limiting the range of interpretation that audiences might read into the image.

Another key pattern is the natural disaster metaphors. The term wave of terror is used about 87 times, whereas other related clusters of storm, wave, flood, and tsunami are used about 68 times in the corpus. The analysis reveals that about 93% of the cluster of storm, wave, flood is related to Palestinian, Hamas activities. By contrast, the same kind of phrase and comparison with Israeli/settler violence is almost nonexistent and is mainly found in foreign/international quotes. This metaphorical pattern is important because natural disasters are typically recognized as forces that have great power over people, and they are beyond human control. Violence can then be represented as a storm, a wave or a flood, which can render the human behaviour of the represented actor invisible as intentional and/or in control of the action, and make the counter-violence of the opposing military actors seem rational and understandable, as a measure of defence. Metaphorical also has ecological implications. A wave or storm is destructive of nature by itself, but applied selectively to one group's actions becomes an apparently natural phenomenon—political violence. This can lead to the next military action seeming equally inevitable.

The results illustrate that the environmental aspect of the Israel-Palestine conflict is not only not mentioned quantitatively, but also is linguistically structured in a specific way. The first one is salience. There is significant lexical and discursive focus on military actions, security and Israeli victimhood. Words like strike and terror are used much more often than words relating to ecological harm. Peace activism and humanitarian cease fire language is relatively underdeveloped. The second is erasure. There is no complete lack of environmental harm, it's just not that noticeable. Limited attention to water pollution, damaged sanitation systems, destruction of agriculture, trees and non-human life. Damage to the environment is often blamed on those outside of the agency or is stated in terms of no agency. The third one is metaphorical sanitisation. Medical and cleaning metaphors are used repeatedly to conceptualise military violence. Surgical strike, for example, is linked

to the precision of the bombardment and to the treatment. The wave/storm of terror metaphor, on the other hand, describes Palestinian violence as an uncontrollable natural force. All these three processes create what Stibbe calls destructive stories-we-live-by. The stories are not just about events, they create human relationships with non-human life and environment. The study, in other words, implies that ecological erasure and human-centred conflict reporting go hand in hand. If there is no environment, then violence can be seen primarily as a struggle between the political actors. Once the ecological impacts are apparent, though, the conflict assumes another level: damage to water, soil, agriculture, biodiversity and the future of a livelihood. This is especially significant since ecological harm can be one type of slow violence. Contaminated water, destroyed soil and agricultural systems can be harmful for years as compared to an explosion or a reported death. They are also temporally dispersed and less amenable to the present-focussed and event-driven nature of traditional news reporting. The results also reinforce the idea of having to go beyond an anthropocentric approach to conflict reporting. Reporting on suffering would not be supplanted by an eco-centric approach. Rather, it would show the interdependency of human and environmental.

5. Conclusion

In this study, 200 hard-news articles from the Jerusalem Post and The Times of Israel were examined using an ecolinguistic analysis to reflect on how the conflict between Israel and Palestine has been represented over the last two years (7 October 2023 to 31 March 2025). The analysis shows three connections. The first is salience: In the eyes of the first, military operations, security and Israeli victimhood are privileged. The military language is especially dominant and the language of peace activism and ecological concerns is marginal. Secondly, erasure makes the environment a hidden victim of conflict. Water pollution, broken sanitation systems, destruction of agriculture, olive trees, the preservation of biodiversity and non-human life are much less noticeable than the military and political events. When environmental references do appear, they are more often provided by outsiders or international bodies and not in the newspapers' own reporting style. Third, metaphor helps to sanitise and naturalise violence. Surgical strike, precision strike, and root out terror, wave of terror and storm of violence are the military violence constructions, which are metaphors of medicine, cleanliness and natural disaster. The findings thus indicate that conflict reporting not only shapes what readers know about war, but also shapes the visibility of what kinds of victims. If humans are killed extensively and ecological damage is given lip service, nature becomes a victim, and is not a background. The study's contribution is thus two-fold. Theoretically, it showcases the potential of ecolinguistics for analysing conflict journalism in general and the Israeli English-language news discourse in particular. Methodologically, it shows how the corpus-assisted analysis could be merged with qualitative ecolinguistic interpretation in

order to understand the pattern of salience, erasure and metaphor. The study does not call for de-substitution of humanitarian reporting by environmental reporting. Instead, this paper proposes to read the two together. Functioning water systems, agricultural land, biodiversity and healthy ecosystems are important for human wellbeing. Thus, any conflict journalism should be telling the stories of the destruction of people and the destruction of their surroundings.

Reference

- Berkowitz, L. (2025). Erased from the frame: Environmental destruction in Gaza coverage. *Media Matters for America*.
- Cap, P. (2023). Geopolitical narratives in Russia-Ukraine war discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 205, 76–89.
- Chiluwa, I. (2024). The language of conflict and peace: Critical discourse studies perspectives. *John Benjamins*.
- Chiluwa, I., & Ruzaite, J. (2024). War rhetoric of Vladimir Putin and Volodymyr Zelensky: A critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 35(4), 412–430.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations & United Nations Satellite Centre. (2025). Satellite-based damage assessment of agricultural land in the Gaza Strip (September 2025 update). *FAO*.
- Greenberg, S. (2025, September 15). Asymmetries in empathy: U.S. media coverage of Israeli and Palestinian deaths, October 2023–September 2025. *The Intercept*.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Kareem, A. (2018). The discursive construction of Saddam Hussein in U.S. media (1980–1988). *Discourse & Communication*, 12(5), 456–478.
- Oddo, J. (2011). War legitimization discourse: A critical analysis of American presidential rhetoric. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 10(3), 285–310.
- Pawliszko, A. (2025). Metaphors and appraisal in global media framing of the Russia-Ukraine war. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 57, Article 100756.
- Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (1st ed.). Routledge. AND Stibbe, A. (2021). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2023). *Environmental impact of the war in Syria*. UNEP.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2025). Environmental impact of the escalation of conflict in the Gaza Strip: September 2025 assessment. UNEP.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. (2025, June 25). Gaza reported impact snapshot | 25 June 2025. OCHA official report

Westing, A. H. (2013). Arthur Westing: Pioneer on the environmental impact of war. Springer.

Zaffar, A., & Thakur, R. (2024). Media bias in the Israel-Palestine conflict: An Al Jazeera Institute report. Al Jazeera Media Institute.