

ABSTRACT

Metaphors in the “Fight” Against Human Trafficking under the Obama Administration

Ashley N. Morgan, M.A.

Thesis Chairperson: Martin J. Medhurst, Ph.D.

Human trafficking and immigration have become prominent policy issues during Barack Obama’s presidency. In this thesis, I argue that the metaphors used in the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric and those used in immigration rhetoric are mutually constitutive. I examine a number of texts related to human trafficking and immigration produced by the Obama administration, including speeches, statements, public service announcements videos, posters, and government reports for the most prevalent metaphors. By comparing the metaphors used by the Obama administration to describe the practices of human trafficking and immigration, this thesis will illustrate the commonly overlooked interlinkages between human trafficking and immigration rhetoric. The implications this rhetoric has for trafficking and immigration policy and conceptualizations of national identity are explored. This analysis contributes to a deeper theorization of the role of metaphor in human trafficking rhetoric and a better understanding of the relationship between human trafficking and immigration rhetoric.

Metaphors in the "Fight" Against Human Trafficking under the Obama Administration

by

Ashley N. Morgan, B.A.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of Communication

David W. Schleuter, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts

Approved by the Thesis Committee

Martin J. Medhurst, Ph.D., Chairperson

Matthew Gerber, Ph.D.

Sara Alexander, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2014

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2014 by Ashley N. Morgan

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One	1
The US Anti-Trafficking Regime	1
Introduction	1
Justification of the Study	9
Methodology	16
Focus of the Thesis	17
Structure of the Thesis	20
Chapter Two.....	32
Rhetoric, Metaphor and Citizenship	32
Review of Existing Literature.....	32
The Relationship between Trafficking and Immigration.....	41
The Role of Metaphor in Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric.....	45
The Rhetorical Construction of National Identity and Citizenship	48
Chapter Three.....	60
Metaphors in the Obama Administration’s Immigration Rhetoric.....	60
Immigrants as Economic Units.....	61
“Illegal” and/or “Alien”	65
Criminal Immigrants and Crime-ridden Borders.....	69
Infectious Immigrants.....	78
The War on Immigration	81
The United States: A Beacon of Hope.....	84
Conclusion	88
Chapter Four	103
Metaphors in the Obama Administration’s Human Trafficking Rhetoric.....	103
“Trafficking in Persons”	103
Trafficking “Victims”	107
Trafficked Persons v. “Illegal Aliens”	118
Criminal Traffickers.....	121
The “Evil” of Trafficking.....	126
The Scourge of Trafficking in Persons	129
The “War” on Human Trafficking”	131
The United States to the Rescue	135
Conclusion	139
Chapter Five.....	155
The Interrelationship Between Human Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric	155
Mutually Constituted Metaphors	155
Human Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric and Anti-trafficking Policies	157
Human Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric and the Construction of National Identity	158
Conclusion	162
Bibliography	166

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible if it were not for the help of several people. First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis director and mentor, Dr. Martin J. Medhurst. Without his expertise, encyclopedic knowledge, and advice, this thesis could not have been completed. I appreciate his willingness to read and edit all of my drafts. The thesis truly would have lacked direction and pivotal pieces of research were it not for the help of Dr. Medhurst. I would also like to share my great appreciation for the help of Dr. Matthew Gerber in the writing of this thesis. If it were not for Dr. Gerber, I would have been unable to attend Baylor and pursue my academic ambitions. His advice helped me to focus my research efforts. Dr. Sara Alexander deserves acknowledgement for her role in the formulation of my thesis as well. Thanks to her input I was better able to structure my thesis to cater to a wider audience. Each of the members of my thesis committee deserves recognition for their time and patience. I appreciate that each of you were willing to read my work and share your knowledge with me.

I would also like to thank my colleagues and friends in the Department of Communication at Baylor. I need to acknowledge Marilyn Spivey, without whom I would not have been able to work while receiving my education, complete my thesis or graduate. In addition to her work ethic and efficiency, I want to thank her for thoughtfulness and kind words. I am thankful for the support of Dr. Leslie A. Hahner. She helped prompt me to complete my thesis in a timely manner. She has also served as an academic role model.

The members of the Glenn R. Capp Debate Forum should be recognized as well. I would like to give special thanks to Dr. Scott J. Varda. I appreciate his willingness to provide me with life, debate, and thesis advice over the years. I would also like to thank the members of the debate team. Being part of the Glenn R. Capp Debate Forum has helped me to achieve my academic goals and make several friends along the way.

Lastly, but not least, I would like to thank my family and friends. Absent the emotional and financial support given to me by my parents, my pursuit of a college education would not have been possible. My siblings also deserve thanks for being willing to listen to me talk about my thesis. John W. Cook II deserves recognition for lending his time and editing skills as well as for offering me advice and encouragement during the crafting of this thesis. I need to extend a special thank you to Dr. Linda Adams for her role as my mentor, undergraduate thesis director and friend. Without her help, I would have been much less prepared for the process, academically and mentally. My two feline friends deserve acknowledgment for keeping me company on the couch for hours while I wrote my thesis. They constantly reminded me to save my thesis for fear of wandering paws. Finally, I would like to extend a thank you to everyone involved in the crafting of this thesis for your energy, time, and support.

CHAPTER ONE

The US Anti-Trafficking Regime

Introduction

Since 1998, United States anti-trafficking policies have been centered on the “3P” strategy that emphasizes prosecution, protection, and prevention.¹ The Executive Memorandum on the Steps To Combat Violence Against Women and Trafficking in Women and Girls was signed by President Clinton in celebration of International Women’s Day. The memorandum calls attention to the trafficking of women and girls in particular. It acknowledges the existence of trafficking in the United States “for the purposes of forced prostitution, sweatshop labor, and exploitative domestic servitude.”²

The 3P strategy was furthered by the Trafficking Victims Protection Act also referred to as the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA) that was passed in 2000. After the passage of the TVPA, anti-trafficking became a more prominent policy issue. The TVPA and its subsequent reauthorizations are the primary pieces of legislation that delineate US anti-trafficking efforts. The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 defines “severe forms of trafficking” as either “sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such an act has not attained 18 years of age” and/or “the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.”³ The “3P” approach was extended in the TVPRA of 2013, which was signed into law by President Obama.⁴

Prosecution includes the criminalization of trafficking. The TVPA criminalizes forced labor and the trafficking of persons.⁵ These TVPA prohibitions are an extension of the legal restrictions against slavery and child prostitution that predated its enactment.⁶ Trafficking carries deservedly harsh sentences under US law. Sex trafficking penalties range from 10 years to life imprisonment.⁷

“Protection” of trafficking victims includes immigration relief and other forms of assistance. The three forms of immigration relief that are given to trafficking victims from outside the United States under the TVPA are “continued presence, which allows temporary immigration relief and may allow work authorization for potential victims who are also potential witnesses in an investigation or prosecution;” the “T visa,” which provides “legal immigration status for up to four years for victims who cooperate with reasonable law enforcement requests for assistance with an investigation or prosecution;” and the “U visa.”⁸ The T visa can serve as a pathway to legal permanent resident status and T visa holders are eligible for benefits that are essentially the same as those allotted to refugees.⁹ U Visa holders can likewise seek permanent residency after a period of three years.¹⁰

Trafficked persons are unable to access immigration relief without going through law enforcement authorities. As such, a considerable amount of discretion is given to law enforcement officials in the implementation of anti-trafficking policies. In order to be eligible for continued presences status or the T visa, one must prove that he or she is a victim of a “severe form of trafficking in persons,” physically present in the United States due to trafficking, have “complied with any reasonable request for assistance in the investigation...of acts of trafficking” and “would suffer extreme hardship involving

unusual and severe harm upon removal.”¹¹ In short, eligibility for the T visa is conditioned upon cooperation with law enforcement.¹² This cooperation is proven through an official endorsement from the law enforcement agency in charge of the related criminal investigation.¹³ It is still possible to obtain a T visa without obtaining a certification of endorsement from a law enforcement agency. However, it is much more difficult for such applicants to prove their status as a trafficked person. They are required to provide secondary sources such as police reports and news articles. They must write a statement about what they tried to do to obtain formal endorsement from a law enforcement agency.¹⁴ They also have to prove that they were unable to leave the country before law enforcement officials became involved in their case.¹⁵ Such trafficked persons are forced to take responsibility for their apparent failure to escape their situation. All T visa applicants must petition for themselves and not even their attorneys can request immigration benefits for them.¹⁶ This prevents many people from accessing benefits because they often must risk being deported for the chance to access immigration relief.

Applicants for the U visa face similar requirements. Beneficiaries of the U visa must:

[1] have suffered substantial physical or mental abuse as a result of having been a victim of a qualifying criminal activity. [2] The individual must have information concerning that criminal activity. [3] The individual must have been helpful, is being helpful, or is likely to be helpful in the investigation or prosecution of the crime. [4] The criminal activity violated U.S. laws.¹⁷

There is no fixed standard for adjudicating whether an individual has suffered “substantial physical or mental abuse.”¹⁸ This gives law enforcement officials an extraordinary amount of leeway in determining eligibility for the U visa. In addition, individuals must cooperate with law enforcement in the criminal investigation and/or

prosecution of their traffickers.¹⁹ The cooperation eligibility requirement for the U visa is only waived for applicants that are under the age of sixteen or are unable to aid investigators due to incapacitation or incompetence.²⁰ To prove that a person is willing to cooperate with the prosecution of their traffickers, they must be certified by the “agencies responsible for investigating or prosecuting the crime.”²¹ One of the features unique to the U visa, in contrast to the T visa, is that representatives of the crime victim are able to petition and cooperate on behalf of the trafficked.²² While this represents more lenience than is allowed for T visa petitions, it does not allow petitioners to sidestep the requirement that they cooperate with law enforcement.

The law enforcement cooperation requirements coupled with quantitative limitations on the amount of visas have resulted in limited access to the “protection” provided by the TVPA. While it is estimated that 17,500 people are trafficked into the United States annually, only 616 victims received T visas between 2000 and 2007. In 2009, 313 T visas were issued and only 299 “victim-witnesses” were granted the right to “continued presence.”²³ There is a numerical cap of five thousand for the T visa, yet the United States continuously fails to meet this cap.²⁴ There is a cap of ten thousand on the U visa.²⁵ Unlike the T visa, trafficked persons are not the only people that are forced to compete under the cap for the U visa. Criminal activity for the sake of determining U visa eligibility ranges from rape to witness tampering to perjury.²⁶ Despite the wide range of crime victims potentially eligible for the U visa, the US government has failed to issue them. From 2000 to 2009 only sixty-five individuals were approved for U-1 visas.²⁷ For the first eight years after its inception, the U visa was only temporarily approved.²⁸ It was

not until the summer of 2009 that roughly sixteen hundred U visas were granted.²⁹ Like the T visa, the U visa cap has never been met.

Prevention efforts are centered on raising awareness about trafficking. Prevention messages are focused on decreasing the demand for “commercial sex and cheap labor to which traffickers respond.”³⁰ The President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking (PITF) is the agency in charge of implementing the TVPA and directs the Senior Policy Operating Group (SPOG) in the enforcement of anti-trafficking measures and the coordination of prevention efforts amongst different governmental agencies.³¹ Ambassador-at-Large Luis CdeBaca in the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons at the US Department of State is the chair of the SPOG.³²

Awareness-raising efforts involve a collection of government agencies, such as the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and Customs and Border Protection (CBP). The audience for these efforts is intended to be law enforcement officials, the public, and the trafficked. The DHS leads the Blue Campaign, which includes training courses and education materials, such as pamphlets, posters, tear cards, and shoe cards. The Blue Campaign website includes resources for law enforcement. Specifically, it outlines signs that law enforcement officials can use to identify trafficked individuals.³³ The Blue Campaign includes law enforcement training videos and videos on “victim support” for non-federal law enforcement.³⁴ ICE has its own media campaign, “Hidden in Plain Sight,” which produces public service announcement videos and radio segments, billboards, posters, and transit shelter signs.³⁵ The stated goal of the “Hidden in Plain Sight” campaign is to “raise public awareness about the existence of human

trafficking in communities nationwide, and asks members of the public to take action if they encounter possible victims.”³⁶

Prevention efforts taken under the Obama administration include public-private partnerships in which the US government partners with media and film companies with the goal of increasing public awareness about trafficking. This includes the creation of sensationalized accounts of human trafficking. For example, the US government partnered with Priority Films to create the film *Holly* about the sex trafficking of children in Cambodia.³⁷ Although the film was made in 2006, it is being shown in theaters in dozens of major cities in the United States starting April 2014. Another example of government-sponsored popular fictionalized accounts of trafficking includes the Lifetime television movie *Baby Sellers*, which aired in August of 2013. The premiere of *Baby Sellers* was held at the United Nations and attended by several ICE agents.³⁸

Anti-trafficking policy creates a murky line between human trafficking, human smuggling, and undocumented immigration. The line between the two is drawn according to the intent of the migrant in question. The 2009 TIPR illustrates this distinction:

Most formulations used to describe trafficking focus on the trade or buying and selling of people, or they mean something closer to “smuggling,” which relates specifically to movement over borders. These words, including the word trafficking in English, may not adequately capture the most important aspect of the practice: exploitation.³⁹

As Jayashri Srikantiah explains, “The line between trafficking and smuggling is not a clear one: unlawful migrants (including trafficking victims) are typically motivated by various ‘push’ factors, including economic instability, political upheaval, and family situations.”⁴⁰ These same factors are experienced by the trafficked as the undocumented migrant with “the necessary additional catalyst of trafficker force, fraud, or coercion.”⁴¹ It

is left to the discretion of law enforcement officials to determine whether an individual is trafficked or an intentional undocumented migrant.

Trafficking is not just an issue of policy; it is a discursive and rhetorical problem. Trafficking discourse refers not only to verbal discussions of trafficking but also to the concepts, images, advertisements, videos, debates, policies, declarations both verbal and nonverbal, and texts circulated in reference to human trafficking. Trafficking discourse does not occur in a vacuum, but instead interacts with other discourse. It is shaped and shapes cultural conceptions of race, gender, and class. Discussion of US anti-trafficking discourse is a necessary component of any critical analysis of US anti-trafficking policy because the United States “has dominated the construction of the definition of trafficking and its subsequent policy.”⁴² Rhetoric encompasses more than the creation of ideas; it concerns the decision-making process that follows.⁴³ As Martin J. Medhurst argues, rhetoric is involved not only in the presentation of a policy position, but in every step of the process, including:

analysis of what is needed to address a problem, the search for what the policy shall be, the internal debates over specific aspects of that policy, the final decisions as to how the policy shall be framed, [and] the selection of the specific language in which the policy will be encompassed.⁴⁴

The rhetorical treatment of human trafficking affects anti-trafficking policy at all stages. The way that the trafficked and traffickers are rhetorically constructed influences their ability to be identified. Governmental outreach and law enforcement training programs are geared toward educating the public and law enforcement to identify traffickers and the trafficked. The way human trafficking is discussed limits the type of policies deemed appropriate to deal with the problem. It shapes the way that anti-trafficking legislation is implemented and enforced. In short, the way that human trafficking is discussed matters

because human trafficking rhetoric provides the justifications and knowledge production that makes anti-trafficking policies and initiatives possible.

Metaphors, both verbal and visual, play an important role in the rhetorical construction of trafficking. Metaphors illuminate and reify societal views: “As repositories of cultural understandings, metaphors are some of the principal tools with which dominant ideologies and prejudices are represented and reinforced.”⁴⁵ Regardless of the amount of knowledge one already has on trafficking, metaphors can influence the way trafficking is conceived because “metaphors have the ability to transform the meaning of an established concept and they also play an essential role in comprehending aspects of the world that are new or that we do not understand.”⁴⁶ Metaphors are more than just descriptive tools. Metaphors “govern, shape, and frame. And they do so not only on the level of language, but also on the level of perception, conception, and affection.”⁴⁷ Public officials use metaphors as “conceptual instruments that embody otherwise amorphous or remote concepts in ways that the public can readily understand.”⁴⁸ Metaphors shape public reception of speeches by government officials: “metaphors participate in creating fundamental understandings of texts and the rhetorical contexts in which they are situated.”⁴⁹ By extension, trafficking metaphors influence the way that trafficking is perceived and understood.

Presidential and governmental rhetoric on human trafficking shape both public perceptions and law enforcement officials’ perceptions about trafficking. The prevention efforts facilitated by the TVPA and its reauthorizations are targeted toward law enforcement and the public.⁵⁰ In 2012 alone, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) “trained or provided anti-human trafficking materials to over 49,000 people,”

including law enforcement officials and members of the general public.⁵¹ Customs and Border Protection (CBP) “distributed 31,700 human trafficking tear cards, 1,472 shoe cards, and 650 posters to stakeholders.”⁵² ICE billboards and transit shelter signs have been placed in highly visible areas in several major cities including Dallas, New York, Boston, Atlanta, and San Francisco, San Antonio, New Orleans, Los Angeles, Detroit, Philadelphia, St. Paul, Tampa and Miami.⁵³ The “Hidden in Plain Sight” radio public service announcements were aired in English and Spanish in November 2012 in twenty-six cities.⁵⁴ Lacking substantial background knowledge on trafficking, the public is easily persuaded by government discourses on trafficking.⁵⁵ Governmental trafficking rhetoric is also likely to be resonant with law enforcement officials, who look to higher-ranking officials for guidance as to how to enforce anti-trafficking legislation.

Justification of the Study

This is an important time to discuss human trafficking and more specifically, the relationship between human trafficking and immigration. Human trafficking has become an increasingly important policy issue. In Obama’s proclamation in recognition of National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month he identifies trafficking as a focus of his administration. He indicates that “[his] Administration is cracking down on traffickers, charging a record number of perpetrators.”⁵⁶ The related issue of immigration rhetoric is also a timely issue. Immigration reform is a policy priority for the Obama administration.⁵⁷ President Obama has utilized nearly every State of the Union Address, except for the State of the Union in 2009, to emphasize the importance of immigration reform.⁵⁸ In his most recent State of the Union, Obama vowed to enact immigration reform by the end of 2014.

Human trafficking rhetoric is a significant topic of discussion. The human trafficking rhetoric of the Obama administration supports a very particular conceptualization of trafficking, the trafficker, the trafficked, and anti-trafficking efforts through the metaphors utilized to describe all components of trafficking in persons. The very terms utilized to describe the practice involve the invocation of metaphor. The practice of trafficking itself is discussed using movement metaphors typically utilized to describe the trade of inanimate objects.

Traffickers are described as “evil.” For example, in the President’s remarks to the Clinton Global Initiative, he argued that trafficking is “evil” and “barbaric:”

When a little boy is kidnapped, turned into a child soldier, forced to kill or be killed – that’s slavery. When a little girl is sold by her impoverished family – girls my daughters’ age – runs away from home, or is lured by the false promises of a better life, and then imprisoned in a brothel and tortured if she resists – that’s slavery. It is barbaric, and it is evil, and it has no place in a civilized world.⁵⁹

Trafficking is also often described as a dark and inhuman activity. Traffickers are considered criminals and trafficking is commonly linked rhetorically to other forms of crime such as human smuggling, organized crime, and/or terrorism.

The trafficked, on the other hand, are rhetorically reduced to “victims,” lacking any sense of agency. Srikantiah describes this as the victim “mythology” which continuously “fails to grapple with the reality of the trafficking victim’s complex identity and psychological state – one in which the survivor may be both victim and individual actor.”⁶⁰ This method of depicting trafficking victims glosses over the complexity of agency as it relates to trafficking. The motivations that may have caused a person to be led into a trafficking situation or the economic threats used to force someone into trafficking can make a person seem ineligible because he or she are not seen as being

passive enough.⁶¹ The TVPA presents women as more likely victims who are “helpless” and in need of being “rescued and protected.”⁶² Women are seen as more likely victims and thus the primary focus of anti-trafficking discourse. When men are included as potential trafficked persons in anti-trafficking discourse, it is almost as an afterthought. In the 2011 TIP Report, the feminine pronoun is used to describe prostitutes and those with the potential to be trafficked for sex.⁶³ The TIP Report portrays prostitutes as women and men as pimps:

...it is little wonder why anti-trafficking efforts may be received skeptically by a *woman* who has been told – and maybe even shown – that law enforcement would not protect *her* and that the only people who care about *her* are *her* pimp and *his* entourage [emphasis added].⁶⁴

This example illustrates another component of the narrative of human trafficking promoted by the Obama administration; sex trafficking is portrayed as the most dominant form of human trafficking and it is described as being facilitated by the demand for prostitution. People that do not qualify as “victims” are treated as criminals, either as prostitutes or as “illegal aliens.”

Anti-trafficking efforts are characterized by a variety of metaphors. Anti-trafficking efforts are elevated rhetorically to the level of “combat.” For example, the office in the Department of State dedicated to dealing with human trafficking is called the Office To Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. The United States is rhetorically constructed as leader in this “fight.” The United States is often described as “shining a light” on human trafficking.⁶⁵ The United States is also characterized as a “protector” or “savior” of the trafficked.

The human trafficking rhetoric used by the Obama administration is influenced by and furthers existing immigration rhetoric. As Srikantiah argues, “The cultural discourse

about trafficking victims is further shaped by existing stereotypes of undocumented migrants.”⁶⁶ Those who are not identified as trafficked persons are determined to be undocumented immigrants and described using popular immigration metaphors, such as ‘illegal alien.’”⁶⁷ In his remarks regarding the 2010 TIPR, CdeBaca argues that the routes used for “illegal” immigration are the same as those used for trafficking: "You can have a person who's flowing through it who is headed towards a life of indentured servitude. You can have another person who's headed through that route who's simply going to melt into society as an illegal alien.”⁶⁸ Trafficking is rhetorically associated with migration. Despite the fact that the definition of trafficking does not require the crossing of borders for trafficking to have taken place, the border is associated with heightened risk for trafficking. The 2013 TIPR shows this emphasis on immigration: “though by definition human trafficking does not require the crossing of borders, migrant workers—including many women who seek new opportunities—remain especially at risk.”⁶⁹ Increasing numbers of immigration are associated with an increased risk in trafficking. In addition, traffickers are often implicitly described as being ‘foreign.’ Campaigns that show traffickers bringing individuals into the United States create the assumption that traffickers are ‘foreign.’⁷⁰ This adds a racial component to the identification of traffickers. Trafficking is associated not only with metaphorical darkness, but with physical blackness.⁷¹

The way that human trafficking is conceptualized and anti-trafficking policies are formed has important implications for the trafficked. Certain groups are largely excluded in the human trafficking rhetoric utilized by the Obama administration. Within dominant anti-trafficking discourse, there are vast amounts of trafficked groups that are left out, or

at the very least deemphasized, due to the gendered notion of the iconic “victim.” These groups include trafficked men, individuals trafficked for non-sexual labor, and individuals that exert a degree of free will within their individual trafficking scenario.⁷² These groups are excluded for various reasons. Men are excluded because it is considered unlikely that they could be coerced, overpowered or manipulated.⁷³ The emphasis on sex trafficking deemphasizes other forms of trafficking. Individuals who exercise autonomy are not considered to be trafficked persons because they migrated willingly.

Human trafficking rhetoric shapes the ability of the trafficked to be identified and granted immigration relief. The trafficked who are identified as such by law enforcement and who meet the cooperation requirements are given access to immigration relief and other services. The trafficked whose status is denied are subject to detention and/or deportation. As a result of rhetorical constructions of trafficking “victims,” whether they are exploited for sex or other forms of labor, trafficked men are commonly denied the benefits allotted to trafficked persons.⁷⁴ Their exclusion also causes them, if found, to be returned to situations that cause them to be vulnerable to being trafficked again.⁷⁵ Men are more commonly grouped as “victims” of their own poorly planned attempts at “illegal” migration and treated as criminals.⁷⁶ In detaining and deporting unidentified trafficked persons and those whose applications for immigration visas are denied, the United States effectively forces the trafficked to go through the process of being trafficked a second time. Deportable trafficked persons can be detained indefinitely: “the deported are (as a rule) “returned” only to the jurisdiction of a state that will claim or accept them, meaning that many “stateless” individuals are in fact indefinitely detained rather than deported.”⁷⁷ This infinite detention is itself a form of torture comparable to the conditions into which

people are trafficked. Immigration detention centers subject deportees to sexual abuse and degrading conditions, such as being verbally harassed and coerced by immigration staff into performing sex acts.⁷⁸ In addition, incidents have been reported in which immigration detainees have been intimidated with attack dogs and given the wrong medication.⁷⁹ The potential consequences of being overlooked as a trafficked individual are profound.

The manner in which human trafficking is constructed rhetorically by the Obama administration impacts the type of scholarship and research that is performed regarding human trafficking. As mentioned above, rhetoric shapes the type of knowledge production that is generated on human trafficking. In addition to ensuring the failure of protection and rehabilitation efforts, the relative exclusion of men and other forms of trafficking than sex trafficking from discourses of human trafficking decreases the capacity for well-informed scholarship on the trafficking of men because statistics concerning trafficked men “are likely to be underestimates.”⁸⁰ In a way, the rhetorical construction of trafficking creates a self-fulfilling prophecy whereby women and children continue to be seen as the most likely to be trafficked and sex trafficking remains the most prevalent form of trafficking because women and individuals trafficked for sex are the only “victims” counted.

Governmental trafficking rhetoric is also significant because it contributes to a shared concept of national identity. Nations and borders are not static or objective; they are rhetorically produced.⁸¹ Government officials, the president in particular, have an incentive to produce a myth of a unified American political community.⁸² US national identity is created through opposition. American identity only has meaning through the

demarcation of others who are not like Americans. As David Campbell explains: “If the identity of the “true nationals” remains intrinsically elusive and “inorganic,” it can only be secured by the effective and continual ideological demarcation of those who are “false” to the defining ideals.”⁸³ Government officials utilize rhetorically constructed threats, like human trafficking, to unify the public and solidify national identity: “Rhetoric, myth, and symbolism—and thus metaphor, narrative, and ritual— are endemic to the articulation of self-defining and affirming fear, especially in today’s hypersymbolic state of governing imagery, which positions both the general public and political elites within its cultural circumference.”⁸⁴

The “fight” against human trafficking has been incorporated into the myth of American political community. Within the Obama administration’s trafficking rhetoric, trafficking is described as antithetical to US values and anti-trafficking efforts are considered part of the US national identity. In his proclamation for National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, Obama argued that the defense of human rights, and by extension anti-trafficking efforts, are central to US national identity: “The steadfast defense of human rights is an essential part of our national identity, and as long as individuals suffer the violence of slavery and human trafficking, we must continue the fight.”⁸⁵ Similarly, in the introduction to the 2011 TIPR, Hillary Clinton’s letter to the reader claims “standing up for human rights is part of our national identity” and calls for the United States to “protect victims, punish abusers, and restore the lives of survivors so that someday they will have the opportunity to realize their God-given potential.”⁸⁶ Citizens are encouraged to take part in anti-trafficking efforts by reporting suspicious activity to law enforcement officials.⁸⁷ For example, the DHS Blue Campaign website

encourages individuals to “Join the Fight” because “everyone has a role to play in combating human trafficking.”⁸⁸

It is also important to analyze the anti-trafficking rhetoric used by the Obama administration because the United States has assumed a leadership role in anti-trafficking efforts globally. Clinton’s 3P memorandum and the passage of the TVPA both preceded the United Nation’s Palermo Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children.⁸⁹ The TVPA “is widely regarded as model legislation for other countries.”⁹⁰ The US anti-trafficking strategy and the 3P approach in particular have served as an international model for anti-trafficking efforts and the formation of anti-trafficking policies in other countries.⁹¹ In addition to serving as a model for other countries, US anti-trafficking policies place the United States in a position to judge other countries’ anti-trafficking efforts. The TVPA requires the US Department of State to create an annual Trafficking in Persons Report in which other countries are ranked on a three-tier system according to their compliance to the US model.⁹² Failure to comply can result in the revocation of humanitarian aid.⁹³

Methodology

In this thesis, I will engage in a close reading of a number of texts produced by the Obama administration related to human trafficking and immigration. The texts analyzed in this thesis can be considered what Michael Calvin McGee has termed “formations of texts” or “fragments.” Instead of constituting “*the text*” of human trafficking or immigration, they are pieces of a larger discourse.⁹⁴ According to McGee, what appears to be “finished discourse is in fact a dense reconstruction of all the bits of other discourses from which it was made.”⁹⁵ It is impossible to contain and comprehend

the issues of human trafficking and immigration within a “single finished text.”⁹⁶ A “finished discourse anticipated in consequence of an essentially homogenous culture” does not exist.⁹⁷ McGee indicates that it is the duty of the “consumers of discourse” to invent “*text suitable for criticism.*”⁹⁸ The formation of texts subject to rhetorical criticism in this thesis are selected from the speeches, statements, public service announcement videos, presidential proclamations, and posters made publicly available on the Internet by the Obama administration. They are selected for their contribution to the circulation of particular prevalent human trafficking and immigration metaphors, which do not occur in a vacuum, but rather alongside the “invisible text” of constantly “changing cultural conditions.”⁹⁹

The thesis will analyze the predominant metaphors utilized in these textual “formations” and the similarities between human trafficking and immigration rhetoric. By comparing the overlapping metaphors used by high-ranking officials in the Obama administration to describe human trafficking and immigration, the thesis will describe the way that human trafficking rhetoric and immigration rhetoric are co-constituted. The thesis will analyze the relationship between the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric and the scholarship and policy initiatives formulated in response to the problem of trafficking in persons.

Focus of the Thesis

The thesis will focus on the implications that this type of human trafficking rhetoric has for the formulation of scholarship and policy related to human trafficking. I argue that the knowledge production on human trafficking is limited by the metaphors used to describe it because the caricature of the female sex trafficking “victim” inhibits

greater attention to male trafficked persons and forms of trafficking other than sex trafficking. Furthermore, the rhetoric of the Obama administration fosters ineffective anti-trafficking policies. Just as statistics and scholarship on human trafficking will continue to underemphasize the amount of male trafficked persons there are or the amount of trafficking that occurs in forms other than sex trafficking, anti-trafficking efforts will continue to be focused on identifying female sex trafficking “victims” at the expense of other types of trafficked persons. The stereotypes about traffickers will likewise limit the effectiveness of policy because they make it less likely that female traffickers will be identified. In addition, the current narrative promotes abolitionist policies aimed at stopping the demand for prostitution. These policies privilege raids as a tool for identifying the trafficked.¹⁰⁰ Currently, TVPA allocates funds to local and federal anti-trafficking task forces, the majority of which take the form of anti-prostitution task forces.¹⁰¹ The “primary goal” is “the policing and punishment of prostitution. Identifying people who have been trafficked can be a secondary goal of anti-prostitution vice raids.”¹⁰² Law enforcement training to recognize the trafficked is ineffective in the face of such an anti-prostitution focus for anti-trafficking task forces.¹⁰³ The emphasis placed on the law enforcement objectives in raids precludes them from being a tool for trafficked persons to receive aid. Both local and federal agents are “unlikely to identify victims of trafficking through raids.”¹⁰⁴

The implications that the Obama administration’s trafficking rhetoric has for cultural conceptions of American national identity will be outlined as well. It is my argument that human trafficking rhetoric defines American identity as oppositional to human trafficking. The United States is positioned as the protector of helpless trafficking

“victims” and the global leader, without whom the darkness of trafficking could not be illuminated and eradicated. Trafficking is depicted as anti-American activity. While trafficking is recognized as occurring within the United States, it is also considered to be a destination country. Human trafficking rhetoric establishes a set of “Others” against which American citizens can identify themselves, such as “illegal aliens” and criminal traffickers. Determinations of which bodies appear to be “illegal” are influenced by gender and racial stereotypes.¹⁰⁵ Americans are encouraged to become a part of the “fight against trafficking” in order to fulfill their civic duty.

This analysis of the dominant metaphors used by the Obama administration in official reports, speeches, and outreach campaigns to describe human trafficking contributes to greater awareness of the assumptions utilized in anti-trafficking efforts. It integrates discussion of the verbal and visual metaphors used to describe human trafficking and includes the integration of stereotypes about immigration into human trafficking rhetoric. It is fundamental to investigate the rhetoric used in public information campaigns. As Steele argues:

Discussing the ways in which current anti-immigrant sentiments are reproduced, specifically through public information campaigns on trafficking run by the United States government, allows for the exploration of the limits in current anti-trafficking thinking and opens up possibilities for reform of both the criminal law and immigration regimes.¹⁰⁶

The manner in which the Obama administration treats trafficking is important because this conceptualization of trafficking is intended to be replicated by individuals and law enforcement officials. It is also important to analyze the Obama administration’s treatment of trafficking in persons because the US approach is used as a model for other countries.¹⁰⁷

Structure of the Thesis

The thesis will analyze the rhetoric of human trafficking and immigration with special attention to the metaphors used to describe the practice of trafficking, traffickers, the trafficked, and immigrants. The project is guided by a series of inquiries about the relationship between human trafficking and immigration rhetoric. What types of metaphors are used by the Obama administration to describe immigration and human trafficking? What is the relationship between the metaphors used to describe immigration and human trafficking? What role does rhetoric play in the construction of policies to deal with each respective issue? How does human trafficking rhetoric and policy influence cultural conceptions of national identity?

In chapter two, “Rhetoric, Metaphor and Citizenship,” the importance of studying human trafficking and immigration rhetoric will be emphasized. The relationship between human trafficking and immigration, in terms of both policy and rhetoric, will be detailed. The chapter will include a review of the pre-existing scholarship on trafficking rhetoric and the metaphorical representation of immigration. The significance of rhetoric, specifically the use of metaphor, to the formulation of national identity will be discussed. It will be argued that the human trafficking rhetoric employed by the Obama administration has an impact on conceptions of national identity by simultaneously depicting trafficking as contrary to US national identity and anti-trafficking as an affirmation of fundamental American values.

In chapter three, I will analyze a collection of speeches on immigration made by the Obama administration, including remarks by President Obama, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State John Kerry, the director of United States Customs and

Immigration Services (USCIS) Alejandro Mayorkas, and the director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) John Morton. This chapter will also include analysis of the Ombudsman's Annual Report to Congress from 2009-2013 produced by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of Citizenship and Immigration Services. The Homeland Security Act of 2002 established the Ombudsman's Office. The Ombudsman's Annual Report to Congress lists problems with the system for accessing immigration benefits and outlines suggestions to be implemented by the USCIS. Finally, I will discuss the public service announcement videos produced by ICE.

Chapter three will explore the common metaphors used by the Obama administration to describe immigration, both documented and undocumented. First, the metaphorical representation of immigrants, used to describe both documented and undocumented immigrants, as economic units will be discussed. Second, the "illegal alien" metaphor, used to describe undocumented immigrants, will be analyzed. Third, I will draw attention to the metaphorical representation of immigrants as criminal, which is used to describe both documented and undocumented immigrants. The fourth metaphor analyzed will be the association between immigrants and disease. The fifth metaphor discussed will be the characterization of the attempt to limit undocumented immigration as a war. Sixth, I will investigate the representation of the United States as a "beacon of hope."

In chapter four, I will explore a number of texts produced by and supported by the Obama administration and made available by the US Department of State website for the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. These texts include the Trafficking Victims Reauthorization Act of 2013, annual Trafficking in Persons Reports from 2010-

2013, reports on the President's Interagency Task Force, and speeches and remarks made by President Barack Obama, Secretary of State Hilary Clinton, Secretary of State John Kerry, and Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons Luis CdeBaca. DHS Blue Campaign videos and posters, and ICE public service announcements on trafficking will be included in the texts studied as well. This collection of texts best represents the Obama administration's rhetoric on the trafficking of persons. The President, Secretary of State and the Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons are the three government officials with the most control over trafficking policy. The Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, the DHS, and ICE are the primary groups that deal with public outreach efforts.

The fourth chapter will give attention to the metaphorical representation of trafficking, the trafficked, and traffickers. In this chapter, I will discuss the eight most prevalently utilized metaphors within the Obama administration's human trafficking rhetoric. First, I will investigate the term "human trafficking," which is itself a metaphor for the involuntary movement of people. Second, there will be a discussion of the use of the "victim" metaphor to label the trafficked. The third metaphor that will be discussed in this chapter will be the "illegal alien" metaphor used to depict the antithesis of the good and deserving trafficked person. Fourth, the metaphorical representation of the trafficked and traffickers as "criminals" will be given attention. Trafficked persons are often equated with prostitution while traffickers are associated with a range of criminality, ranging from organized crime in general, to terrorism. The fifth metaphor analyzed will be the representation of trafficking as a disease or "scourge." Sixth, the association between traffickers and "evil" will be discussed. Seventh, the metaphorical representation

of anti-trafficking efforts as part of a “war” against trafficking will be analyzed. Anti-trafficking is often characterized as “combatting trafficking” or a “fight.” The eighth metaphor that will be included in this chapter is the representation of the United States as a “protector” or “savior” for trafficked persons.

The concluding chapter will synthesize the descriptions of immigration and human trafficking metaphors and explore the implications of human trafficking rhetoric. The overlap and similarities between the types of metaphors used in trafficking and immigration discourse will be discussed. I argue that the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric is shaped by and reifies certain stereotypes of both documented and undocumented immigrants, namely the conception of undocumented migrants as criminals and “illegal aliens.” I will argue that the metaphors used by the Obama administration to describe trafficking in persons and immigration impact the way trafficking is thought about and the types of solutions made to deal with trafficking. To be more specific, the metaphorical representation of the iconic “victim” trains individuals and law enforcement officials to assume that women and girls are more likely to be trafficked than are men and boys. This narrative also narrows the focus of anti-trafficking efforts on sex trafficking by creating an association between human trafficking and prostitution. Individuals not identified as “victims” are seen as criminals, in the form of “illegal immigrants,” prostitutes, or both. Men, particularly foreign men, are rhetorically constructed as being more likely to be traffickers. Trafficking is depicted as spreading like a disease and traffickers are associated with criminality and “evil” more generally.

Notes

¹ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 12.

² President's Interagency Council on Women, "Executive Memorandum on Steps to Combat Violence Against Women and Trafficking in Women and Girls" (March 11, 1998).

³ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2011), 8.

⁴ White House, "The Obama Administration's Record on Human Trafficking Issues," Last modified April 09, 2013. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/04/09/obama-administration-s-record-human-trafficking-issues>

⁵ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 339.

⁶ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 339.

⁷ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 339.

⁸ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 341.

⁹ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 341.

¹⁰ United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, "Questions and Answers: Victims of Human Trafficking, U Nonimmigrant Status," Last Updated November 22, 2010. <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.5af9bb95919f35e66f614176543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=1b15306f31534210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=ee1e3e4d77d73210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD>

¹¹ Jayashri Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims and Real Survivors: The Iconic Victim in Domestic Human Trafficking," *Boston University Law Review* 87, no. 157 (2007): 174-5.

¹² Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 175.

¹³ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 176.

- ¹⁴ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims,” 176.
- ¹⁵ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims,” 177.
- ¹⁶ Women’s Commission for Refugee Women and Children, “The U.S. Response to Human Trafficking: An Unbalanced Approach,” May 2007. Available from <http://www.humantrafficking.org/uploads/publications/ustraff.pdf> (Accessed 18 January 2010).
- ¹⁷ United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, “Questions and Answers: Victims of Human Trafficking, U Nonimmigrant Status” Last updated October 03, 2011. <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/victims-human-trafficking-other-crimes/victims-criminal-activity-u-nonimmigrant-status/victims-criminal-activity-u-nonimmigrant-status>
- ¹⁸ Jean Pierre Espinoza and Jung Choi, “Overview of the U Visa: “Race between Approval and Removal,” Bender’s Immigration Bulletin, no. 15 (May 2010): 647.
- ¹⁹ Espinoza and Choi, “Overview,”” 647.
- ²⁰ Espinoza and Choi, “Overview,”” 647.
- ²¹ Kavitha Sreeharsha, “Victims’ Rights Unraveling: The Impact of Local Immigration Enforcement Policies on the Violence Against Women Act,” *Georgetown Journal of Gender and the Law* 11 (2010): 669.
- ²² Espinoza and Choi, “Overview,”” 646.
- ²³ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 340.
- ²⁴ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims and Real Survivors,” 175.
- ²⁵ United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, “Questions and Answers: Victims of Human Trafficking, U Nonimmigrant Status,” Last Updated November 22, 2010. <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.5af9bb95919f35e66f614176543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=1b15306f31534210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=ee1e3e4d77d73210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD>
- ²⁶ United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, “Questions and Answers: Victims of Human Trafficking, U Nonimmigrant Status”

²⁷ Anna Gorman, “U-visa program for crime victims falters,” LA Times, 26 January 2009, <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/jan/26/local/me-crimevisa26>.

²⁸ Gorman, “U-visa program for crime victims falters”

²⁹ Espinoza and Choi, “Overview,” 645.

³⁰ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 342.

³¹ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010), 342.

³² United States Department of State, “President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons” <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/response/usg/index.htm>

³³ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Law Enforcement: Victims Are in Plain Sight” <http://www.dhs.gov/blue-campaign/law-enforcement>

³⁴ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Law Enforcement Training” Last updated September 17, 2012. <http://www.dhs.gov/video/law-enforcement-training>; Department of Homeland Security. “Victim Support Video for Law Enforcement Part 1” <http://www.dhs.gov/blue-campaign/law-enforcement>

³⁵ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “ICE gives voice to victims of human trafficking in the United States,” Last updated November 2, 2009. <http://www.ice.gov/news/releases/0911/091102washingtondc.htm>

³⁶ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “ICE gives voice to victims of human trafficking in the United States” Last updated November 2, 2009. <http://www.ice.gov/news/releases/0911/091102washingtondc.htm>

³⁷ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. *Trafficking in Persons Report: 9th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2009), 10.

³⁸ Press Release Point, “HSI, Lifetime premiere ‘Baby Sellers’ human trafficking film at UN” Last updated August 15, 2013. <http://www.pressreleasepoint.com/hsi-lifetime-premiere-baby-sellers-human-trafficking-film-un>

³⁹ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 9th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2009), 15.

- ⁴⁰ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 161.
- ⁴¹ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 161.
- ⁴² Moshoula Capous Desyllas, "A Critique of the Global Trafficking Discourse and U.S. Policy," *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 34, no. 4 (2007): 58.
- ⁴³ Martin J. Medhurst, "Why Rhetoric Matters: George H.W. Bush in the White House" in *The Rhetorical Presidency of George H.W. Bush*, ed. Martin J. Medhurst (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006), 4
- ⁴⁴ Medhurst, "Why Rhetoric Matters," 4.
- ⁴⁵ J. David Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of "Immigrant as Pollutant" in Media Representations of Immigration," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11, no. 4 (2008): 571.
- ⁴⁶ Richard Little, *The Balance of Power in International Relations: Metaphors, Myths and Models* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 23.
- ⁴⁷ Cor van der Weele and Marianne van den Boomen, "How to Do Things with Metaphor?: Introduction to the Issue," *Configurations* 16, no.1 (2008): 2.
- ⁴⁸ Otto Santa Ana, "Like an Animal I was Treated': Anti-Immigrant Metaphor in US Public Discourse," *Discourse & Society* 10, no. 2 (1999): 195.
- ⁴⁹ J. David Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities," 570.
- ⁵⁰ United States Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, "Obama Administration Accomplishments in Combatting Trafficking in Persons as of February 2013," Last updated April 9, 2013.
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/reports/2013/207199.htm>.
- ⁵¹ United States Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, "Obama Administration."
- ⁵² United States Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, "Obama Administration."
- ⁵³ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement "ICE gives voice to victims of human trafficking in the United States" Last updated November 2, 2009.
<http://www.ice.gov/news/releases/0911/091102washingtondc.htm>

⁵⁴ United States Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, “Obama Administration.”

⁵⁵ Sarah L. Steele, “‘Combating the Scourge’: Constructing the Masculine ‘Other’ Through U.S. Government Anti-trafficking Campaigns” *Journal of Hate Studies* 9, no. 1 (2011): 46.

⁵⁶ Barack Obama, "Proclamation 9074 - National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, 2014," *The American Presidency Project*, December 31, 2013, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=104553>.

⁵⁷ “President Obama Eyes Immigration Reform As A Top Priority For 2014” *Fox News Latino*, December 27, 2013, <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/12/27/president-obama-eyes-immigration-reform-as-top-priority-for-2014>.

⁵⁸ Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress," *The American Presidency Project*, February 24, 2009, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=85753>; Barack Obama, “Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union,” *The American Presidency Project*, January 27, 2010, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=87433>; Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, January 25, 2011, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=88928>; Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, January 24, 2012, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=99000>; Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, February 12, 2013, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=102826>; Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, January 28, 2014, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=104596>.

⁵⁹ Barack Obama, “Remarks by the President to the Clinton Global Initiative” September 25, 2012, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2010/index.htm>.

⁶⁰ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims and Real Survivors,” 198.

⁶¹ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims and Real Survivors,” 198.

⁶² Moshoula Capous Desyllas, “A Critique of the Global Trafficking Discourse and U.S. Policy” in *International Sex Trafficking of Women & Children: Understanding the Global Epidemic*, eds. Leonard Territo and George Kirkham (Flushing, NY: Looseleaf Law Publications, 2009), 353.

⁶³ United States Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2011), 25.

⁶⁴ United States Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2011), 25.

⁶⁵ Luis CdeBaca, "Technology as a Tool in the Fight Against Human Trafficking," July 24, 2013. www.state.gov/r/pa/pl/cwa/212411.htm.

⁶⁶ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 205.

⁶⁷ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 205.

⁶⁸ Luis CdeBaca, "2010 Trafficking in Persons Report."

⁶⁹ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 9.

⁷⁰ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 45-6.

⁷¹ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 46.

⁷² Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 211.

⁷³ Rebecca Surtees, "Trafficked Men as Unwilling Victims," *STAIR* 4, no. 1 (2008): 17.

⁷⁴ Surtees, "Trafficked Men," 19.

⁷⁵ Surtees, "Trafficked Men," 23-4.

⁷⁶ Surtees, "Trafficked Men," 23-4.

⁷⁷ Nathalie Peutz and Nicholas De Genova, *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement* (United States: Duke University Press, 2010), 14-15.

⁷⁸ Bryan Lonagan, "American Diaspora: The Deportation of Lawful Residents from the United States and the Destruction of their Families," *NYU Review of Law & Social Change* 32 (2008): 67-8.

⁷⁹ Lonagan, "American Diaspora," 68.

⁸⁰ Surtees, "Trafficked Men," 20.

⁸¹ Lisa A. Flores, "Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20, no. 4 (2003): 364.

⁸² Vanessa B. Beasley, *You, the People* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 8-9.

⁸³ David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 91.

⁸⁴ Robert L. Ivie and Oscar Giner, "More Good, Less Evil: Contesting the Mythos of National Insecurity in the 2008 Presidential Primaries" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 12, no. 2 (2009): 279.

⁸⁵ Proclamation No. 8772, 77 Fed. Reg. 4 (January 6, 2012).

⁸⁶ United States Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 1.

⁸⁷ United States Department of Homeland Security, "Combating Human Trafficking," <http://www.dhs.gov/topic/human-trafficking>.

⁸⁸ United States Department of Homeland Security, "Join the Fight" <http://www.dhs.gov/blue-campaign/join-fight>.

⁸⁹ Neil Howard and Mumtaz Lalani, "Editorial Introduction: The Politics of Human Trafficking," *STAIR* 4, no. 1 (2008): 7.

⁹⁰ Elizabeth Talbot and Mark Rodgers, "Leadership and International Community Collaborations to Impact Education and Human Trafficking Prevention," *Journal of Global Social Work Practice* 4, no. 1 (2011).

⁹¹ Kimberly Williams, "Crime, Corruption and Chaos: Sex Trafficking and the 'Failure' of US Russia Policy," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13, no. 1 (2011): 2.

⁹² Gretchen Soderlund, "Running from the Rescuers: New U.S. Crusades Against Sex Trafficking and the Rhetoric of Abolition" *NWSA Journal* 17 (2005): 74.

⁹³ Soderlund, "Running from the Rescuers," 73.

⁹⁴ Michael Calvin McGee, "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54 (1990): 287.

- ⁹⁵ McGee, "Text, Context," 279.
- ⁹⁶ McGee, "Text, Context," 288.
- ⁹⁷ McGee, "Text, Context," 287.
- ⁹⁸ McGee, "Text, Context," 288.
- ⁹⁹ McGee, "Text, Context," 287.
- ¹⁰⁰ Melissa Ditmore, "The Use of Raids to Fight Trafficking in Persons," Sex Workers Project. 2009, <http://www.nswp.org/sites/nswp.org/files/swp-2009-raids-and-trafficking-report.pdf>
- ¹⁰¹ Ditmore, "The Use of Raids," 17.
- ¹⁰² Ditmore, "The Use of Raids," 17.
- ¹⁰³ Ditmore, "The Use of Raids," 49.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ditmore, "The Use of Raids," 49.
- ¹⁰⁵ Karma R. Chávez, "Embodied Translation: Dominant Discourse and Communication with Migrant Bodies-as-Text," *The Howard Journal of Communication* 20 (2009): 20-24.
- ¹⁰⁶ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 35.
- ¹⁰⁷ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 211.

CHAPTER TWO

Rhetoric, Metaphor and Citizenship

Review of Existing Literature

Human trafficking has become a more prominent issue both in terms of the creation of policies to address trafficking and academic work to describe and analyze trafficking. Existing scholarship on human trafficking has worked to trace the historical trajectory of human trafficking law and discourse. Most scholarship ranges from discussions concerning the debate between particular stances on anti-trafficking, namely abolitionist and feminist stances, to the analysis of specific policies and/or metaphors in anti-trafficking discourse.

Penelope Saunders analyzes the different components of debates about human trafficking and critiques dominant abolitionist discourse. Saunders describes the various sides of the trafficking debate. She isolates three major strands of non-governmental anti-trafficking advocates. One of these three groups includes abolitionists groups such as the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW).¹ This strand of abolitionists and feminists, represented by Catharine MacKinnon, holds prostitution to be the “clearest example of institutionalized and informal male sexual violation of women.”² Another group is the nonabolitionists. These advocates support a broad definition of trafficking that expands their focus beyond coerced prostitution to other forms of forced labor. In opposition to the abolitionists, they support sex work as a legitimate form of labor.³ The third major group is sex workers themselves. Organizations like the Network of Sex

Work Projects (NSWP) represent this group. They criticize the conflation of trafficking with sex work.⁴

Musto argues that the abolitionist perspective has been “comprehensively streamlined into U.S. anti-trafficking efforts” and anti-trafficking efforts abroad.⁵ The linkages made between trafficking and prostitution are demonstrated by “the fact that prostitution continues to be linked to sex trafficking in U.S. policy, and since all domestic and foreign NGOs that receive U.S. governmental anti-trafficking funds must sign ‘an anti-prostitution pledge,’ prohibiting the promotion of prostitution and sex work as a labor option.”⁶ Within the abolitionist perspective, women could not conceivably “voluntarily enter prostitution.”⁷ Musto argues that the attempt to expand the term trafficking to mean forms of trafficking beyond sex trafficking has not resulted in “more sophisticated methods of detection for trafficking cases that are not sexual in nature or proffered the ability to rethink the limits of state and federal labor laws.”⁸ Musto is critical of the manner in which “the rhetorical prowess of trafficking terminologies... has emboldened and diversified the U.S. government’s fight against commercial sex vis-à-vis human trafficking policies.”⁹

Saunders, like Musto, argues against the abolitionist framework for anti-trafficking efforts. According to Saunders, the anti-prostitution framework is harmful to sex workers. The anti-prostitution strategy causes them to be stigmatized as prostitutes, sexually harassed, and, in some cases, deported.¹⁰ Abolitionist framing has “provoked crackdowns on migrant sex workers via brothel raids... curtailed the few legal avenues for sex worker migration, and... limited what programs can do and say when working with sex workers.”¹¹ In order to break from this framing, she claims that a new discourse is

needed that situates trafficking as “an occupational hazard for migrant sex workers.”¹²

Saunders argues that rethinking the framing of violence and vulnerability within discourse on human trafficking is an imperative for anyone involved with the problems facing migrant sex workers.¹³

Saunders argues that the trajectory of anti-trafficking legislation has been impacted by the Mann Act of 1910 also known as the White Slave Traffic Act. Moshoula Desyllas similarly critiques the legacy of the Mann Act. The Mann Act “prohibited unmarried women from crossing state lines for immoral purposes and it criminalized interracial couples.”¹⁴ The Mann Act, according to Saunders, was more concerned with regulating the voluntary movement of women than stopping human trafficking. Saunders cites the fact that in 1914, 70% of convictions were for prostitution and migration for immoral purposes.¹⁵

Saunders and Desyllas explain that this framework for treating trafficking was extended into subsequent US and international law. In 1949, the UN Convention for the Suppression of the Trafficking in Persons and Exploitation of Prostitution of Others was created. It declared prostitution as incompatible with human worth.¹⁶ It also limited its view of victims to being women and children. Saunders argues that the Palermo Protocol is framed in terms of stopping criminal activity instead of protecting human rights.¹⁷ Desyllas argues that the TVPA has also been impacted by the legacy of the Mann Act. She criticizes the language of the TVPA for presenting women as helpless “victims” in need of being “‘rescued’ and ‘protected’.”¹⁸ Desyllas argues that this framework is counterproductive. According to Desyllas, “international and U.S. policies” motivated by “western fears of migration and the sexuality of women...may generate more harm to

migrants and others working in the sex industry and targeted under the trafficking framework.”¹⁹

Some scholarship is critical of particular components of contemporary anti-trafficking policies. For example, Melissa Ditmore critically analyzes the use of raids as a technique for cracking down on trafficking.²⁰ She shows that raids deter individuals from approaching law enforcement in a non-raid format. Ditmore conducted a survey of sex workers, service providers, and law enforcement officials. In that survey, one attorney remarked, “Law enforcement will blow off a trafficking victim who is sitting in front of them for ten imaginary victims in some brothel somewhere where they don’t even know what’s going on.”²¹ Trafficked persons that come to law enforcement absent raids are ignored.

Ditmore argues that deferring identification of the trafficked to law enforcement officials causes the objectives of raids to be inherently more focused upon law enforcement objectives than the interests of the potential trafficked. This is especially the case when trafficking raids take the form of anti-prostitution raids. The “primary goal” is “the policing and punishment of prostitution. Identifying people who have been trafficked can be a secondary goal of anti-prostitution vice raids.”²² Law enforcement training to recognize the trafficked is ineffective in the face of such an anti-prostitution focus for anti-trafficking task forces.²³ The emphasis placed on the law enforcement objectives in raids precludes them from being a tool for trafficked persons to receive aid. Both local and federal agents are “unlikely to identify victims of trafficking through raids.”²⁴ Ditmore’s study provides a useful example of the subordination of the interests of the trafficked to law enforcement objectives. Out of the nine women she interviewed that had

been arrested in police raids, “none had been identified by local law enforcement following the raid, despite the fact that 7 of these 9 women self-identified as trafficked.”²⁵ Only one of the nine women “had been asked whether she was coerced into sex work following arrest by local law enforcement.”²⁶ Another woman was arrested four times in raids before eventually escaping her trafficker on her own.²⁷

In addition to the subordination of the interests of the trafficked to law enforcement objectives, law enforcement officials are unlikely to be effective at identifying trafficked persons in raids because of their proclivity to see the trafficked as criminals. To law enforcement agents trained to identify and detain prostitutes or “illegal immigrants,” trafficked persons toe a fine line between the innocent victim and the deportable criminal. In the context of anti-trafficking or anti-prostitution raids, officers are even more likely to allow these predispositions to color their judgment: “Law enforcement and the criminal legal system” frame sex workers as “either deviant criminals who must be punished, or as victims in need of rescue.”²⁸

In a case study of a 2005 raid in Dallas, Texas, Marisa Silenzi Cianciarulo provides a good illustration of the views held about sex workers and immigrants in law enforcement. Of the forty-two women that were found in the raid, only five were determined to be “potentially eligible for immigration benefits” for cooperating with law enforcement officials and only four of those five were present at the trial for the woman responsible for their forced prostitution.²⁹ The thirty-eight women that did not receive relief were deported and treated as criminals. An ICE Agent, John Chawkin, claimed that the majority of the women were “mature women in their 30s....who knew exactly what they were doing,” implying that they should have “known better.”³⁰ All of the evidence

obtained from the raid suggests the opposite of Chawkin's assumptions. The women in the brothel were forced to "work as prostitutes six and seven days a week" and "to be on call for sex at all times."³¹ Their movements were monitored via video surveillance and escorts.³² In addition, the fact that the women were made to work as prostitutes to pay off debt, proves that they were not the willing and "professional prostitutes" that Chawkin depicted them as being.³³ This case illustrates the inability of law enforcement agents to delineate between criminals and trafficked individuals, particularly in raid situation where such judgments must be made quickly and in the midst of much chaos and confusion. Raids unnecessarily expose the trafficked to immigration officials and law enforcement agents that tend to view them as potential criminals. The treatment of potential trafficked persons as harboring criminality creates a poor environment for identifying the trafficked. People who appear to be too fearful or uncooperative are disqualified from being considered trafficked.³⁴ In supplication to the unlikelihood that officers will recognize the trafficked, treatment of the trafficked as potential criminals legitimates an unnecessary amount of surprise and force in raids that magnifies their failure to provide an outlet for trafficked persons to self-identify and seek aid. This causes an ugly cycle in which the trafficked are too terrified to present themselves as iconic "trafficking victims" and thus deserving of aid.

Others focus on the cooperation requirements for trafficked persons.³⁵ T.K. Logan, Robert Walker and Gretchen Hunt maintain that the trauma which trafficked persons undergo makes the cooperation requirement an inaccurate "way to distinguish between trafficking victims and other undocumented migrants."³⁶ Even for those that can clearly demonstrate that they are trafficked and not simply undocumented migrants, immigration

relief is placed out of reach by the emphasis on law enforcement. The endorsement/cooperation requirement incentivizes prosecutors to abandon the purpose of the visa as a form of relief for the trafficked and instead use it as a prosecutorial tool. Jayashri Srikantiah argues that these cooperation requirements cause applicants that would otherwise meet the criterion to be rejected because they make poor witnesses.³⁷

A large amount of human trafficking scholarship focuses on particular features of anti-trafficking rhetoric and the metaphors utilized to describe trafficking. For example, Jo Doezema and Mary Ann Irwin critique the white slavery metaphor surrounding the Mann Act.³⁸ White slavery rumors began to circulate as European women began to migrate in increasing numbers in search for work.³⁹ Doezema emphasizes that historians have proven the “mythical nature of this paradigm of the ‘white slave.’”⁴⁰ She contends “the myths around ‘white slavery’” were “indicative of deeper fears and uncertainties concerning national identity, women’s increasing desire for autonomy, foreigners, immigrants and colonial peoples.”⁴¹ Irwin argues that the metaphor was effective in providing “a new conceptual framework for thinking about the position of women in Victorian society.”⁴² Unlike Doezema and others, Irwin chooses not to address the issue of whether white slavery rhetoric was accurate and instead argues that the metaphor provoked a “shift in focus from women, as prostitutes, to men, as their exploiters, opened a formidable wedge in the previously forbidden topic of sexuality and, in the process, exposed male and female relations to new-and potentially radical-interpretations.”⁴³

A number of essays have been dedicated to the treatment of trafficked persons as “victims.”⁴⁴ Gretchen Soderlund argues that such rhetoric “casts women as victims in need of protection from harm rather than as subjects deserving of positive rights.”⁴⁵

According to Soderlund, this “emphasis on victimization” causes “only those victims whose innocence – and distance from state-based oppression – could be established or asserted in sympathetic terms” to be “exalted and protected.”⁴⁶ Doezeema argues that “today’s stereotypical ‘trafficking victim’ bears as little resemblance to women migrating for work in the sex industry as did her historical counterpart, the ‘white slave.’”⁴⁷

Srikantiah argues that this rhetoric was involved in the passage of the TVPA:

To obtain passage of the TVPA, lawmakers repeatedly referred to trafficking victims as meek, passive objects of sexual exploitation. Victims of trafficking for forced labor were largely ignored. Even sex trafficking victims, moreover, were described as exercising no free will during their illegal entry into the United States and as passive during their subsequent sexual exploitation.⁴⁸

This influence is illustrated in Soderlund’s description of the TVPA as having “no category for unforced prostitution” and using trafficking “as a synonym for the exploitation of all women and girls in systems of prostitution.”⁴⁹

Similarly, Musto critiques the use of the term “sexual slavery.”⁵⁰ She argues that the term is reliant upon the “assumptions that women are universal victims of patriarchal oppression and that no woman, lest she fall prey to false consciousness, could or should voluntarily enter prostitution.”⁵¹ Musto argues that feminist abolitionist organizations, namely CATW, have utilized the argument “that all forms of prostitution are oppressive and that trafficking thrives in areas where prostitution is legalized, regulated, and/or decriminalized.”⁵² These groups are described as having considerable sway over US anti-trafficking policy:

[A]bolitionism maintains widespread support in the United States, most notably through the “consultative access” and influence that abolitionists in general and feminist abolitionists in particular have achieved in “shaping the terms” and direction of anti-trafficking policy.⁵³

According to Musto, the consequence of the abolitionist approach has been the dismissal of the views of prorigths feminists and sex workers.⁵⁴

The representation of trafficking as a “disease” has also recently become the subject of critical analysis.⁵⁵ Sarah L. Steele analyzes the rhetoric of President George W. Bush and argues that he frequently referred to traffickers as a “scourge” and a “disease.”⁵⁶ She argues that the Obama administration has utilized similar rhetoric.⁵⁷ Steele argues that this type of rhetoric “relegates both trafficked men and traffickers to the status of ‘Others’ who are risky.”⁵⁸

Some analyze the use of the term “evil” in descriptions of traffickers and trafficking.⁵⁹ Steele argues that countries are often associated with evil through their failure to comply with US standards as well.⁶⁰ She argues that through their use of imagery in which the trafficker is shown “cloaked in darkness approaching a young victim, who sits in the light” is “designed to capture the public’s attention and sympathy, [invoking] familiar binaries of “evil/good and dark/light.”⁶¹

Others have analyzed the treatment of trafficking and slavery as interchangeable terms.⁶² Samuel Martinez argues that contemporary slavery narratives are pervasive:

antislavery publications in a variety of textual and visual genres, including academic studies, reports of governmental, inter-governmental, and non-governmental organizations, memoirs and journalistic exposes, newspaper and magazine investigative reports, novellas and graphic novels, movies, public exhibits, photo-essays, and documentary films.⁶³

Musto, like Martinez, critiques the term “modern day slavery.” Musto argues that it is devoid of definitional clarity.⁶⁴ She argues that “modern day slavery is more of an ahistorical catchall phrase and elusive specter, inciting moral outrage and charitable voyeurism without in fact changing the economic conditions within which it

flourishes.”⁶⁵ Musto explains that in this discourse, the focus is on the pervasiveness of slavery “in everyone’s ‘First’ and ‘Third’ world backyards and the role of the consumer in facilitating slave labor.”⁶⁶ The modern slavery narrative detracts attention away from the causes of global income disparity in favor of attention to the individual.⁶⁷

The Relationship between Trafficking and Immigration

A large amount of the pre-existing scholarship on human trafficking and immigration rhetoric deals with either human trafficking or immigration rhetoric but not both. Attending to the interrelationship between human trafficking and immigration rhetoric is important because they are mutually reinforcing. Human trafficking and immigration are interlinked in many ways. Human trafficking policy is related to immigration policy. There is a large degree of overlap between the agencies that enforce human trafficking and immigration policy. For example, ICE agents are often the first government officials to interact with trafficked persons. Raids by law enforcement are the “primary means of identifying victims of trafficking in persons.”⁶⁸ As mentioned in Chapter One, trafficked persons are offered immigration benefits in the form of the T visa or U visa in exchange for their testimony. Human trafficking and immigration are also rhetorically linked. As Moshoula Capous Desyllas notes, “scholars use ‘trafficking’ interchangeably with.....illegal immigration.”⁶⁹

The interrelationship between human trafficking and immigration has become the subject of a substantial amount of scholarship recently. An example of this scholarship is the academic work done by Claudia Aradau. Aradau explains that in order to prove that they are trafficked, individuals must prove that they are not “illegal aliens.” The statutory limitations upon what constitutes “severe human trafficking” and the

requirements for law enforcement agency endorsement reify a stereotype of the “good” desirable immigrant and the “bad” “illegal alien.”⁷⁰ Jayashri Srikantiah similarly argues against this association between human trafficking and illegal immigration. She quotes The Department of Justice (DOJ) as arguing in a fact sheet that “[p]ersons smuggled are violating the law. They are not victims.”⁷¹ It is often difficult for agents to make a clear distinction between economically driven immigrants and those that have been trafficked. As Nandita Sharma explains: “In reality, it is usually impossible to distinguish the acts of smugglers from the acts of traffickers as both smugglers and traffickers move people along illegalized routes of migration.”⁷² The line between trafficking and migration involves questions of intent and is thus a murky one: “The line drawn between the innocent victim and the willful illegal immigrant used to determine punishment and protection is not only a dangerous one, but it is also a distinction that does not hold.”⁷³ It is difficult to determine the culpability of migrants with their migration because “most trafficking victims are also economic migrants.”⁷⁴ The motivations that may have gotten someone lured into a trafficking situation or the economic threats used to force someone into trafficking can make a person seem ineligible because they are not seen as being passive enough in the conditions spurring their being trafficked.⁷⁵

Musto criticizes the fine line between smuggling and trafficking. She argues that anti-trafficking efforts have become entangled with national debates over “illegal immigration.”⁷⁶ In Musto’s words,

This is significant in that there is a tendency amongst policymakers and law enforcement agents in the United States to consider all “irregular” migrants, whether smuggled or trafficked, as criminals first and victims only after they have proven to have been unlawfully exploited.⁷⁷

She explains that in addition to being categorically grouped rhetorically with other irregular migrants, trafficked immigrants must be able to prove that they have not voluntarily participated in sex work or border crossing. “No matter how exploitative the conditions in which they are found may be, real or perceived evidence of their agency to illegally enter the United States renders them culpable and subject to deportation.”⁷⁸ This is particularly problematic because presuppositions about race and gender “influence whether a person is profiled as trafficked or smuggled.”⁷⁹

Sharma critiques the use of natural disaster and disease metaphors to describe migrants, the “victim” metaphor for trafficked persons, the rhetorical positioning of the United States as the “rescuer” of trafficking “victims,” and the association between human trafficking and immigration. After analyzing US and Canadian anti-trafficking rhetoric and policies and conducting interviews with female migrants in Canada, Sharma argues that the rhetorical association between human trafficking and immigration is more harmful than helpful to the trafficked. The 24 women she interviewed arrived in Canada from China on a set of ships that traveled “with the aid of smugglers and without the official permission of Canada or China.”⁸⁰ In the incident she examined, the women and children were argued to be trafficked persons while the men on the ships who did not qualify as refugees were detained and deported.⁸¹ She explains that the migrants were described using metaphors of natural disasters and contagion.⁸²

She also problematizes the idea that migration is a cause of trafficking. The focus on migration as a potential cause of trafficking normalizes the idea that migrants are “always better off at ‘home.’”⁸³ This line of argument legitimates “acts of deportation” by associating these acts with “the moral authority of helping a victim,” who is presumably a

woman or child.⁸⁴ Sharma argues that the “catch-all justification of acting ‘for women and children’ has been effectively mobilized within anti-trafficking frameworks” to create “moral panic” with the effect of “legitimizing criminalization of both the migrants who circumvent those controls and those who help them.”⁸⁵ The focus on criminalizing traffickers and “illegal” migration sponsors arguments for restricting immigration. Sharma shows that “by choosing to mainly focus on traffickers, anti-trafficking campaigns...function as the moral regulatory branch of anti-immigration movements.”⁸⁶

Caroline Ausserer problematizes the discursive and conceptual linkages between undocumented/illegal migration and human trafficking as well. She argues that such couplings mask the inextricable overlap between legal and illegal migration.⁸⁷ Ausserer argues that the definitions of trafficking in international agreements that view trafficking as necessarily including “elements of deceit, force and violence” fail to address unequal distributions of access to mobility that are fueled by globalization and other related processes.⁸⁸ According to Ausserer, the process by which countries are divided into destination countries and countries from which people are trafficked is racialized. The view of migration as a threat to the nation-state solidifies binaries between the domestic and international, the civilized and uncivilized, self and other, and order and disorder.⁸⁹ The nation-state is seen as containing a homogenous political community that is at risk due to the outside forces.⁹⁰

Aradau explains that the rhetorical construction of the interrelationship between trafficking and immigration policy puts trafficked persons at risk. She argues that the manner in which victimhood has been constructed “sees women as perpetuating a risk of illegal migration to Western society; to contain and neutralize this risk, they are to be

surveyed and disciplined.”⁹¹ Ausserer explains further: “The attribution of a dangerous identity to potential migrants and trafficked persons puts in motion biopolitical control mechanisms leading, paradoxically, to a higher vulnerability of ‘abject’ persons like potential migrants/strangers as trafficked persons.”⁹²

Jyoti Sanghera argues that the policies created based upon this rhetoric are ineffective as well as being harmful to migrants. Sanghera argues that “curbing migration has not and will not stop trafficking.”⁹³ Harsher immigration policies “have merely resulted in pushing the trafficked persons further into situations of violence and abuse, and rendering them more inaccessible.”⁹⁴ Sanghera references the results of increased “surveillance on the Indo-Nepal border” and argues that trafficking is simply pushed further underground in response to stricter immigration controls.⁹⁵

The Role of Metaphor in Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric

Metaphors play an important role in trafficking and immigration rhetoric. As Mark Ellis and Richard Wright argue, “metaphor is a fundamental rhetorical device.”⁹⁶ Metaphor can be defined as “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.”⁹⁷ As Robert L. Ivie notes, “thought itself is metaphoric.”⁹⁸ Metaphors are used “in order to extract perspectives and situations from their familiar and orthodox settings and manipulate them within more unconventional and unfamiliar contexts.”⁹⁹ Metaphors influence reality by normalizing certain cognitive frames and associations. They “potentially provide not only theoretical insight and cognitive content but can also be used to define what is taken for granted and thought to be true.”¹⁰⁰

Metaphors are “pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action.”¹⁰¹ As Karma R. Chávez argues, “metaphors are...central to national social

imaginaries."¹⁰² Metaphors influence the way that concepts are understood, scholarship is produced, and the type of solutions that are considered viable to deal with particular problems. In short, "Metaphor enables the creation of new and alternate realities."¹⁰³ Foreign policy in particular is influenced by the use of metaphor: "In international relations and foreign policy, metaphors are used by scholars and policymakers alike."¹⁰⁴ Scholarship on human trafficking and immigration and speeches by policymakers are no exception. Metaphors are important to the conceptualization of trafficking because as Saunders and Soderlund note, "our understandings of sexual trafficking are always mediated through language and institutional discourses."¹⁰⁵

Metaphors shape the type of action that is taken in response to human trafficking and immigration. Metaphors shape the way that policies are formulated. As J. David Cisneros argues, "metaphors of immigration serve as conceptual tools with which scholars build research, society establishes group relationships, and government creates public policy."¹⁰⁶ Metaphors are similarly important to human trafficking policy. Those who control the terms of the anti-trafficking debate influence policy. Different groups compete to define trafficking in order to "shape national and international policy decisions."¹⁰⁷ As Ronald Weitzer explains:

Anti-prostitution forces frequently network with government officials during private meetings, at conferences, and at hearings—giving them unique opportunities to shape the terms of the debate and subsequent policy changes. Groups that do not share the crusade's views have been denied access to these venues and to policy makers more generally.¹⁰⁸

As the thesis will elaborate further in the following chapters, metaphors influence the way that immigration and human trafficking are conceptualized and dealt with in terms of legislation by causing particular types of solutions to be prioritized.

The role that metaphors play in societal conceptualizations of immigration, trafficking, and national identity necessitates the examination of the metaphorical representation of immigrants and the trafficked. Critical examination of the metaphorical representation of immigrants “provides an opportunity to critique dominant logics by exploring the ideological implications of contemporary immigration rhetoric.”¹⁰⁹ Examining the metaphors used to describe immigration is important to reveal the ideological and sometimes racist assumptions implicit within immigration rhetoric. Similarly, it is vital that the metaphors used in trafficking rhetoric be critically investigated. Otto Santa Ana argues, “the conceptual foundation of racism continues to be expressed via the metaphors most commonly utilized in the public discourse on immigrants.”¹¹⁰ The role that metaphorical representations of immigrants and immigration can have in perpetuating racist stereotypes necessitates critical analysis of the metaphors used to describe immigrants: “Because of social implications that follow from the use of racist political metaphors and the world-views involved, the dominant mappings of political issues can and should be contested.”¹¹¹ Racist political metaphors can sponsor violence. As Guillermo Gomez-Pena argues:

What begins as inflammatory rhetoric eventually becomes [an] accepted dictum, justifying racial violence against suspected illegal immigrants. What Operation Gatekeeper, Proposition 187, and SOS [Save Our State] have done is to send a frightening message to society: The governor is behind you; let those "aliens" have it. Since they are here "illegally," they are expendable.... To hurt, attack, or offend a faceless, and nameless "criminal" doesn't seem to have any legal or moral implications.¹¹²

It is important to engage in a critical reading of human trafficking and immigration texts to illuminate these potentially racist metaphors. As George Lakoff warned, metaphors are more than “just linguistic expressions.”¹¹³ Metaphors can sponsor action. In this context,

they may contribute to potentially exclusionary and violent conceptualizations of human trafficking and immigration.

The Rhetorical Construction of National Identity and Citizenship

The metaphors used to describe trafficking and immigration contribute to the conceptualization of national identity and by extension, citizenship. According to Cisneros, “Metaphoric representations are a crucial component of this identity construction.”¹¹⁴ National identity and citizenship are not stable concepts; they are rhetorically constructed.¹¹⁵ As Kent A. Ono argues “borders, citizens, and the nation” are terms that “are socially constructed through discourse, are historically contextualized, are not fixed in any indelible way, and are culturally variant.”¹¹⁶ “Rhetoric functionally creates the conditions for...shifts” in the conceptualization of borders.¹¹⁷ Citizenship is a malleable concept that is dependent up on not only law, but rhetoric in order to have meaning.¹¹⁸

Rhetorical scholars have shown how citizenship can be performative.¹¹⁹ Viewing citizenship as performative emphasizes that “citizenship relies upon both regulations that mandate exclusions and the participatory agency and mobilized imaginations of activated individuals.”¹²⁰ Citizenship does not only refer to the legal standards for belonging to a particular national community. Citizenship is performed daily “through rhetorical acts.”¹²¹ Citizenship is given meaning as it is performed in a particular way repeatedly in rhetorical acts. These rhetorical acts include rhetoric by non-citizens, citizens, border patrol agents, consular agents, law enforcement officials, scholars, and policymakers. Citizenship is conceptualized both “through a nation’s laws, institutions, or myths” and “in individual and group performances of citizenship.”¹²²

Non-citizens are not only excluded or the subject of such discourse, they can also perform citizenship. As Cisneros emphasizes:

Dominant discourses of US citizenship are contested through alternative attempts to (re)border the civic imaginary. Just as the border is drawn to exclude migrants based on their legal, racial, ethnic, or other “difference,” borders can be redrawn to reshape the contours of US citizenship.¹²³

Through their struggle with “dominant discourses of US citizenship,” non-citizens work against hegemonic border narratives.¹²⁴ Rhetorical acts in which citizenship is performed can both affirm and work against dominant conceptions of citizenship.

Rhetorical acts may vary in form from photographs, posters, public service announcement videos, speeches, and/or proclamations to protests, graffiti, conversations and/or legislation. “Community activism, artistic expression, speeches, conversations, cultural demonstration, protest, or even economic activity” can constitute means of “enacting or performing citizenship.”¹²⁵ For example, presidential rhetoric can facilitate the myth of the united national community.¹²⁶ Anne Demo illustrates that the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) and Border Patrol work to create a way of seeing the border with visual rhetoric. The INS and Border Patrol juxtapose surveillance imagery with “scenes of unchecked illegal immigration” to portray the border as a lawless space that can and must be “placed under the rule of law.”¹²⁷ In this way, “INS and Border Patrol rhetoric recast the border by fashioning a compelling image of effective deterrence.”¹²⁸ Another example includes “answers at the border” during interviews with border patrol officials, which “are acts of performative citizenship.”¹²⁹ These “routine performances of the border (on both citizens and foreigners) [create] the subject and the sovereign through the submission of the traveler and recognition of the sovereign.”¹³⁰

As discussed in Chapter One, American citizenship is given meaning through negation. In the face of the instability of the concepts of national identity and citizenship, the citizen is defined in relation to the non-citizen. Cisneros argues that public unease over the instability of national identity has caused the “alienization of the non-citizen [to be] fundamental to the rhetorical maintenance of US identity.”¹³¹ The inside and outside of the nation are mutually constituted discursively.¹³² Migrants “have served as ‘Others’ through which US identity is constituted in part.”¹³³ The refusal of rights and negation of political agency of non-citizen Others is necessary to imbue citizenship with meaning: “The constitution of the differentiation between us and them not only permits the installation of mechanisms of exclusion and the negation of related rights, but also allows “a ‘re-foundation’ of the political community.”¹³⁴ As Didier Bigo explains, “Citizens are then conceived as nationals, understood by opposition to foreigners, and, migrants are framed through various cultural discourses as foreigners, or as citizens of a different national origin, who do not fit the ‘national standard’ of norms and values.”¹³⁵

The way in which borders are discussed influences how they are enforced. Human trafficking and immigration metaphors shape policy formation. How human trafficking and immigration are conceptualized influences which solutions will be favored. Cisneros elaborates, “The ways in which news media images and textual fragments construct immigration as a danger is problematic, for they inform society's relationship to immigrants and they influence the direction of public policy on immigration.”¹³⁶ The rhetoric of public officials helps to determine which types of solutions will be selected: “federal agencies both receive *and* help define a “threat” or “problem” (such as migration) and then construct particular solutions.”¹³⁷

It is important to analyze human trafficking and immigration rhetoric even if it is difficult to prove a direct link between particular rhetorical devices and policymaking. As Flores notes, “while explicit causal relations between the mediated demonization of immigrants and restrictive immigration policies are difficult to sustain, casual dismissal of such connections appears short-sighted.”¹³⁸ Immigration and trafficking discourse might not automatically result in policy, but immigration and trafficking rhetoric is related to the way the border is conceptualized. Demo argues that the “dominant modes of talking about and visualizing borders function as the means by which political, social, and cultural norms are redefined.”¹³⁹ The way that immigration and trafficking are represented shapes the way that they are discussed and the type of scholarship that is produced about them and the way that national identity is conceptualized.

The mutually reinforcing human trafficking and immigration rhetoric employed by the Obama administration has an impact on conceptions of national identity. It does so by simultaneously depicting trafficking as contrary to US national identity and anti-trafficking as an affirmation of fundamental American values. In the following two chapters, the thesis will outline the dominant metaphors utilized in the human trafficking and immigration rhetoric utilized by members of the Obama administration.

Notes

¹ Penelope Saunders, "Traffic Violations: Determining the Meaning of Violence in Sexual Trafficking Versus Sex Work," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20 (2005): 347.

² Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 350.

³ Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 347.

⁴ Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 347.

⁵ Jennifer Lynne Musto, "What's in a Name?: Conflations and Contradictions in Contemporary U.S. Discourses of Human Trafficking" *Women's Studies International Forum* 32 (2009): 284.

⁶ Musto, "What's in a Name," 285.

⁷ Musto, "What's in a Name," 285.

⁸ Musto, "What's in a Name," 286.

⁹ Musto, "What's in a Name," 286.

¹⁰ Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 354.

¹¹ Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 355.

¹² Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 344.

¹³ Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 355.

¹⁴ Moshoula Capous Desyllas, "A Critique of the Global Trafficking Discourse and U.S. Policy," *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 57 (2007): 61.

¹⁵ Saunders, "Perfect Victims," 346.

¹⁶ Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 346.

¹⁷ Saunders, "Traffic Violations," 347.

¹⁸ Desyllas, "A Critique," 353.

¹⁹ Desyllas, "A Critique," 348.

²⁰ Melissa Ditmore, “The Use of Raids to Fight Trafficking in Persons,” Sex Workers Project. 2009, <http://www.nswp.org/sites/nswp.org/files/swp-2009-raids-and-trafficking-report.pdf>.

²¹ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 51.

²² Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 17.

²³ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 49.

²⁴ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 49.

²⁵ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 24.

²⁶ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 24.

²⁷ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 31.

²⁸ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 19.

²⁹ Marisa Silenzi Cianciarulo, “Modern-Day Slavery and Cultural Bias: Proposals for Reforming the U.S. Visa System for Victims of International Human Trafficking,” *Nevada Law Journal* 7 (2007): 832.

³⁰ Cianciarulo, “Modern-Day Slavery,” 833.

³¹ Cianciarulo, “Modern-Day Slavery,” 831.

³² Cianciarulo, “Modern-Day Slavery,” 831.

³³ Cianciarulo, “Modern-Day Slavery,” 831.

³⁴ Ditmore, “The Use of Raids,” 22.

³⁵ Alese C. Wooditch, M.A. DuPont-Morales and Don Hummer, “Traffick jam: a policy review of the United States’ Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000,” *Trends Organ Crim* 12 (2009): 245.

³⁶ T.K. Logan, Robert Walker and Gretchen Hunt, “Understanding Human Trafficking in the United States,” *Trauma Violence Abuse* 10.3 (2009): 16.

³⁷ Jayashri Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims and Real Survivors: The Iconic Victim in Domestic Human Trafficking,” *Boston University Law Review* 87, no. 157 (2007): 174-5.

³⁸ Jo Doezema, "Loose Women or Lost Women? The Re-emergence of the Myth of White Slavery in Contemporary Discourses of Trafficking in Women" *Gender Issues* 18 (1999): 40; Mary Ann Irwin, "White Slavery as Metaphor," *Ex Post Facto: The History Journal* 5 (1996), n.p.

³⁹ Doezema, "Loose Women or Lost Women?" 27.

⁴⁰ Doezema, "Loose Women or Lost Women?" 24.

⁴¹ Doezema, "Loose Women or Lost Women?" 24.

⁴² Irwin, "White Slavery."

⁴³ Irwin, "White Slavery."

⁴⁴ Doezema, "Loose Women or Lost Women," 40; Nandita Sharma, "Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric and the Making of a Global Apartheid" *NWSA Journal* 17 (2005): 90; Gretchen Soderlund, "Running from the Rescuers: New U.S. Crusades Against Sex Trafficking and the Rhetoric of Abolition" *NWSA Journal* 17 (2005): 82.

⁴⁵ Soderlund, "Running from the Rescuers," 82.

⁴⁶ Soderlund, "Running from the Rescuers," 82.

⁴⁷ Doezema, "Loose Women or Lost Women," 24.

⁴⁸ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 160.

⁴⁹ Soderlund, "Running from the Rescuers," 74.

⁵⁰ Musto, "What's in a Name," 285.

⁵¹ Musto, "What's in a Name," 285.

⁵² Musto, "What's in a Name," 285.

⁵³ Musto, "What's in a Name," 284.

⁵⁴ Musto, "What's in a Name," 284.

⁵⁵ Sarah L. Steele, "'Combating the Scourge': Constructing the Masculine 'Other' Through U.S. Government Anti-trafficking Campaigns" *Journal of Hate Studies* 9 (2011): 49.

- ⁵⁶ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 34.
- ⁵⁷ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 51.
- ⁵⁸ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 34.
- ⁵⁹ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 46; Yvonne C. Zimmerman, *Other Dreams of Freedom: Religion, Sex, and Human Trafficking* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2013), 50.
- ⁶⁰ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 55.
- ⁶¹ Steele, "Combating the Scourge," 49.
- ⁶² Samuel Martinez, "Taking Better Account: Contemporary Slavery, Gendered Narratives and the Feminization of Struggle" *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 2 (2011): 277; Musto, "What's in a Name," 284; Tryon P. Woods, "Surrogate Selves: Notes on Anti-Trafficking and Anti-Blackness," *Social Identities* 19 (2013): 122.
- ⁶³ Martinez, "Taking Better," 279.
- ⁶⁴ Musto, "What's in a Name," 284.
- ⁶⁵ Musto, "What's in a Name," 284.
- ⁶⁶ Musto, "What's in a Name," 284.
- ⁶⁷ Musto, "What's in a Name," 284.
- ⁶⁸ Melissa Ditmore, "The Use of Raids to Fight Trafficking in Persons," Sex Workers Project. 2009, <http://www.nswp.org/sites/nswp.org/files/swp-2009-raids-and-trafficking-report.pdf>
- ⁶⁹ Desyllas, "A Critique," 60.
- ⁷⁰ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 188.
- ⁷¹ Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims," 192.
- ⁷² Sharma "Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric," 91.
- ⁷³ Wendy Chapkis. "Trafficking, Migration, and the Law: Protecting Innocents, Punishing Immigrants" *Gender & Society* (2003): 931.

- ⁷⁴ Chapkis, “Trafficking, Migration, and the Law,” 931.
- ⁷⁵ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims,” 198.
- ⁷⁶ Musto, “What’s in a Name,” 283.
- ⁷⁷ Musto, “What’s in a Name,” 283.
- ⁷⁸ Musto, “What’s in a Name,” 283.
- ⁷⁹ Musto, “What’s in a Name,” 283.
- ⁸⁰ Sharma, “Anti-trafficking Rhetoric,” 92.
- ⁸¹ Sharma, “Anti-trafficking Rhetoric,” 93.
- ⁸² Sharma, “Anti-trafficking Rhetoric,” 92.
- ⁸³ Sharma, “Anti-trafficking Rhetoric,” 96.
- ⁸⁴ Sharma, “Anti-trafficking Rhetoric,” 96.
- ⁸⁵ Sharma, “Anti-trafficking Rhetoric,” 91
- ⁸⁶ Sharma, “Anti-trafficking Rhetoric,” 92.
- ⁸⁷ Caroline Ausserer, “‘Control in the Name of Protection’: A Critical Analysis of the Discourse of International Human Trafficking as a Form of Forced Migration,” *STAIR* 4, no.1 (2008): 98-99.
- ⁸⁸ Ausserer, “Control in the Name of Protection,” 100.
- ⁸⁹ Ausserer, “Control in the Name of Protection,” 104.
- ⁹⁰ Ausserer, “Control in the Name of Protection,” 104.
- ⁹¹ Claudia Aradau, “The Perverse Politics of Four-Letter Words: Risk and Pity in the Securitisation of Human Trafficking,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 33 (2004): 276.
- ⁹² Ausserer, “Control in the Name of Protection,” 104.

⁹³ Jyoti Sanghera, "Unpacking the Trafficking Discourse," in *Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New Perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Rights* ed. Kamala Kempadoo (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2005), 11.

⁹⁴ Sanghera, "Unpacking the Trafficking," 11.

⁹⁵ Sanghera, "Unpacking the Trafficking," 11.

⁹⁶ Mark Ellis and Richard Wright, "The Balkanization Metaphor in the Analysis of U.S. Immigration," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88, no. 4 (1998): 688.

⁹⁷ George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 5.

⁹⁸ Robert L. Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse: The Case of 1812," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 240.

⁹⁹ Aditi Bhatia, "Religious metaphor in the discourse of illusion: George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden," *World Englishes* 26, no. 4 (2007): 510.

¹⁰⁰ Ellis and Wright, "The Balkanization," 688.

¹⁰¹ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 1.

¹⁰² Karma R. Chávez, "Embodied Translation: Dominant Discourse and Communication with Migrant Bodies-as-Text" *The Howard Journal of Communication* 20 (2009): 19.

¹⁰³ Aditi Bhatia, "Religious metaphor," 510.

¹⁰⁴ Keith L. Shimko, "Metaphors and Foreign Policy Decision Making" *Political Psychology* 15, no. 4 (1994): 655.

¹⁰⁵ Penelope Saunders and Gretchen Soderlund, "Threat or Opportunity: Sexuality, Gender and the Ebb and Flow of Trafficking as Discourse," *Canadian Woman Studies* 22, no. 3 (2003): 22.

¹⁰⁶ Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities," 570.

¹⁰⁷ Saunders and Soderlund, "Threat or Opportunity," 22-3.

¹⁰⁸ Ronald Weitzer, "The Social Construction of Sex Trafficking: Ideology and Institutionalization of a Moral Crusade," *Politics Society* 35 (2007): 459.

- ¹⁰⁹ Cisneros, “Contaminated Communities,” 591.
- ¹¹⁰ Otto Santa Ana. “Like an Animal I was Treated’: Anti-Immigrant Metaphor in US Public Discourse” *Discourse & Society* 10 (1999): 218.
- ¹¹¹ Santa Ana, “Like an Animal,” 218.
- ¹¹² Guillermo Gómez-Peña, *The New World Border: Prophecies, Poems, and Loqueras for the End of the Century* (San Francisco: City Lights, 1996), 69.
- ¹¹³ George Lakoff, “The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor” in *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 209.
- ¹¹⁴ Cisneros, “Contaminated Communities,” 591.
- ¹¹⁵ Kent A. Ono. *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Immigration and California’s Proposition 187* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002), 364.
- ¹¹⁶ Ono, *Shifting Borders*, 160.
- ¹¹⁷ Ono, *Shifting Borders*, 160.
- ¹¹⁸ Ono, *Shifting Borders*, 106.
- ¹¹⁹ Chávez, “Embodied Translation; J. David Cisneros, “(Re)Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Rhetoric, Hybridity, and Citizenship in La Gran Marcha,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97 (2011): 40; Sara L. McKinnon, “Citizenship and the Performance of Credibility: Audiencing Gender-based Asylum Seekers in U.S. Immigration Courts,” *Text and Performance Quarterly* 29 (2009): 205-221; Karen S. Mitchell, Sonja Arsham Kuflinec, and Harry Brod, “Introduction: How Does Citizenship Mean?” *Text and Performance Quarterly* 29 (2009): 201-204.
- ¹²⁰ Mitchell, Kuflinec, and Brod, “Introduction,” 201.
- ¹²¹ Cisneros, “(Re)Bordering,” 40.
- ¹²² Cisneros, “(Re)Bordering,” 30.
- ¹²³ Cisneros, “(Re)Bordering,” 27.
- ¹²⁴ Cisneros, “(Re)Bordering,” 27.
- ¹²⁵ Cisneros, “(Re)Bordering,” 31.

¹²⁶ Vanessa B. Beasley, *You the People: American National Identity in Presidential Rhetoric* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 8.

¹²⁷ Anne Demo, "Sovereignty Discourse and Contemporary Immigration Politics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91 (2006): 298.

¹²⁸ Demo, "Sovereignty Discourse," 298.

¹²⁹ Salter, "We are All Exiles," 11.

¹³⁰ Mark B. Salter, "We are All Exiles: Implications of the Border as State of Exception" (paper presented at the Standing Group on International Relations Conference, Turin, Italy, September 13, 2007).

¹³¹ Cisneros, "(Re)Bordering," 26.

¹³² Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Immigration and National Identity: Constructing the Nation," *Review of International Studies* 22 (1996): 239.

¹³³ Cisneros, "(Re)Bordering," 27.

¹³⁴ Ausserer, "Control in the Name of Protection," 105-106.

¹³⁵ Didier Bigo, "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease" *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27 (2002): 67.

¹³⁶ Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities," 591.

¹³⁷ Jason Ackleson, "Constructing security on the U.S.-Mexico border" *Political Geography* 24 (2005): 174.

¹³⁸ Lisa A. Flores, "Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20 (2003): 363.

¹³⁹ Demo, "Sovereignty Discourse," 306.

CHAPTER THREE

Metaphors in the Obama Administration's Immigration Rhetoric

Immigration rhetoric is ripe with metaphors and a considerable amount of scholarship has been produced pertaining to the metaphorical representation of immigration. These metaphors express a myriad of positive and negative stereotypes. As Vanessa B. Beasley explains, the “tradition within American culture of viewing the immigrant as a symbol of hope and opportunity in the United States” is accompanied by “one that is at least as old and equally if not more hardy – that suggests quite the opposite.”¹ As Marjorie S. Zatz and Hilary Smith argue: “The demonization and racialization of immigrants have historically been central elements in the rhetoric surrounding US immigration policy.”² Nativist anti-immigrant sentiment “continues to be present within political rhetoric in the United States.”³ It is pertinent that the rhetorical construction of immigrant stereotypes be studied because immigrant stereotypes are pervasive and powerful:

Popular discourses of immigration – whether emanating from political leaders, mainstream media, or radical groups like the Minutemen – relied on ‘deeply embedded’ stereotypes and dominant logics of immigration as a social problem and of immigrants as threats to the nation.⁴

Metaphors further the circulation of both positive and negative stereotypes of immigrants that can contribute to the conceptualization of immigration and the formulation of policies in response to immigration issues.

Immigrants are commonly metaphorically constructed as economic units, illegal or aliens, criminals, disease (parasites or pathogens), invasions and natural disasters.⁵

Another common metaphor for immigrants is that immigrants are sub-human or animals.⁶ Immigrants are also metaphorically represented as pollutants.⁷ Immigrants are discursively portrayed as destructive and analogized to natural disasters.⁸ The metaphors that are most common in the Obama administration's immigration rhetoric are the representation of immigrants as economic units, illegal aliens, criminals, and animals, the representation of the immigration issue as a "war," and the discursive construction of the United States as a "beacon of hope" for immigrants.

Immigrants as Economic Units

The Obama administration routinely discusses immigration in economic terms. In Obama's 2014 State of the Union Address, he introduces and justifies immigration reform by associating it with economic growth:

Finally, if we're serious about economic growth, it is time to heed the call of business leaders, labor leaders, faith leaders, law enforcement -- and fix our broken immigration system... Republicans and Democrats in the Senate have acted. And I know that members of both parties in the House want to do the same. Independent economists say immigration reform will grow our economy and shrink our deficits by almost \$1 trillion in the next two decades. And for good reason: When people come here to fulfill their dreams -- to study, invent, contribute to our culture -- they make our country a more attractive place for businesses to locate and create jobs for everybody. So let's get immigration reform done this year.⁹

In this speech, Obama advances the arguments that immigrants are good for the economy because they attract businesses and that immigration reform would decrease the deficit. Immigrants are categorically grouped and spoken about as a collective unit in relation to the economy. In the 2013 State of the Union Address, Obama similarly argues "Our economy is stronger when we harness the talents and ingenuity of striving, hopeful

immigrants.”¹⁰ Immigrants are seen as an economic unit and a resource that can be ‘harnessed’ by the United States for financial gain.

Legal immigrants are described as beneficial to the economy while illegal immigration is described as a threat. This delineation can be seen in Obama’s 2013 State of the Union Address:

Real reform means establishing a responsible pathway to earned citizenship, a path that includes passing a background check, paying taxes and a meaningful penalty, learning English, and going to the back of the line behind the folks trying to come here legally. And real reform means fixing the legal immigration system to cut waiting periods and attract the highly skilled entrepreneurs and engineers that will help create jobs and grow our economy.¹¹

Good immigrants are described as those who go through the system, “come here legally,” pay taxes, and “[learn] English,” while bad immigrants migrate outside of the system.¹²

Instead of welcoming the “huddled masses,” Obama declares that the proverbial doors are open for skilled migrants, such as entrepreneurs and engineers. Deputy Director of ICE Daniel Ragdale similarly argues that legal immigrants, entrepreneurs in particular, are the type of immigrants that should be welcome due to their economic value. Ragdale argues that immigration reform is a matter of “commonsense” because it would help the economy:

It would also modernize our legal immigration system, allowing families to be reunited in a humane and timely manner and grow our economy by attracting the highly- skilled entrepreneurs and workers who will help create good paying jobs. These are all commonsense steps that the majority of Americans support.¹³

Obama makes the same designation between good (legal/economically productive) immigrants and bad (undocumented/economically unproductive) immigrants in his 2010 State of the Union Address:

We're going to crack down on violations of equal pay laws so that women get equal pay for an equal day's work. And we should continue the work of fixing our broken immigration system, to secure our borders and enforce our laws and ensure that everyone who plays by the rules can contribute to our economy and enrich our Nation.¹⁴

This discourse creates a clear line between good (economically useful/productive) immigrants and bad (economically useless/unproductive) immigrants. Legal immigrants who play “by the rules” are described as part of a functioning economy and nation.

Economic productivity is constructed as a part of citizenship. In the lines following the above quote, Obama further emphasizes that productivity is an essential component of good citizenship:

In the end, it's our ideals, our values that built America, values that allowed us to forge a nation made up of immigrants from every corner of the globe, values that drive our citizens still. Every day, Americans meet their responsibilities to their families and their employers... They take pride in their labor and are generous in spirit. These aren't Republican values or Democratic values that they're living by, business values or labor values, they're American values.¹⁵

Hard work is elevated to the level of an American value. It is implicitly argued that because America is made of economically productive immigrants, immigrants who display these traits and values are able to be integrated into the national community of the United States. This view that illegal immigration is a hindrance to the national economy is supported by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) website, which argues that the enforcement of immigration laws is essential to a healthy economy in the United States: “protecting our borders from the illegal movement of weapons, drugs, contraband, and people, while promoting lawful entry and exit, is essential to homeland security, economic prosperity, and national sovereignty.”¹⁶ Obama deploys similar rhetoric in the 2011 State of the Union Address:

Now, I strongly believe that we should take on, once and for all, the issue of illegal immigration. And I am prepared to work with Republicans and Democrats to protect our borders, enforce our laws, and address the millions of undocumented workers who are now living in the shadows. I know that debate will be difficult. I know it will take time. But tonight, let's agree to make that effort. And let's stop expelling talented, responsible young people who could be staffing our research labs or starting a new business, who could be further enriching this Nation.¹⁷

Obama emphasizes the undesirability of shadowy undocumented workers, while underscoring the importance of recruiting and welcoming productive immigrants into the United States. He expresses the view that detention and deportation are strategies that are only inappropriate for the economically productive.

Although it would appear on the surface that the categorization of immigrants as economic units might be beneficial because liberal arguments for immigration reform can be supported by the view that immigrants help the economy, the treatment of immigrants as an economic unit can just as easily be utilized to support anti-immigrant sentiments. Even legal immigrants can readily be portrayed as an economic threat. When they are no longer seen to be productive, immigrants are easily characterized as undesirable.

Throughout the history of the United States, the treatment of immigrants has been dependent upon the state of the economy. While the economic climate is certainly not the only determination of the public attitude toward immigration, it is a significant factor: “Immigrants to U.S. shores have been handled according to their sending nation and to the economic climate in the United States at the time.”¹⁸ When the economy is healthy anti-immigrant sentiments are lower, whereas “when production slows due to a stagnant or failing economy and domestic unemployment is high, anti-immigrant sentiment rises, along with policy implementation and action (detention and deportation).”¹⁹ As Juliet P. Stumpf argues, the “pendulum between expansion and restriction of immigration” is

frequently determined by the “magnetism of factors such as economic demand for labor.”²⁰ While the economy is but one factor determining the stance of the United States toward immigration at any particular time, it is a significant one.

The utilization of economic arguments in the name of immigration restrictions was seen in the debates in California over Proposition 187. In their book, *Shifting Borders*, Kent A. Ono and John M. Sloop explain how the metaphorical representation of immigrants as economic units was utilized to support anti-immigrant movements.²¹ They argue that mainstream news discourse related to Proposition 187 portrayed undocumented immigrants as “economic commodities for the state of California.”²² In rhetoric “both for and against Proposition 187” the assumption is that “undocumented immigrants are human capital.”²³ Once immigrants are no longer helpful to the economy, they are no longer useful and expendable: “migrant workers are needed to keep the economy strong but must be returned when they become a drain on the economy.”²⁴

“Illegal” and/or “Alien”

Another common immigration metaphor is the representation of immigrants as “illegals” and/or “aliens.”²⁵ The “alien” metaphor is the “most dominant metaphor in all of immigration law.”²⁶ Officials in the Obama administration frequently refer to immigrants using these metaphors. In rhetoric and in policy, immigrants are treated as “illegal aliens.” Members of the Obama administration commonly refer to the practice known as “human smuggling” with the phrase “alien smuggling.” For example, in response to a Senate hearing on combating organized crime, Deputy Director of ICE, Kumar C. Kibble, stated:

A coordinated strategy of attacking criminal networks at multiple locations along the illicit travel continuum will reduce pressure on law enforcement resources and assist partner nations in preventing or disrupting organized alien smuggling within their own territories.²⁷

Undocumented immigrants are rhetorically lowered from the level of “humans” to “aliens.”

Members of the Obama administration refer to both documented and undocumented immigrants as “aliens.” For example, Director of the ICE Office of Investigations, Marcy M. Forman, made the statement that “During the enforcement of all laws, like other law enforcement agencies, ICE encounters United States citizens and work-authorized aliens, in addition to undocumented aliens.”²⁸ Forman refers to immigrants with work visas as “aliens” and rhetorically groups documented and undocumented immigrants together. In a statement by Executive Associate Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations at ICE Gary Mead, he similarly groups all non-citizens as “aliens,” “Since the beginning of FY 2009, ICE has released 12,567 individual aliens, including both criminal and noncriminal aliens, under the terms of the Zadvydas settlement.”²⁹ Another example can be seen in a statement by then Assistant Secretary of ICE, John Morton: “Through Secure Communities, aliens—including those who have overstayed their visas or otherwise violated their immigration status and are then encountered by law enforcement—can be identified when booked for crimes by state and local law enforcement.”³⁰ All non-citizens are grouped together by Morton as “aliens” that need to be monitored by the government.

In policy, “aliens” are targeted by ICE. James T. Hayes, Jr., Director of the ICE Office of Detention and Removal Operations, describes the purpose of his office as follows: “DRO’s core mission is the arrest, detention, and removal of inadmissible and

deportable aliens.”³¹ “Criminal aliens” is one of the categories that ICE uses in prioritizing removals. According to David Venturella, Executive Director of Secure Communities at ICE, “Secretary Napolitano has made the identification and removal of criminal aliens a top priority for ICE.”³² Similarly, Gary Mead, Executive Associate Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations for ICE, stated that “In Fiscal Year 2011, over 90% of our removals fell within our priority categories: Criminal Aliens (55%), Repeat Immigration Law Violators (20%), Border Removals (12%) and Immigration Fugitives (5%).”³³ Similarly, in written testimony for Congress, Thomas Horman, Executive Director for the ICE Office of Enforcement and Removal Operations, stated:

Overall, in fiscal year (FY) 2012, ICE’s Office of Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) removed a record number of 409,849 individuals. Of these, approximately 55 percent, or 225,390, had a criminal conviction – almost double the total removals of criminals in FY 2008. This includes 1,215 aliens convicted of homicide; 5,557 aliens convicted of sexual offenses; and 40,448 aliens convicted for crimes involving drugs. Moreover, ICE also continues to make progress in the removal of other enforcement priorities. In FY 2012, 96 percent of all ICE’s removals fell into a priority category – a record achievement.³⁴

“Criminal aliens” are described as threats to the safety of the American public: “DHS must ensure that our immigration enforcement resources are focused on the removal of those who constitute our highest priorities, specifically individuals who pose threats to public safety such as criminal aliens.”³⁵

The use of the metaphors “illegal” and “alien” separately or together is problematic. The utilization of the terms “illegal” and/or “alien” naturalizes violence against those who appear to be noncitizens and the prioritization of detention and deportation in response to undocumented immigration and those who do not appear to be citizens. It is not only undocumented immigrants but also citizens that have been subject

to harassment, detention and deportation as a result of presumptions about what a real American citizen looks like, how they act, or how they speak: “There are many examples--stretching from the late nineteenth century to the present day--of cases in which U.S. citizens have had to wage protracted battles to prove their citizenship, or have been deported prior to being able to do so.”³⁶ Depending upon the circumstances in which they are taken into custody, individuals may not have the ability to obtain the documents necessary to prove their citizenship status.³⁷ According to Rachel E. Rosenbloom, the false identifications of citizens as non-citizens is exacerbated by “the relaxed procedural safeguards embodied in the immigration enforcement system, including lack of counsel, the prospect of prolonged detention, and summary proceedings.”³⁸ The accused are unable to obtain or have legal counsel obtain proof that they are indeed US citizens.

Detention and deportation are naturalized as solutions to immigration by “illegal alien” rhetoric. As Lisa A. Flores argues: “Whether invoked directly or indirectly, the figure of the “illegal alien” is hauntingly consistent, as is the quick turn to deportation.”³⁹ Flores argues that one piece of evidence for this connection is that Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) videos are full of “verbal references to “freeways teeming with illegals,” the “onslaught of aliens,” and “large and unruly groups” that “charge,” “surge,” and “swell” over the border....”⁴⁰ This preference for detention and deportation as responses to “illegal aliens” disproportionately impacts some people because determinations of which bodies appear to be “illegal” are influenced by gender and racial stereotypes about what type of appearance and/or behavior is appropriate for a person of a specific gender and/or race.⁴¹ As Ming H. Chen explains, “moral panic over

immigration has spread to include more categories of undesirables such as Latinos who either are, or who are perceived to be, illegal aliens.”⁴² The term “illegal alien” is most often used to reference “unauthorized Mexican immigrants and draws upon stereotypes of Mexicans as criminals.”⁴³ According to Rachel E. Rosenbloom, “Mexicans have replaced the Chinese as the primary target of immigration enforcement over the course of the twentieth century.”⁴⁴ Although it is most frequently used to label Mexican immigrants, the term “illegal alien” is a label used to categorize people of any nationality who appear to be non-citizens.

Criminal Immigrants and Crime-ridden Borders

Members of the Obama administration equate immigration and the borders of the United States with crime. These linkages can be seen in the rhetoric and policies of the administration. Immigrants are described as more likely to be criminals. The immigration system and borders more generally are described as being vulnerable to different types of criminals. Immigration is treated as a criminal issue as a matter of policy.

DHS and its subset, ICE, treat immigration and the border as related to crime. The border and immigration are portrayed as vulnerable to crime and necessitating a strong response from the DHS.⁴⁵ The DHS is described as working to “prevent the exploitation of our non-immigrant visa system by terrorists and criminals.”⁴⁶ The leading organization in immigration enforcement in the United States and a subset of the DHS, ICE, is associated with crime fighting in both rhetoric and practice. The rhetorical linkage between immigration and crime can be seen in a variety of speeches and statements made by high-ranking ICE officials. ICE officials draw clear connections between immigration and crime in statements describing the purpose of ICE. In practice, ICE functions as a

crime fighting organization. This statement by Forman, Director of the Office of Investigations at ICE, is illustrative of both the rhetorical construction of linkages between crime and immigration and its influence on policy:

ICE has the most expansive investigative authority and largest force of investigators in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We protect national security and uphold public safety by targeting transnational terrorist and other criminal networks that seek to exploit vulnerabilities at our borders.⁴⁷

Forman describes the borders as being vulnerable to crime syndicates. The presence of large amounts of US immigration officials on the border and the expansion of ICE authority is seen to be a justifiable and appropriate response to the threat of crime on the border. In a separate hearing nearly a month following Forman's remarks, John P. Torres, Deputy Assistant Secretary of ICE, uses very similar language to describe the threat of crime:

As the primary investigative agency in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), ICE protects national security and upholds public safety by targeting transnational criminal networks and terrorist organizations that might exploit potential vulnerabilities at our borders.⁴⁸

In both Forman and Torres' statements, the potential for criminal activity along the border is elevated to a threat to national security. In these statements and others, ICE is described as an organization primarily concerned with countering crime. In a speech given to an assembly of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), Director of ICE John Morton describes ICE as a law enforcement agency like any other, concerned with the eradication of crime: "Let me also thank our state, local, tribal, and international partners out there...I hope you have come to see us for what we are: a law enforcement agency like you trying to protect the public and get criminals off our streets and behind bars."⁴⁹

Crime is associated with the border and migration. In a speech in honor of National Police Week in 2010, Morton argues that crime has spread throughout the states along the border of the United States and Mexico:

95 years later, our federal agents are combating an acceleration of crime that has infiltrated into our border states. While horse thieves may be bandits of a by-gone era, criminals are still a menacing force that ICE agents and officers deal with every day – whether Mexican drug dealers, violent gang members, alien smugglers, or hardened criminals coming out of U.S. prisons.⁵⁰

Ignoring the differences in historical context, Morton links contemporary crime along the border with horse thievery in the early 1900s. This rhetorical move naturalizes the presence of ICE officials in states on the border between the United States and Mexico. Decisions to fortify and securitize the border become as uncontested as the use of law enforcement agents to stop horse thievery and ICE agents are elevated to heroes akin to federal marshalls chasing down cattle wranglers. In addition to creating an image of crime-filled border states, Morton singles out Mexicans as potential drug dealers and refers to undocumented immigrants as “aliens.”

The border and immigration are associated with a variety of criminal activities. In addition to being linked with drug crimes, gang violence, and “alien smuggling,” as can be seen in the above quote from Morton, borders and immigration are rhetorically linked to “transnational criminal organizations.” This is illustrated in a statement made by the Deputy Director of ICE:

ICE has targeted considerable resources at the Southwest border to address the activities associated with transnational criminal organizations, including the interdiction of contraband such as firearms, ammunition, bulk cash currency, stolen vehicles, human smuggling, and the detection of tunnels and other border crime at and between ports of entry along the Southwest border.⁵¹

In this statement, Kibble isolates the “Southwest border” as most vulnerable to “transnational criminal organizations.” Though his statement was days after Kibble’s statement and on a different topic, John Morton, Director of ICE, describes crime along the border using identical language:

ICE has targeted considerable resources at the Southwest border to address the activities associated with transnational criminal organizations, including the interdiction of contraband such as firearms, ammunition, bulk cash currency, stolen vehicles, human smuggling, and the detection of tunnels and other border crime at and between ports of entry along the Southwest border.⁵²

In these statements, the term “transnational criminal organizations” is utilized to encompass a large number of different types of crime from grand theft auto to “human smuggling.” Terrorism is included amongst the types of crimes that are associated with the “transnational criminal organizations” that threaten the border security of the United States. Kibble groups together “criminal organizations” and “terrorist organizations” in describing the purpose and immigration enforcement efforts of ICE:

ICE leads efforts in national security investigations through interconnected programs that prevent criminals and terrorists from using our nation’s immigration system to gain entry to the United States. This includes: investigating terrorist organizations and their actors; preventing criminal and terrorists from obtaining U.S. visas overseas; preventing criminal and terrorist organizations from acquiring and trafficking weapons and sensitive technology.⁵³

ICE officials regurgitate the same statements about the threat of crime, specifically the threat of crime from “transnational criminal organizations,” in order to solidify the perception that crime constantly threatens to destabilize the borders of the United States and endanger the security of the nation.

While the border is equated with crime, the threat of immigration-related crime is not limited to the physical borders of the United States. According to officials within the Obama administration, vigilance is required at every step of the immigration process

because the potential for crime does not stop at the physical border. Kibble describes the need for ICE's expansive scope while referring to undocumented immigrants as "aliens":

ICE targets transnational criminal organizations at every critical phase in the cycle: internationally in cooperation with foreign counterparts, where transnational criminal and terrorist organizations operate; at our nation's physical border and ports of entry (POEs) in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), where the transportation cells attempt to exploit America's legitimate trade, travel, and transportation systems; and in cities throughout the United States, where criminal organizations earn substantial profits off the smuggling of aliens and illicit goods.⁵⁴

The elevation of the threat of immigration-related crime is used to justify ICE's virtually limitless jurisdiction. Morton explains that ICE must track crime anywhere and simultaneously emphasizes that no space is safe from the threat of immigration/border crime:

We will follow criminal activity wherever it occurs, including the internet. In short, we are going to stay at it. I am unapologetic on that last point, just as we are when a crime occurs at our physical border, in your home, or at the proverbial corner of Fourth and Main. Crime is crime.⁵⁵

ICE rhetorically constructs immigration-related crime as a boundless never-ending threat that requires expanses in their authority.

Immigration and/or border-related crimes are described as threats to homeland security. According to Kibble, "transnational criminal organizations...threaten the stability and national security of the host countries and pose continuing threats to the homeland security of the United States."⁵⁶ Fallen ICE agents have been described as heroes protecting the country from crime: "These five men join 43 other fallen officers and agents on our new memorial: special agents, detention officers, pilots, patrol officers, and air interdiction officers – all heroes working toward one important goal – to protect

our country from the ravages of crime.”⁵⁷ The threat of crime along the border is rhetorically elevated to an imminent threat that endangers the entire country.

The association between crime and immigration negatively influences legal responses to immigration and the treatment of immigrants more generally. The effect that this has had on immigration law is sometimes referred to as “cimmigration law.”⁵⁸ The term “cimmigraton law” refers to the simultaneous increase in the amount of “deportations of lawfully present noncitizens through the expansion of criminal deportability grounds” and the criminalization of “migration-related conduct through crimes such as unlawful entry, unlawful re-entry and smuggling.”⁵⁹ Until 1988, “the criminal behavior of LPRs [(legal permanent residents)] was a criminal justice matter and not an immigration concern.”⁶⁰ The number of federal prosecutions for immigration crimes now exceeds the amount of prosecutions for “crimes related to weapons and drugs.”⁶¹ Between 1985 and 2010, the number of annual non-citizens that were deported rose from about 23,000 to almost 400,000.⁶²

Cimmigration law also includes an increase in “discretionary enforcement of these migration crimes and reducing the procedural protections that traditionally restrain government power in criminal proceedings.”⁶³ Although immigration law and criminal law have blended, the procedural protections offered to the accused in criminal proceedings are not extended to the accused in immigration proceedings.⁶⁴ For example, in deportation proceedings, the accused are denied fundamental rights such as “the right to counsel at government expense or to a jury trial...protection from self-incrimination or to being tried twice for the same offense, or to the retroactive application of the law, among other procedural protections.”⁶⁵

The rhetorical association of immigration with crime normalizes restrictive immigration laws. Social insecurities concerning immigration and crime are manipulated to provide justification for more restrictive immigration policies: “Statistics about criminal acts by migrants or reports of high levels of unlawful migration have fueled policymakers’ efforts to magnify border exclusion, deportation, and continued criminalization of migration.”⁶⁶ In the statements and speeches by ICE officials and President Obama, the threat that “border crime” poses to national security is utilized to naturalize the expansion of efforts to secure the border through increased personnel, surveillance, exclusion of immigrants, detention, and deportation.

Detention and deportation are privileged by the Obama administration as the best way to enforce immigration laws and secure the border. This preference is indicated by a number of speeches from ICE officials and evidenced by the enforcement of immigration laws under the Obama administration. Deportation is justified by the rhetorical construction of threats to national security and “public safety”:

ICE utilizes its immigration and customs enforcement authority to protect America and uphold public safety. ICE does this by dismantling terrorist and criminal organizations that seek to exploit our borders and by vigilantly identifying, apprehending, and removing criminal and other illegal aliens from the United States.⁶⁷

In statements made a few days apart from one another, the Deputy Director of Ice Kumar Kibble and the Director of ICE John Morton stated in similar language that reducing deportations was more or less an unthinkable proposition. According to Kibble:

There will be no reduction in the overall levels of enforcement and removals – only a more effective way of marshaling our resources towards our highest priority cases and thus, increasing the number of criminal aliens and repeat immigration violators removed from the country.⁶⁸

A mere eight days later, Morton reiterated:

At no point will any individuals be granted any form of “amnesty.” There will be no reduction in the overall levels of enforcement and removals – only a more effective way of marshaling our resources towards our highest priority cases and thus, increasing the number of criminal aliens and repeat immigration violators removed from the country.⁶⁹

Kibble and Morton emphasize that “criminal aliens” are the priority of immigration enforcement and that the removal of these criminals is the most preferential policy response to immigration. In lieu of considering alternative approaches, members of the Obama administration demand an increase of status quo efforts. Success is defined not in terms of the effectiveness of immigration enforcement techniques, but instead in the intensification of these efforts:

DHS considers a number of indicators and outcomes to evaluate security efforts at our borders, including factors such as resource deployment, crime rates in border communities, and apprehensions. While enforcement statistics and economic indicators point to increased security and an improved quality of life, no single metric can conclusively define the state of border security. Any individual metric can only capture one element of border security and none captures the true state of security along our borders. Rather than focus on any particular metric, our focus is on the enhancement of our capabilities, ensuring that we have tools that will lead to an increased probability of interdiction in high activity areas along our Southwest border.⁷⁰

The complexity of analyzing all of the metrics of border security is used as an excuse to eschew self-reflexivity concerning the effectiveness and viability of the tools used by the DHS and ICE, more specifically.

The actions of the Obama administration provide further evidence for the preference for deportation as a policy response to the threat of “border crime.” Deportation has become an integral part of ICE’s operations: “The removal of criminal aliens is central to ICE’s mission.”⁷¹ More people have been deported from the United States under the Obama administration than at any other point in American history:

In Fiscal Year 2011, we removed at [sic] total 396,906 individuals — the largest number in the agency's history. Of that number 216,698 were criminal aliens— also more than any other year in history. Nearly 55 percent of the aliens we removed had been convicted of criminal offenses- an 89 percent increase in the removal of criminals since FY 2008.⁷²

The amount of deportations conducted annually during Obama's presidency has increased by about one hundred thousand individuals in comparison to the amount of annual deportations during the presidency of George W. Bush.⁷³ In 2012, the number of deported individuals rose to 409, 849.⁷⁴ In addition to raising the overall number of deported individuals, the Obama administration has increased the number of deportations of criminals and violators of immigration law.⁷⁵

The type of “immigration reform” for which the Obama administration advocates, indicates that “cimmigration law” and the preference for the increasing exclusion of immigrants, detention, and deportation as policy responses to immigration will continue. In his 2013 State of the Union Address, President Obama associates “real reform” with more government officials patrolling the border: “Real reform means stronger border security, and we can build on the progress my administration has already made: putting more boots on the southern border than at any time in our history and reducing illegal crossings to their lowest levels in 40 years.”⁷⁶ According to Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) Border Patrol Chief Michael Fisher and Office of Field Operations Acting Assistant Commissioner David Murphy, “Secretary Napolitano has made it clear that Congress can help by passing a commonsense immigration reform bill that will allow CBP to focus its resources on the most serious criminal actors threatening our borders.”⁷⁷

Infectious Immigrants

Another common metaphor is the description of immigrants as a threat to the health of the national body, which is vulnerable at its borders.⁷⁸ Rhetorical scholars have examined the use of this metaphor in media and popular discourse on immigration.⁷⁹ Leo Ralph Chavez explains that immigrants have been “represented using metaphors of illness, disease, parasites, and plagues that threaten the nation.”⁸⁰ In these metaphors the immigrant is treated as a contaminant to public health.⁸¹ When the nation is metaphorically represented as the body, immigrants are represented as a disease.⁸² This metaphoric representation takes health concerns generated by the movement of groups of people, which do have some basis in fact, and distorts the actual risk to associate immigrants with disease. As Howard Markel and Alexandra Minna Stern explain, “Anti-immigrant rhetoric and policy have often been framed by an explicitly medical language, one in which the line between perceived and actual threat is slippery and prone to hysteria and hyperbole.”⁸³ Immigrants are discursively portrayed as threats to the health of the nation: “Migrants are constructed as bodies carrying disease...as carriers of infection.”⁸⁴

In the Obama administration’s rhetoric on immigration, borders are described using metaphors for disease. “Border crime” is referred to as a “plague” by the Director of the Office of Investigations Marcy M. Forman:

The recent escalation of violence along our southwest border, by drug cartels and other criminal organizations...requires a comprehensive and bilateral effort and in response, on January 30, 2009, Secretary Napolitano issued an Immigration and Border Security Action Directive to focus the Department’s wide-ranging authorities, priorities, and efforts on immigration and border security on this plague of violence.⁸⁵

The border between the United States and Mexico is isolated as the site of crime and violence. This violence is depicted as a plague that threatens to infect others and seep through the border into the national body.

In addition, immigrants are treated as likely health risks. Detainees are described as lacking any experience with medical care: “Many of these detainees learn of a medical ailment or receive medical care and treatment for the first time through this comprehensive screening.”⁸⁶ Director of the Office of Detention and Removal Operations at ICE James T. Hayes, Jr. echoed this association of detainees with a lack of healthcare on the same day in a separate hearing: “90 percent of our detainee population comes from 10 of the world’s most underdeveloped nations and have generally not received adequate health care prior to entering ICE custody.”⁸⁷ Executive Associate Director of Enforcement and Removal Operations at ICE Gary Mead argues recent limitations by the Supreme Court on indefinite detention of “aliens” poses a risk to public safety:

Prior to the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Zadvydas*, aliens subject to final orders of removal from the United States could potentially be detained indefinitely if they posed a threat to the community or posed flight risks. However, after *Zadvydas*, many aliens with final orders of removal, including aliens determined to pose a threat to the community or flight risks, may not be detained beyond a period of six months if there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future. Only a small number of aliens who pose certain health and safety risks may continue to be detained for a prolonged period of time. These include aliens with highly contagious diseases, aliens who pose serious adverse foreign policy consequences of release, security or terrorism concerns, and aliens found after a hearing to be “specially dangerous” criminal aliens as provided in relevant regulations.⁸⁸

Detainees and “criminal aliens” in particular are seen to be harboring disease and Mead implies that the powers of detention and deportation are necessary to protect the national body from this threat.

In response to the health risk posed by immigrants to the national body, expulsion of the threat is seen as a natural response.⁸⁹ The metaphorical representation of immigrants as carriers of infectious disease impacts immigration policy and public opinion about immigration. As Gerald V. O'Brien notes:

Infection- and disease-related metaphors were very much in keeping with the thinking of immigration restrictionists, and provided a rhetorically picturesque means of sharing these fears publicly. Moreover, immigrants have always been rightly feared as carriers of disease, and thus the public was conditioned to think of them in such a way.⁹⁰

Disease-related immigration metaphors favor the exclusion, detention, and deportation of potentially threatening immigrants. This type of policymaking can be seen in the Obama administration.

Under the Obama administration, the definition of “communicable diseases of public health significance” has expanded. In November 2009, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) changed the definition of “communicable diseases of public health significance” and expanded the list of inadmissible infections. The new definition of a “communicable disease of public health significance” adds to the list “Any quarantinable, communicable disease specified by current or future Presidential Executive Orders,” “pandemic flu,” SARS, viral hemorrhagic fevers, cholera, diphtheria, infectious tuberculosis, plague, smallpox, yellow fever and “any communicable disease that is a public health emergency of international concern reported to the World Health Organization.”⁹¹ The new definition gives the president authority to add to the list at any time via executive order.

It is important to note that not all of the Obama administration’s policies have reflected this turn toward expulsion, detention and deportation as responses to the

rhetorically constructed threat of immigrants to public health. In November 2009, the DHHS eliminated the treatment of HIV/AIDS as grounds for inadmissibility.⁹² This policy “was a monumental step in eliminating the exceptionalism of HIV and reducing stigma and social barriers for those living with HIV.”⁹³

The War on Immigration

Officials within the Obama administration have rhetorically constructed a “war” against immigration. War metaphors are a pervasive feature of the Obama administration’s immigration rhetoric. Immigration enforcement efforts are commonly referred to as combat. The border is discussed as if it were the site of an actual war. While violence does occasionally occur along the border, it is not part of a war. The struggle to enforce immigration laws is not a declared conflict between states. The actors in this so-called war are constantly changing. The motivations of these actors are as diverse as the immigrants themselves. In addition, “war” is a poor term for the interactions between immigrants and US officials on the border and elsewhere because immigration enforcement has no foreseeable end. If securing the border is a war then it is a perpetual war.

The various security concerns that are associated with the border are described as needing to be “combated” and both current and future efforts by the United States to deal with “border crime” are described as “combat.” A flagrant example is a statement made by Deputy Director of ICE Kibble on “Combating Organized Crime.”⁹⁴ Kibble refers to the future efforts by the United States and its partners to deal with organized crime associated with the border as “combat”: “By building cooperative platforms and networks, the U.S. will generate greater collective action, joint cases, and common strategic

approaches with our international partners to combat converging transnational criminal threats.”⁹⁵ The combat metaphor is circulated throughout all levels of the Obama administration, from President Obama to ICE officials. For example, Deputy Director of ICE Kibble regurgitates Obama’s combat language in reference to efforts to stop “transnational organized crime”:

In his written message to the Strategy, President Obama states that the Strategy is organized around a single, unifying principle: to build, balance, and integrate the tools of American power to combat transnational organized crime—and urge our partners to do this. DHS and ICE fully support this principle to bring together best practices from international, federal, local, state and tribal law enforcement in order to combat transnational organized crime and related threats to our national security.⁹⁶

Similar combat language is used by the CBP Border Patrol Chief Michael Fisher and Office of Field Operations Acting Assistant Commissioner David Murphy:

CBP will continue to work with DHS and our federal, state, local, tribal, and international partners, to strengthen border security. We must remain vigilant and focus on building our approach to position CBP’s greatest capabilities to combat the greatest risks that exist today, to be prepared for emerging threats, and to continue to build a sophisticated approach tailored to meet the challenges of securing a 21st century border.⁹⁷

Several of the Annual reports include combat language in reference to efforts to address financial crimes such as identity theft and fraud.⁹⁸ Visa fraud is discussed using the combat metaphors as well.⁹⁹

The border is referred to as the “front lines” of this “war” on immigration. The Department of Homeland Security Border Security Overview website states:

CBP Border Patrol agents, agriculture specialists, Air and Marine agents, and officers guard America’s front lines. These men and women prevent terrorists and their weapons from entering the United States while continuing their mission of seizing contraband and apprehending criminals and others who illegally attempt to enter the United States.¹⁰⁰

Officials who work along the border are elevated to the status of soldiers on the “front lines.”

The pervasiveness of war metaphors for immigration enforcement is reflected in the policies of the Obama administration. ICE Enforcement and Removal Executive Associate Director Thomas Horman refers to ICE’s Illicit Pathways Attack Strategy (IPAS) as part of the Obama administration’s strategy to “combat” transnational organized crime, which is constructed as a threat to the security of the nation:

IPAS supports the Administration’s Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime, an initiative launched in July 2011 that integrates federal resources to combat transnational organized crime and related threats to national security and public safety while urging foreign partners to do the same.¹⁰¹

In addition, millions of dollars have been dedicated to Operation Stonegarden which gives grants to law enforcement to “combat border crime” by financing “law enforcement personnel, overtime, travel and other related costs in order to further increase the law enforcement presence along the Southwest border.”¹⁰² Operation Stonegarden sponsors cooperation between ICE and state and local law enforcement to “combat border-related crime”:

DHS has increased the funding state and local law enforcement can use to combat border-related crime through Operation Stonegarden—a DHS grant program designed to support state and local law enforcement efforts along the border. Based on risk, cross-border traffic, and border-related threat intelligence, 81 percent of Operation Stonegarden awards between 2009 and 2012 went to Southwest border states.¹⁰³

The “Southwest border states” are treated as being the most at risk for “border-related crime.”

War metaphors are not uncommon in immigration rhetoric.¹⁰⁴ Immigration is portrayed as a threat to the integrity of the borders of the United States. The weapons of

the enemy are “drugs, crime, and the invasion of a servile and un- American class of people.”¹⁰⁵ Mexican and un-American are seen to be synonymous.¹⁰⁶ Laticia Saucedo and Francis Mootz argue that “employing the rhetoric of ‘war on’ invariably leads to demonizing an ‘other,’ particularly on racial grounds.”¹⁰⁷

This rhetoric influences which types of immigration policies are implemented. The “war on immigration” has historically had an impact on policymaking. Saucedo and Mootz explain that “immigration policy at the federal level has been rooted in the war metaphor during the past century.”¹⁰⁸ Erik Camayd-Freixas argues that the “war on immigration” creates the conditions and infrastructure necessary for the “systematic repression” of both immigrants and citizens.¹⁰⁹ According to Camayd-Freixas, “the war on immigration provides the pretext to justify, finance, build and exercise a growing domestic paramilitary force and an expansive prison infrastructure to guarantee the readiness and security of the State against all perils.”¹¹⁰ Angelo N. Ancheta emphasizes that the “war on immigration” is associated with a decrease in civil liberties.¹¹¹

The United States: A Beacon of Hope

The flip side to the negative portrayal of particular immigrants is the portrayal of the United States as a “beacon of hope” and a haven of freedom for those desirable immigrants who migrate legally. The depiction of the United States as a “beacon of hope” is a popular metaphor, particularly in presidential rhetoric. Scholars have analyzed the use of the “beacon of hope” metaphor in many contexts, including immigration.¹¹² According to Cisneros: “The refrain of a “nation of immigrants,” discourses of American exceptionalism – America as a city on a hill or a beacon of hope – and the American Dream have long formed the basis of immigration rhetoric in this country.”¹¹³

From President Nixon to President Obama, American presidents have cultivated the image of America as a “beacon of hope.” In President Richard Nixon’s 1973 Inaugural Address, he described America as a “beacon of hope for all the world.”¹¹⁴ President Ronald Reagan referred to the United States as a “beacon of hope” in his 1981 Inaugural Address.¹¹⁵ President George H.W. Bush argued in his 1991 State of the Union that the “burden of leadership and...strength...has made America the beacon of freedom in a searching world.”¹¹⁶ President William Clinton described America as a “beacon of hope” in his 1997 State of the Union Address.¹¹⁷ It was a common metaphor in speeches made by President George W. Bush as well. For example, Bush utilized the “beacon of hope” metaphor to explain why the United States is a target for terrorism.¹¹⁸ He also employed the metaphor in his 2008 State of the Union.¹¹⁹ In the context of immigration, Bush “maintained immigrants were central to America’s standing as a ‘unique,’ ‘great,’ nation, that was a ‘beacon of hope, a ‘beacon of liberty,’ and a ‘leader of the world.’”¹²⁰ Like his predecessors, Obama has frequently utilized the “beacon of hope” metaphor. The “beacon of hope” metaphor has been a tool in Obama’s proverbial rhetorical toolbox since the 2008 election in which Obama cultivated a “mythical mandate” for his “democratic vision” by consistently speaking of America as a “beacon of freedom and justice.”¹²¹

The “beacon of hope” metaphor is pervasive in the Obama administration’s immigration rhetoric in particular. The United States is referred to as a “beacon” of both hope and freedom. In his remarks in honor of World Refugee Day 2013, Secretary of State John Kerry refers to the United States as a “beacon of hope”:

Because of your commitment, our most sacred values and the United States hopes and aspirations still remain a beacon of hope for people all over the world. We have work yet to do, but we recognize that we do it as a land of second chances and as an example for what we can do to help people achieve that second opportunity.¹²²

Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Alejandro Mayorkas argues that the United States is a “beacon of hope and opportunity for people from around the world.”¹²³ Mayorkis refers to the United States as “a nation of immigrants and a beacon of hope and opportunity.”¹²⁴ In a speech given for a special naturalization ceremony in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in 2011, Mayorkas compared the work of USCIS to the work of Dr. King because the USCIS is “dedicated to fulfilling our nation’s promise as a beacon of hope and opportunity.”¹²⁵ The name of the USCIS blog is “The Beacon.”¹²⁶ The “beacon” metaphor is also utilized in the 2011 Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report.¹²⁷

The United States is portrayed as a place for people of similar ideals, namely freedom and democracy. President Obama refers to the United States as a “beacon” for those desiring freedom in his 2013 State of the Union: “America must remain a beacon to all who seek freedom during this period of historic change.”¹²⁸ In his 2013 Inaugural Address, Obama rhetorically linked the mission of welcoming immigrants who display American values with the legacy of the pioneers:

It is now our generation's task to carry on what those pioneers began...Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity—until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country.¹²⁹

In a 2011 speech on immigration reform given in El Paso, Texas, Obama describes the United States as a “nation of immigrants” that welcomes all those who “embrace

America's ideals and America's precepts."¹³⁰ Mayorkas argues that America is a "beacon of hope and opportunity" for those who value freedom and democracy: "American citizenship provides a unique bond that unites people around the civic ideals of freedom and democracy. These ideals led to our independence and continue to keep America a beacon of hope and opportunity."¹³¹

Much like the metaphorical representation of immigrants as economic units, the "beacon of hope" metaphor appears to be positive on the surface but can be manipulated to negatively portray non-citizens and the countries from which they originate. The "beacon of hope" metaphor "connotes leadership" but it also implies exceptionalism.¹³² As Beasley explains, the "beacon" metaphor has been used historically to contrast "civilized" nations with "backward" nations.¹³³ The metaphor is utilized to subordinate other nations to the United States. The "beacon of hope" metaphor symbolizes that the United States is "a city on a hill, a beacon of democracy to the world, chosen by God."¹³⁴ Not only is the United States exceptional when compared to other nations, Americans are also portrayed as "chosen" in this rhetoric. America and Americans are juxtaposed with other lesser nations and peoples. The Obama administration's use of the "beacon of hope" metaphor makes it "clear that immigrant's successful integration into the fabric of the nation, culturally, economically, and politically, is central to being celebrated as a "good" immigrant."¹³⁵ The image of the immigrant easily integrated into the United States serves as the foundation for arguments for the exclusion and expulsion of all those who are not seen to hold American values.

Conclusion

Metaphors are prevalent in the Obama administration's immigration rhetoric. The most common of these metaphors are the representation of immigrants as economic units, "illegal" and/or "aliens," criminals, and carriers of infectious disease, the representation of the enforcement of immigration laws and pursuit of border security as a war, and the depiction of the United States as a "beacon of hope" for the appropriate types of immigrants. Many of these metaphors are interrelated. In the speeches examined above, immigrants are referred to as "criminal aliens," meshing together the metaphorical representation of immigrants as criminals and as "illegal aliens." The representation of the enforcement of immigration laws as a war often involves the criminal and "illegal alien" metaphors to explain the threat that the United States must "combat." The rhetorical treatment of immigrants as economic units and the representation of the United States as a "beacon of hope" often involve the use of the "illegal alien" and criminal metaphors in the delineation between desirable and undesirable immigrants.

In addition to being interrelated with one another, the metaphors used in immigration rhetoric are supported by the dominant metaphors used in human trafficking rhetoric. As explained in Chapter Two, human trafficking and immigration are rhetorically linked in addition to being linked in terms of policy and the organizations that enforce those policies. The following chapter will contain analysis of the Obama administration's human trafficking rhetoric and the nine most predominant metaphors therein.

Notes

¹ Vanessa B. Beasley, "Presidential Rhetoric and Immigration: Balancing Tensions between Hope and Fear" in *Who Belongs in America?: Presidents, Rhetoric, and Immigration*, ed. Vanessa B. Beasley (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006), 9.

² Marjorie S. Zatz and Hilary Smith, "Immigration, Crime, and Victimization: Rhetoric and Reality," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 8 (2012): 153.

³ Beasley, "Presidential Rhetoric and Immigration: Balancing Tensions between Hope and Fear", 10.

⁴ J. David Cisneros, "(Re)Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Rhetoric, Hybridity, and Citizenship: La Gran Marcha," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97 (2011): 28-29.

⁵ Chávez, "Embodied Translation," 18-19; J. David Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of 'Immigrant as Pollutant' in Media Representations of Immigration," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11 (2008): 593; Otto Santa Ana, "Like an Animal I was Treated': Anti-Immigrant Metaphor in US Public Discourse," *Discourse & Society* 10 (1999): 213.

⁶ Santa Ana, "Like an Animal," 198.

⁷ Cisneros, "Contaminated Communities," 578.

⁸ Kent A. Ono and John M. Sloop, *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Immigration, and California's Proposition 187* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2002), 54.

⁹ Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, January 28, 2014, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=104596>.

¹⁰ Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, February 12, 2013, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=102826>.

¹¹ Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, February 12, 2013.

¹² Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, February 12, 2013.

¹³ Daniel Ragsdale, “Written testimony of U.S. Department of Homeland Security for a Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs hearing titled ‘Border Security: Examining Provisions in the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act (S. 744),” May 7, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

¹⁴ Barack Obama, “Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union,” *The American Presidency Project*, January 27, 2010, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=87433>.

¹⁵ Obama, “Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union,” *The American Presidency Project*, January 27, 2010.

¹⁶ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Border Security Overview,” www.dhs.gov/border-security-overview, (accessed October 7, 2013).

¹⁷ Barack Obama, “Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union,” *The American Presidency Project*, January 25, 2011, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=88928>.

¹⁸ Dulcinea Lara, Dana Greene and Cynthia Bejarno, “A Critical Analysis of Immigrant Advocacy Tropes: How Popular Discourse Weakens Solidarity and Prevents Broad, Sustainable Justice,” *Social Justice* 36 (2010): 24.

¹⁹ Lara, Greene and Bejarno, “A Critical Analysis,” 30.

²⁰ Juliet P. Stumpf, “Two Profiles of Crimmigration Law: Criminal deportation and Illegal Migration,” in *Globalisation and the Challenge to Criminology*, ed. Francis Pakes (New York: Routledge, 2013), 94.

²¹ Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*, 28.

²² Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*, 28.

²³ Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*, 29.

²⁴ Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*, 56.

²⁵ Lisa A. Flores, “Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration,” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20 (2003): 363.

²⁶ Keith Cunningham-Parameter, “Alien Language: Immigration Metaphors and the Jurisprudence of Otherness,” *Fordham Law Review* 79 (2011): 1568.

²⁷ Kumar C. Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding A Hearing on “Combating Organized Crime: Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources” Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism,” November 1, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

²⁸ Marcy M. Forman, “Statement of Marcy M. Forman Director, Office of Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Before The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security and International Law For a hearing regarding: “Immigration Raids: Postville and Beyond,” July 24, 2008, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

²⁹ Gary Mead, “Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘H.R. 1932, The Keep Our Communities Safe Act’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” May 24, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/110524mead.pdf>.

³⁰ John Morton, “Statement of John Morton Assistant Secretary U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Visa Overstays: Can They be Eliminated?’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security,” March 25, 2010, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/100325morton.pdf>.

³¹ James T. Hayes, Jr., “Statement of James T. Hayes, Jr. Director of Office of Detention and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Medical Care and Treatment of Immigration Detainees and Deaths in DRO Custody’ Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security,” March 3, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

³² David Venturella, “Statement of David Venturella Executive Director of Secure Communities U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Priorities Enforcing Immigration Law’ Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security,” April 2, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

³³ Gary Mead, “Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Secure Communities Oversight’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” November 30, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

³⁴ Thomas Horman, “Written testimony of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations Executive Associate Director Thomas Homan for a House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security hearing titled ‘Border Security Oversight: Identifying and Responding to Current Threats’” June 27, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

³⁵ Kumar Kibble, “Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding a Hearing on “Does Administrative Amnesty Harm our Efforts to Gain and Maintain Operational Control of the Border” Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” October 4, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

³⁶ Rachel E. Rosenbloom, “The Citizenship Line: Rethinking Immigration Exceptionalism,” *Boston College Law Review* 54 (2013): 1967.

³⁷ Rosenbloom, “The Citizenship Line,” 1967.

³⁸ Rosenbloom, “The Citizenship Line,” 1969.

³⁹ Flores, “Constructing Rhetorical Borders,” 363.

⁴⁰ Anne Demo, “Sovereignty Discourse and Contemporary Immigration Politics,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91 (2006): 299.

⁴¹ Karma R. Chávez, “Embodied Translation: Dominant Discourse and Communication with Migrant Bodies-as-Text,” *Howard Journal of Communications* 20 (2009): 20-24.

⁴² Ming H. Chen, “Alienated: A Reworking of the Racialization Thesis After September 11,” *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy and the Law* 18 (2010): 436.

⁴³ Joseph Nevins, *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the “Illegal Alien” and the Making of U.S.-Mexico Boundary* (NY: Routledge, 2002:), 97.

⁴⁴ Rosenbloom, “The Citizenship Line,” 2018.

⁴⁵ Dinkins, Wagner, and Lyon, “Statement.”

⁴⁶ James A. Dinkins, John Wagner, and Shonnie Lyon, “Statement of James A. Dinkins Executive Associate Director Homeland Security Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and John Wanger Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner Office of Field Operations U.S. Customs and Border Protection and Shonnie Lyon Acting Director Office of Biometric Identity Management National Protection and Programs Directorate Regarding a hearing on ‘Visa Security and Overstays: How Secure is America?’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” May 21, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/130521dinkins.pdf>.

⁴⁷ Marcy M. Forman, “Statement of Marcy M. Forman Director, Office of Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Priorities Enforcing Immigration Law’ Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security,” April 2, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

⁴⁸ John P. Torres, “Statement of John P. Torres Deputy Assistant Secretary U.S. Immigrant and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Securing the Borders and America’s Points of Entry, What Remains to be Done’ Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Homeland Security,” May 20, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

⁴⁹ John Morton, “Remarks Prepared for delivery by Director John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security *International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) General Assembly* Chicago, Illinois,” October 25, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/111028morton.pdf>.

⁵⁰ John Morton, “Remarks Prepared for Assistant Secretary John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security,” May 10, 2010, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/100510morton.pdf>.

⁵¹ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding a Hearing on "Does Administrative Amnesty Harm our Efforts to Gain and Maintain Operational Control of the Border" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” October 4, 2011.

⁵² John Morton, “Statement of John Morton Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding the Hearing ‘Oversight Hearing on U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Priorities and the Rule of Law’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” October 12, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/111012morton.pdf>.

⁵³ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding a Hearing on ‘Does Administrative Amnesty Harm our Efforts to Gain and Maintain Operational Control of the Border’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” October 4, 2011.

⁵⁴ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding a Hearing on ‘Does Administrative Amnesty Harm our Efforts to Gain and Maintain Operational Control of the Border’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” October 4, 2011.

⁵⁵ John Morton, “Remarks by Director John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security State of the Net Conference Washington, D.C.,” January 18, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/011811morton.pdf>.

⁵⁶ Kumar C. Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Combating Organized Crime, Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources’ Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism,” November 1, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/111101kibble.pdf>.

⁵⁷ John Morton, “Remarks Prepared for Assistant Secretary John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security National Police Week 2010 ICE Honor and Remembrance Memorial Ceremony,” May 10, 2010, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/100510morton.pdf>.

⁵⁸ Juliet P. Stumpf, “The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, and Sovereign Power,” *American University Law Review* 56 (2006): 367-; Stumpf, “Two profiles,” 92; Allison S. Hartry, “Gendering Crimmigration: The Intersection of Gender, Immigration, and the Criminal Justice System,” *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice* 27 (2012): 1-25.

⁵⁹ Stumpf, “Two Profiles,” 92.

⁶⁰ Amy Wolper, “Unconstitutional and Unnecessary: A Cost/Benefit Analysis of ‘Crimes Involving Moral Turpitude’ in the Immigration and Nationality Act,” *Cardoza Law Review* 31 (2010): 1936.

⁶¹ Stumpf, “Two Profiles,” 94.

⁶² Stumpf, “Two Profiles,” 94.

⁶³ Stumpf, “Two Profiles,” 92.

⁶⁴ Stumpf, “Two Profiles,” 94.

⁶⁵ Stumpf, “Two Profiles,” 94.

⁶⁶ Stumpf, “Two Profiles,” 93.

⁶⁷ Mead, “Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘H.R. 1932, The Keep Our Communities Safe Act’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” May 24, 2011.

⁶⁸ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding a Hearing on “Does Administrative Amnesty Harm our Efforts to Gain and Maintain Operational Control of the Border” Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” October 4, 2011.

⁶⁹ Morton, “Statement of John Morton Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding the Hearing ‘Oversight Hearing on U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Priorities and the Rule of Law’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” October 12, 2011.

⁷⁰ Michael Fisher and David Murphy, “Written Testimony of CBP Border Patrol Chief Michael Fisher and Office of Field Operations Acting Assistant Commissioner David Murphy for a House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security Hearing Titled ‘Border Security Oversight: Identifying and Responding to Current Threats,’” June 27, 2013, <http://www.dhs.gov/news/2013/06/27/written-testimony-cbp-house-oversight-and-government-reform-subcommittee-national>.

⁷¹ Mead, “Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘H.R. 1932, The Keep Our Communities Safe Act’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” May 24, 2011.

⁷² Morton, “Remarks Prepared for delivery by Director John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security *International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) General Assembly* Chicago, Illinois,” October 25, 2011.

⁷³ Kate Anderson Brower, “Republicans Seeking Hispanic Votes Risk Immigration Backlash,” *Bloomberg*, March 16, 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-16/republicans-seeking-hispanic-votes-risk-backlash-on-immigration.html>.

⁷⁴ Horman, “Written testimony of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations Executive Associate Director Thomas Homan for a House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security hearing titled ‘Border Security Oversight: Identifying and Responding to Current Threats’” June 27, 2013.

⁷⁵ Mead, “Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘H.R. 1932, The Keep Our Communities Safe Act’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” May 24, 2011; Morton, “Statement of John Morton Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding the Hearing ‘Oversight Hearing on U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Priorities and the Rule of Law’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” October 12, 2011.

⁷⁶ Obama, “Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union,” *The American Presidency Project*, February 12, 2013.

⁷⁷ Fisher and Murphy, “Written Testimony.”

⁷⁸ Cisneros, “Contaminated Communities,” 572.

⁷⁹ Cisneros, “Contaminated Communities,” 570-575; Gerald V. O’Brien, “Indigestible Food, Conquering Hordes and Waste Materials: Metaphors of Immigrants and the Early Immigration Restriction Debate in the United States,” *Metaphor and Symbol* 18, no. 1 (2003): 33-47; Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*, 34; Santa Ana, “Like an Animal,” 199.

⁸⁰ Leo Ralph Chavez, *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008): 115.

⁸¹ Chavez, *The Latino*, 115.

⁸² Santa Ana, “Like an Animal,” 199.

⁸³ Howard Markel and Alexandra Minna Stern, “The Foreignness of Germs: The Persistent Association of Immigrants and Disease in American Society,” *The Milbank Quarterly* 80 (2002): 757.

⁸⁴ Ono and Sloop, *Shifting Borders*, 39.

⁸⁵ Marcy M. Forman, “Statement of Marcy M. Forman Director, Office of Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Priorities Enforcing Immigration Law’ Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security,” April 2, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

⁸⁶ Jose H. Rodriguez, “Statement of Jose H. Rodriguez, MD, MBA, CHA Captain, U.S. Public Health Service Director Division of Immigration Health Services U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Advances in Immigration Detainee Medical Care’ Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security,” March 3, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

⁸⁷ James T. Hayes, Jr., “Statement of James T. Hayes, JR. Director Office of Detention and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Medical Care and Treatment of Immigration Detainees and Deaths in DRO Custody’ Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security,” March 3, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

⁸⁸ Mead, “Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘H.R. 1932, The Keep Our Communities Safe Act’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement,” May 24, 2011.

⁸⁹ Chavez, *The Latino*, 115.

⁹⁰ O’Brien, “Indigestible Food,” 36.

⁹¹ Center for Disease Control and Prevention, “Laws and Regulations: Legal Authorities for Medical Examination of Aliens,” September 20, 2013, <http://www.cdc.gov/immigrantrefugeehealth/laws-regulations.html>.

⁹² Susanna E. Winston and Curt G. Beckwith, “The Impact of Removing the Immigration Ban on HIV-Infected Persons,” *AIDS Patient Care and STDS* 25, no. 12 (2011): 709-711.

⁹³ Winston and Beckwith, “The Impact,” 709-711.

⁹⁴ Kumar C. Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Combating Organized Crime: Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources’ Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism,” November 1, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/111101kibble.pdf>.

⁹⁵ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Combating Organized Crime: Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources’ Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism,” November 1, 2011.

⁹⁶ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Combating Organized Crime: Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources’ Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism,” November 1, 2011.

⁹⁷ Thomas Homan, “Statement of Thomas Homan Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement U.S. Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on Border Security Oversight: Identifying and Responding to Current Threats Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security,” June 27, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/130627homan.pdf>.

⁹⁸ January Contreras, “Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2010,” June 30, 2010, <http://www.dhs.gov/topic/prior-annual-reports>; January Contreras, “Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2011,” June 29, 2011, <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cisomb-annual-report-2011.pdf>.

⁹⁹ James A. Dinkins, John Wagner, and Shonnie Lyon, “Statement of James A. Dinkins Executive Associate Director Homeland Security Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and John Wagner Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner Office of Field Operations U.S. Customs and Border Protection and Shonnie Lyon Acting Director Office of Biometric Identity Management National Protection and Programs Directorate Regarding a Hearing on ‘Visa Security and Overstays: How Secure is America?’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” May 21, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/130521dinkins.pdf>.

¹⁰⁰ Department of Homeland Security, “Border Security Overview,” <http://www.dhs.gov/border-security-overview>.

¹⁰¹ Thomas Homan, “Statement of Thomas Homan Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement U.S. Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on Border Security Oversight: Identifying and Responding to Current Threats Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security,” June 27, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/130627homan.pdf>.

¹⁰² Department of Homeland Security, “Secretary Napolitano Announces Additional \$30 Million in Operation Stonegarden Funds to Secure the Southwest Border,” August 11, 2009, <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2009/08/11/30-million-operation-stonegarden-funds-secure-southwest-border>.

¹⁰³ Department of Homeland Security, “Border Security Results,” <https://www.dhs.gov/border-security-results>.

¹⁰⁴ Leticia Saucedo and Francis Mootz, “The ‘Ethical’ Surplus of the War on Illegal Immigration,” *Iowa Journal on Gender, Race and Justice*, 2012, <http://scholars.law.unlv.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1711&context=facpub>

¹⁰⁵ Saucedo and Mootz, “The ‘Ethical’ Surplus.”

¹⁰⁶ Saucedo and Mootz, “The ‘Ethical’ Surplus.”

¹⁰⁷ Saucedo and Mootz, “The ‘Ethical’ Surplus.”

¹⁰⁸ Saucedo and Mootz, “The ‘Ethical’ Surplus.”

¹⁰⁹ Erik Camayd-Freixas, “Raids, Rights, and Reform: The Postville Case and the Immigration Crisis,” *DePaul Journal for Social Justice* 2, no. 1 (2008): 19.

¹¹⁰ Camayd-Freixas, “Raids, Rights,” 19-20.

¹¹¹ Angelo N. Ancheta, “Our Immigrant Heritage: A Struggle for Justice,” *UCLA Asian Pac. Am. LJ* 2 (1994): 103.

¹¹² Amy Skonieczny, “Constructing NAFTA: Myth, Representation, and the Discursive Construction of U.S. Foreign Policy,” *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (2001): 441.

¹¹³ Josue David Cisneros, “The Son of a Black Man from Kenya and a White Woman from Kansas,” in *American Identity in the Age of Obama*, ed. Amílcar Antonio Barreto and Richard L. O’Bryant (New York: Routledge, 2014), 82.

¹¹⁴ Richard Nixon, "Oath of Office and Second Inaugural Address," *The American Presidency Project*, January 20, 1973, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=4141>.

¹¹⁵ Ronald Reagan, "Inaugural Address," *The American Presidency Project*, January 20, 1981, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=43130>.

¹¹⁶ George Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, January 29, 1991, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=19253>.

¹¹⁷ William J. Clinton, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, February 4, 1997, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=53358>.

¹¹⁸ Ivan Leudar, Victoria Marsland and Jiri Nekvapil, "On Membership Categorization: 'Us', 'Them' and 'Doing Violence' in Political Discourse," *Discourse & Society* 15 (2004): 247.

¹¹⁹ George W. Bush, "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, January 28, 2008, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=76301>.

¹²⁰ Jason A. Edwards, "Melding a New Immigration Narratives? President George W. Bush and the Immigration Debate," *The Howard Journal of Communications* 23 (2012): 54.

¹²¹ Robert Ivie and Oscar Giner, "More Good, Less Evil: Contesting the Mythos of National Insecurity in the 2008 Presidential Primaries," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 12 (2009): 286.

¹²² John Kerry, "Remarks at the World Refugee Day Event," June 20, 2013, <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2013/06/210935.htm>.

¹²³ U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, "USCIS Announces Citizenship and Integration Grant Opportunities," January 20, 2011, <http://www.uscis.gov.edgesuite-staging.net/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.5af9bb95919f35e66f614176543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=15b82dad650ad210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=a2dd6d26d17df110VgnVCM1000004718190aRCRD>.

¹²⁴ Alejandro N. Mayorkas, "Alejandro N. Mayorkas Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Remarks to: Immigration & American Competitiveness: The Challenge Ahead," September 28, 2011, <http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Resources%20for%20Congress/Testimonies%20and%20Speeches/Chamber%20Speech%20September%2028%202011.pdf>.

¹²⁵ U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, "Special Naturalization Ceremony in Honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.," January 21, 2011, <http://www.uscis.gov/news/special-naturalization-ceremony-honor-dr-martin-luther-king-jr>.

¹²⁶ U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, "The Beacon: The Official Blog of USCIS," <http://blog.uscis.gov/>.

¹²⁷ January Contreras, "Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2011," June 29, 2011, <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cisomb-annual-report-2011.pdf>.

¹²⁸ Barack Obama, "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, February 12, 2013, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=102826>.

¹²⁹ Barack Obama, "Inaugural Address," *The American Presidency Project*, January 21, 2013, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=102827>.

¹³⁰ Barack Obama, "Remarks by the President on comprehensive immigration reform," May 10, 2011, <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2011/05/10/text-of-obamas-speech-on-immigration/?mg=blogs-wsj&url=http%253A%252F%252Fblogs.wsj.com%252Fwashwire%252F2011%252F05%252F10%252Ftext-of-obamas-speech-on-immigration>.

¹³¹ U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, "The United States to Welcome More Than 7,800 New Citizens during Independence Day Celebrations," July 2, 2013, <http://www.uscis.gov/news/united-states-welcome-more-7800-new-citizens-during-independence-day-celebrations>.

¹³² Chang Pu, "Discourse Analysis of President Bush's Speech at Tsinghua University, China," *Intercultural Communication Studies* 16, no. 1 (2007): 213.

¹³³ Beasley, *Who Belongs in America?* 119.

¹³⁴ Ryan LaMothe, "Obsession for National Security and the Rise of the National Security State-Industry: A Pastoral-Psychological Analysis," *Pastoral Psychology* 61 (2012): 43.

¹³⁵ Cisneros, "The Son," 82.

CHAPTER FOUR

Metaphors in the Obama Administration's Human Trafficking Rhetoric

The Obama administration's rhetoric related to trafficking in persons is filled with metaphors. As noted in Chapter One, trafficking metaphors have received a significant amount of attention from rhetorical scholars, feminist scholars, and political scientists.¹ In the Obama administration's rhetoric, the most common metaphors are 1) the use of the term "trafficking," which is itself a metaphor, 2) the representation of trafficked persons as "victims," 3) the juxtaposition between trafficked persons and "illegal aliens," 4) the association between traffickers, trafficking, and criminality, 5) the description of trafficking as "evil," 6) the representation of trafficking as a "scourge" or disease, 7) the treatment of anti-trafficking efforts as part of a "war on trafficking," and 8) the depiction of the United States as a rescuer of the trafficked.

"Trafficking in Persons"

The two terms "human trafficking" and "trafficking in persons" are themselves metaphors. The trafficking metaphor is the label that is most often used to refer to the practice of obtaining labor from a person through force or coercion. Although the trafficking metaphor is the most pervasive metaphor in trafficking rhetoric, it is probably given the least attention by rhetorical scholars. While a disproportionately small amount of scholarship has been completed regarding the "trafficking in persons" and/or "human trafficking" metaphor, there has been some attention given to the use of the metaphor.²

Anthony M. DeStefano explains that the trafficking metaphor became accepted as part of the lexicon after being used to describe to “the movement of or commerce in illegal substances such as drugs” by law enforcement officials and by journalists to refer to “the smuggling of immigrants as a form of trafficking.”³ Jennifer Lynne Musto argues that the term “trafficking” lacks definitional consensus.⁴ David A. Feingold explains that each part of typical definitions for trafficking generates ambiguity over the meaning of the definition of “trafficking”: “To unpack the concept of ‘trafficking’ still further, its elements can be understood as ‘movement’ plus ‘force,’ ‘fraud,’ ‘coercion’ or “‘deception’ leading to ‘exploitation.’ Even here, none of these terms are clear and uncontested.”⁵ The concept of trafficking “comes as a package, and there is room for dispute as to which particular actions and outcomes, and in what particular combination, should be included under its umbrella.”⁶ The trafficking metaphor ultimately generates more confusion than clarity over the meaning of the practice.

The trafficking metaphor can be found across speeches and policies related to the practice of forced labor. In press releases, speeches, and statements made by the Obama administration, the practice is most commonly referred to as either “human trafficking” or “trafficking in persons.”⁷ The TVPA uses the trafficking metaphor in its name. The office of the State Department that deals with trafficking issues, the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, includes the term trafficking. These terms are also circulated by the annual TIPR produced by the State Department.⁸

The ambiguity of the trafficking metaphor has implications for scholarship and policy. Musto argues that the absence of any consensus on the definition of trafficking results in “a host of methodological challenges, including a lack of consensus in

determining how many persons are trafficked each year.”⁹ Musto explains that “trafficking” serves as an “analytic catchphrase and dominant cognitive map for making sense of related and overlapping phenomenon such as migration, commercial sex, and modern day slavery.”¹⁰ The lack of consensus over the meaning of the term results in inconsistencies in reports over the prevalence of the practice. Laura Agustin argues that the term trafficking has been proven by “more than 60 studies worldwide” to be “inadequate to describe the experiences of many migrants (women, men, boys, girls) who leave their homes and sell sex in other towns and countries.”¹¹ In addition, the trafficking metaphor implies that transportation and movement must take place for the crime of trafficking in persons to have occurred. This is an incorrect depiction of the legal concept of trafficking in persons. As the 2013 TIPR explains: “A victim need not be physically transported from one location to another in order for the crime to fall within these definitions.”¹² The ambiguous trafficking metaphor, circulated by scholarship and the rhetoric of government officials, contributes to flawed data collection. This in turn fosters poorly informed policy decisions.

The trafficking metaphor is also problematic because it contributes to the view of trafficked persons as lacking any subjectivity. In the use of the terms “human trafficking” and “trafficking in persons,” the same trafficking metaphor used by law enforcement to refer to the criminal trade of weapons, drugs, and other inanimate objects is used to refer to the trade of human beings. The association between the extraction of labor from humans without their consent and the commercial sale of criminalized items elides the differences between these practices. It removes any consideration to the motivations

behind the actions of the trafficked and contributes to the rhetorical construction of trafficked persons as helpless “victims.”

Trafficking “Victims”

The representation of trafficked persons as “victims” is one of the most prevalent metaphors utilized by the Obama administration. The “victim” metaphor is surpassed in prevalence only by the trafficking metaphor. Trafficked persons are termed “victims” in rhetoric and in policy.

As explained in the first two chapters, a great deal of attention has been given by scholars to the use of the term “victim” to label the trafficked.¹³ The ideal image of the “innocent” victim is contrasted with the willing criminal/prostitute: “There is a dichotomizing of good versus bad: between innocent women who deserve protection and guilty women who deserve the circumstances they may get into.”¹⁴ As Jo Doezema explains, the image of the trafficking “victim” is cultivated by several mutually reinforcing rhetorical strategies:

The “innocence” of the victim was established through a variety of rhetorical devices: by stressing her youth/virginity; her whiteness; and her unwillingness to be a prostitute. The “innocence” of the victim...served as a perfect foil for the “evil trafficker”; simplifying the reality of prostitution and female migration to a melodramatic formula of victim and villain.¹⁵

The use of the term “victim” to label trafficked persons emphasizes the innocence of the trafficked in juxtaposition with the trafficker.

“Victim” rhetoric causes women and children to be prioritized as possible victims and sex trafficking to be emphasized over other forms of trafficking: “trafficking victims, described as vulnerable women and children forced from the safety of their home/homelands into gross sexual exploitation, are distinguished from economic migrants who are understood to be men who have willfully violated national borders for individual gain.”¹⁶ Men are left out of accounts of trafficking:

[B]elief systems perpetuating the notion that males cannot or are unlikely to be victims of sex crimes or human trafficking undermine the impartiality, open-mindedness, and objectivity necessary to determine whether a male engaged in labor or sexual activity is a victim of human trafficking and deserving of protection under the TVPA.¹⁷

Because women and children are rhetorically constructed as more likely victims, men are deprioritized in United States anti-trafficking efforts.

Viewing the trafficked as “victims” creates negative views of women’s mobility. Doezema explains that this view of trafficking creates a negative association with female migration: “female migration is seen in exclusively negative terms, a desperate flight from intolerable conditions, with no agency credited to the woman.”¹⁸ Visual representations of trafficking similarly create a limited view of women’s agency:

[T]echniques used in the production of victimizing images might have paradoxical effects and even contribute to the objectification of women as they capture women’s bodies within stereotypical representations of femininity and hence, demarcate the limits within which women can be imagined as active agents.¹⁹

Caroline Joan Picart argues that the use of the term “victim” “fails to get at the complex gradations of power and disempowerment women differentially occupy.”²⁰

As Picart emphasizes, rhetorical constructions of victimhood have real material effects on women’s lives.²¹ According to Gretchen Soderlund this victimization rhetoric projects a form of human rights that is not gender neutral. This model for human rights denies women status as subjects and represents them as in need of protection from instead of “subjects deserving of positive rights.”²² Victimization discourse has resulted in the protection of “only those victims whose innocence...could be established or asserted in sympathetic terms.”²³

The labeling of trafficked persons as “victims” is extremely common in the Obama administration’s rhetoric and policy concerning trafficking in persons. In DHS Blue Campaign posters, trafficked persons are continuously referred to as “victims.” One DHS poster in particular includes the term “victim” to describe the trafficked nine times.²⁴ The 2013 TIPR refers to trafficking as “victimization.”²⁵ Every TIPR that has been produced during the Obama administration refers to the trafficked as “victims” at least twenty times a piece.²⁶

Trafficked persons are described as “victims” in anti-trafficking policies. The main piece of legislation that dictates the framework for US anti-trafficking policies, the TVPA (Trafficking Victims Protection Act), includes “victims” in its name. According to Desyllas, the title of the TVPA “demonstrates how the government depicts women as ‘victims’ to be ‘rescued’ and ‘protected.’”²⁷ Each reauthorization of the TVPA extends this rhetorical devaluation of the trafficked. The description of trafficked persons as “victims” is also reinscribed in the policy of ranking other countries according to the progress or lack therein of their anti-trafficking efforts. Countries are put on the Tier 2 Watch List if “the absolute number of victims of severe forms of trafficking is very significant or is significantly increasing.”²⁸

The prevention and prosecution efforts sponsored by the United States spread this view of the trafficked as “victims.” The labeling of the trafficked as “victims” is circulated through training efforts for law enforcement officials and others who may come in contact with trafficked persons. For example, the 2013 TIPR emphasizes the difficulties with identifying “victims” of sex trafficking and the importance of training government officials to identify “victims”:

A number of other factors that may lead to a person being overlooked as a victim by authorities are a sex trafficking victims' initial consent, the belief that they are in love with their trafficker, not self-identifying as a victim, or being away from a pimp's physical control with what seems to be ample opportunity to ask for help or flee. None of these factors, taken alone or in sum, mean that someone is not a victim of a severe form of trafficking. Dispelling these myths should be an essential part of training for every government employee and everyone who does business with or on behalf of a government.²⁹

Particular emphasis is placed on training law enforcement officials to identify trafficked persons as “victims.”³⁰

ICE works to disseminate training for “victim” identification throughout the public. As mentioned in Chapter One, the DHS and ICE run public awareness raising campaigns. The DHS produces and distributes a plethora of materials to educate the public including, but not limited to public service announcements (PSAs), pamphlets, posters, and “wallet-sized human trafficking indicator cards” that explain the difference between trafficking and smuggling.³¹ John Morton stated this goal in a press release for the “Hidden in Plain Sight” campaign:

Most Americans would be shocked to learn that slavery still exists in this day and age in communities throughout the country....Because this heinous crime is extremely well-hidden, we need to help educate members of the public about human trafficking, and encourage them to keep alert for possible human trafficking victims.³²

He reiterates, “ICE is asking for the public's help to remain alert to recognize and identify victims of modern-day slavery who are in our midst.”³³ Trafficked persons are referred to as “victims” in “victim assistance” efforts as well: “Eighteen of ICE's 26 HSI offices have hired full-time victim specialists to date – complementing the work of ICE's 350 collateral duty victim assistance coordinators and one full-time child forensic interview specialist.”³⁴

This “victim” identification training is circulated amongst a broad group of people who may contact the trafficked. The TIPR identifies everyone from volunteers in homeless shelters to church workers as requiring training to identify “victims”:

Those well positioned to identify human trafficking victims can include religious leaders; officials in organizations that work with immigrants, children, the homeless, refugees, and other vulnerable populations; social workers; and employees and volunteers in shelters for victims of domestic violence or sexual assault, runaway youth, or the homeless.³⁵

The view of trafficked persons as “victims” is spread to the public in these awareness-raising efforts. Members of the public are encouraged to aid law enforcement efforts to identify people as “victims.”

Trafficking “victims” are described as lacking agency and subjectivity. For example, one DHS Blue Campaign poster declares “Death is not the only way to lose your life: Be alert. Be strong. Be free. Stop Human Trafficking.”³⁶ Trafficking is described as a form of death. The trafficked are rhetorically lowered to the status of the dead in terms of their capacity for agency. The Blue Campaign’s “Forced Labor Awareness Poster,” the only one on the Blue Campaign Resource Catalog to feature a male trafficking “victim,” describes “victims” as vulnerable to being “lured” into trafficking by the promise of work and as completely lacking “freedom” and autonomy once trafficked. Above the picture of a tired man working on a sewing machine in a textile factory, the poster reads in all capitalized letters: “WHAT GOOD IS A TIMECARD, WHEN HIS FREEDOM CLOCKED OUT LONG AGO?” Beneath the picture, the poster explains: “Often lured by promises of steady work and a better life, victims are robbed of their freedom, and forced to work in factories, farms, restaurants and small businesses – for little or no money. This is human trafficking, and it’s a

heinous crime.”³⁷ “Victims” are described as well-intentioned hard-workers who sought the American Dream only to have their freedom stolen from them.

Following the trajectory of the 1998 memorandum made by President Clinton, women and children are treated as the most likely “victims” of trafficking” in the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric. More specifically, women and girls are treated as the most at risk for sex trafficking. This can be seen in the speeches by the head of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons Luis CdeBaca and State Department TIPRs. It is also evident in the awareness-raising efforts of the DHS and ICE, more specifically.

In reports and statements generated by the State Department, “victims” are described as primarily being made up of women and girls. In the TIPR produced by the State Department female “victims” are represented more. Of the thirteen “victim’s stories” included in the 2011 TIPR, nine are from the perspective of a female trafficked person while only four are from that of a person who identifies themselves as male.³⁸ CdeBaca describes being a woman as an indicator that one will be at greater risk for trafficking: “the number-one predictor of whether there will be long-term, ongoing sexual abuse, sexual slavery of a woman is not whether she is being used in forced prostitution or in the sex sector, but it is, rather, if she is a woman.”³⁹ CdeBaca uses female pronouns to refer to trafficked persons: Modern slavery is not a dry policy issue, but a tragedy with a human face. It happens in every country, and women and girls are affected not just in the sex industry, but also in labor trafficking – where physical and sexual abuse is rife.”⁴⁰

CdeBaca isolates girls as the people most vulnerable to the use of the Internet for the solicitation of prostitution.⁴¹ In descriptions of trafficking events, men are described as engaging in solicitation of female prostitution:

Real men need to speak out against bad behavior. Even when it's tough. Even when it's a friend, an associate, a colleague. Especially then. Bachelor parties, R and R's, when it's your best friend or your boss or your brother-in-law and you're just not the type to cause drama. Think of the drama in the woman's life that – absent your action – would otherwise continue unabated.⁴²

CdeBaca emphasizes that “real men,” read heterosexual men, speak against prostitution.

Prostitutes are assumed to be female.

This is driven by demand. No girl or woman would be a victim of sex trafficking if there were no profits to be made from their exploitation. You each play a role in reducing that demand, and living by example – by refraining personally from engaging in human trafficking or buying commercial sex, not just because of the UCMJ or National Security Presidential Directive 22, but because it is the right thing to do.⁴³

Instead of saying that nobody of any gender would be trafficked were there no demand, CdeBaca assumes that sex trafficking “victims” are girls or women.

This view is reflected in and disseminated by the efforts of the DHS and ICE to raise awareness amongst law enforcement officials and members of the general public concerning trafficking and the identification of “trafficking victims.” Seven out of the eight “victims” portrayed in the DHS “Law Enforcement Training” video are women.⁴⁴ In each of ICE’s public service announcement (PSA) videos about human trafficking, women feature the most prominently in representations of “victims.” Although ICE videos proclaim that a “victim” can be any gender, nationality, and age, it is women that are most often used to portray a “victim.”⁴⁵ For example, in the “full version” of ICE’s human trafficking PSA, out of the 13 “victims” depicted, eight are women.⁴⁶ This version of the PSA was displayed at “port[s] of entry and departure gates.”⁴⁷ In the “Any Age

version,” three out of the four “victims” shown are women.⁴⁸ In the “Prostitution version” of the video, five out of eight “victims” are women.⁴⁹ This video also emphasizes the views that prostitution causes sex trafficking and that sex trafficking is the most prevalent form of trafficking. No other forms of labor for which people are trafficked have an entire video dedicated to them. In the “Spanish version” of the video, eight out of the 13 “victims” are women.⁵⁰ In ICE’s “In Plain Sight” video, the majority of the trafficked persons shown are women. The men in the video are primarily traffickers or law enforcement agents.⁵¹

DHS posters focus on women as more likely trafficking “victims.” Of the six large posters provided in the “Blue Campaign Resource Catalog,” the five posters that include depictions of trafficked persons predominately feature women. Four out of the five feature women as “trafficking victims.”⁵² The “Sex Trafficking Awareness Poster,” “Domestic Servitude Awareness Poster,” “Death is not the only way to lose your life,” and “Human Trafficking Poster for Firefighters and EMTs” all include pictures of female trafficking “victims.”⁵³ It is only the “Forced Labor Awareness Poster” that features a male trafficking “victim.”

It is one of these posters that provides perhaps the best example of the ideal “trafficking victim.” The Blue Campaign’s “Sex Trafficking Awareness Poster,” features a sad looking Caucasian woman with heavy make-up on who is staring into a mirror. The title reads: “Lured by Fairy Tale Promises, She Learned Not Every Prince is Charming.”⁵⁴ Women and girls are portrayed as heterosexual weak dainty princesses in search of their “Prince Charming.” The text beneath the picture reads: “The commercial sex trade is thriving due to human traffickers. Innocent children and even adults, are lured

with empty promises, only to be exploited by the very people they trust. This is human trafficking and it's a heinous crime."⁵⁵ In the poster, women and girls are portrayed as aspiring princesses. This characterization of "trafficking victims" "promotes a view of these people as passive objects, fooled into migration through their own ignorance and ridiculous dreams."⁵⁶

Although written in the context of a popular image of the trafficked person in Brazil, the work of Ana Paula da Silva, Thaddeus Gregory Blanchette, and Andressa Raylane Bento is applicable to the portrayal of the trafficking "victim" in US trafficking rhetoric. They explain that the depiction of trafficking "victims" as Cinderella or fairy princesses contributes to a negative conception of women's autonomy:

The belief that women labeled as trafficking victims make their decisions to migrate based on fairy tales, in which they see themselves as Cinderellas being courted by handsome princes (in reality viscous pimps) serves a dual purpose. In the first place, it infantilizes and trivializes these women and calls into question their ability to make rational decisions in their own best interests. Children, of course, believe fairy tales and a woman who sees herself as Cinderella is dangerously infantile and in need of sober guidance. But the second, more subtle meaning of "fairy tale" language is that it reassures those who recount and listen to the myth that Brazil's legions of poor black and brown Marias are not Cinderellas, that their proper place is not at the European ball but back home, sweeping out the chimney.⁵⁷

This infantilization can be seen in the DHS poster. The "Sex Trafficking Awareness Poster" emphasizes that "even adults" can be fooled by someone who they think is their "Prince Charming."⁵⁸ Instead of being taken seriously as hard-working adults making calculated decisions in their self interest, women are treated as children, day-dreaming about their prince and making foolish choices.

Another poster includes a picture of a downtrodden woman sitting on the steps of a house with cleaning supplies. The poster reads: "Some Prison Cells Have Metal Bars,

and Some Have Picket Fences.”⁵⁹ Underneath the image of the woman, the poster declares:

Human trafficking is a global problem, and it’s happening right here on Main Street, USA. Traffickers prey on the vulnerable, using trickery and coercion to imprison their victims into lives of domestic servitude. This is human trafficking, and it’s a heinous crime. The Department of Homeland Security’s *Blue Campaign* was created to turn the tables on those who sell human dignity for commercial gain.⁶⁰

Trafficking is described as a “heinous crime” that results in the loss not only of a trafficked person’s labor, but also their “human dignity.” Trafficked persons are described as “vulnerable” and as “victims.”

In the Obama administration’s “victim” rhetoric, sex trafficking is treated as the most prevalent form of trafficking. In the 2013 TIPR the only type of trafficking with a section dedicated to prevention efforts was sex trafficking. Sex trafficking is spoken about apart from the other categories of trafficking and equated to prostitution: “As Secretary Clinton said recently, anywhere from 12 to 27 million people are currently held in bondage for labor or prostitution.”⁶¹ Sex is described as an exceptional type of trafficking and members of the Obama administration avoid referring to sex as a form of labor. For example, in this speech by CdeBaca, sex trafficking is referred to separately from trafficking for other forms of labor:

We found that trafficking occurs for both sex and labor. We see it in domestic servitude, agriculture, manufacturing, janitorial services, construction, health care, and beauty salons. We see trafficking in prostitution and strip clubs, as the traffickers dehumanize and destroy.⁶²

Sex trafficking is seen as a distinct form of trafficking, which deprives the trafficked of their humanity.

The emphasis on women as “victims” in this rhetoric has implications for anti-trafficking policies. Efforts are misdirected toward mythical “villains” and “victims” while simultaneously “the demands of real migrants and sex workers are ignored.”⁶³ For example, as described in Chapter Two, policies emphasize the use of raids over other forms of identification methods. Some trafficked persons are not recognized and particular types of trafficked persons, namely female sex trafficking “victims,” are recognized at the expense of others.

Men are de-emphasized as potential trafficked persons. This can result in the criminalization of male trafficked persons instead of their identification as trafficked:

Those who start from a "victim approach" to prostitution often advocate prosecuting men who participate in the sex trade as pimps, clients, traffickers, or brothel owners, proposing laws that criminalize working women in the belief that they can rehabilitate men who use prostitutes and can "rescue" or "save" women in a missionary fashion.⁶⁴

Instead of being recognized as trafficked persons, they are blamed. Samuel Vincent Jones explains: “male victims are as much the object of visual and cognitive indifference as they are the object of blame. Like the trafficked male who is often perceived as a criminal rather than a victim, male child victims are perceived in the same fashion.”⁶⁵ The image of the trafficking victim as an innocent woman or female child causes men and boys to be vilified and ignored.

The focus on the sex trafficking of women as the most common form of trafficking causes a trade-off in anti-trafficking efforts. Efforts are disproportionately placed on addressing sex trafficking. The emphasis on sex trafficking in anti-trafficking discourse at the expense of other forms of labor exploitation is unjustified statistically. “The inordinate focus on sex-sector trafficking belies the reality that non-sex-sector

trafficking accounts for nearly as many—and arguably more—trafficking cases worldwide.”⁶⁶ Focus on the innocent helpless female sex trafficking victim also causes a tradeoff between attention to gender as an indicator of vulnerability and attention to other factors motivating migration, such as globalization, gender/class/racial and other categories of hierarchies based upon personal identity (race, religion, nationality, etc).⁶⁷ This is an important omission from trafficking scholarship because it causes anti-trafficking efforts to fail to address the root causes of human trafficking. This is not to say that sex trafficking is an unimportant issue, but that it ought not be prioritized at the expense of other forms of trafficking and should not be framed as solely a women’s issue.

Trafficked Persons v. “Illegal Aliens”

Another common metaphor in the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric is the description of undocumented immigrants as “illegal aliens.” As Chapter Two showed, human trafficking and immigration linked both rhetorically and in policy. Individuals whose status as trafficked persons is not recognized are considered criminals or “illegal aliens.”

Trafficking is treated as being closely linked to “human smuggling” and the transportation of “illegal aliens.” A DHS Blue Campaign poster explains the fine distinctions between trafficking and smuggling in a section entitled “Trafficking vs. Smuggling”:

Human Trafficking is defined as:

Sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such acts is younger than 18; or the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage or slavery.

Human Smuggling is defined as:

The importation of people into the United States involving deliberate evasion of immigration laws. This offense includes bringing illegal aliens into the country, as well as the unlawful transportation and harboring of aliens already in the United States.⁶⁸

The distinction between trafficking and smuggling relies on determining whether there is an intent to migrate without following the procedures put in place by US immigration laws. In the poster, the humans that are the “smuggled” are referred to as “illegal aliens.” While the poster attempts to reduce ambiguity between the definitions of trafficking and smuggling, it ultimately illustrates the indistinction between the two terms. The poster indicates that the decision to migrate “illegally” is a fundamental component of the definition of smuggling, yet at the same time the poster states that one of the “common trafficking indicators” is that a “victim’s salary is garnished to pay off smuggling fees.”⁶⁹ People who purposefully engage in “human smuggling” can be considered “victims” if once they have arrived in the United States, they are forced to work to pay off the fee for the transportation into the country. The distinction between smuggling and trafficking is therefore not only an issue of a person’s willful transportation into the United States, but also an issue of when and how they pay for this transportation if it was willfully committed. A Blue Campaign factsheet echoes the same definitional distinction between trafficking and smuggling. It includes the disclaimer “These are *not* interchangeable terms,” adding “smuggling is transportation-based” and “trafficking is exploitation-based.”⁷⁰

Human trafficking and the movement of “illegal aliens” are not just close in definition; they are also explained as occurring in the same spaces. CdeBaca describes the routes for trafficking and the movement of “illegal aliens” as being interlinked:

We have to be mindful of the fact that these routes can be used for various things. You can have a person who's flowing through it who is headed towards a life of indentured servitude. You can have another person who's headed through that route who's simply going to melt into society as an illegal alien. But then you could also have someone who's coming in to do harm. And so we're looking at that across the board to try to make sure that we can disrupt those established smuggling routes.⁷¹

Smuggling routes and trafficking routes are labeled one and the same.

The close relationship between human trafficking and immigration can be seen in policy as well. As explained in Chapter Two, the organizations in charge of enforcing immigration laws are also in charge of enforcing anti-trafficking policies. ICE is the primary investigator of both immigration and trafficking crime: "We are the principal investigator of human trafficking and smuggling crimes, and we run the national human smuggling and trafficking center."⁷² The name for the anti-smuggling campaign "Operation In Plain Sight" is almost identical to ICE's "Hidden in Plain Sight" campaign.⁷³

The fine line between trafficking and smuggling and the utilization of the "illegal alien" metaphor to label the undocumented have implications for the enforcement and formulation of US anti-trafficking policies. The association between undocumented immigration and trafficking has created a system wherein those who are not certified as trafficked are criminalized as "illegal aliens." According to Srikantiah: "Imperfect trafficking victims who fail to meet the restrictive legal (and cultural) definition are not only non-victims, but they are placed in the category of "illegal aliens."⁷⁴ Because they are treated as "illegal aliens," deportation and detention are seen as appropriate responses to those who are not certified as trafficked. The association between human trafficking and human smuggling/illegal immigration is utilized to justify increased immigration

controls. Nandita Sharma argues that these restrictive immigration laws create the foundation for “a global apartheid whereby differential legal regimes are organized...one for “citizens” and another far more regressive one for those, such as people categorized as “illegal,” who are denied a permanent legal status within the nation space.”⁷⁵

Criminal Traffickers

Traffickers are treated as criminals and trafficking is associated with other forms of crime. While trafficking is a criminalized act, traffickers are described as if they harbor a criminal disposition as a personality trait. Traffickers are described as being involved in other crimes and trafficking is rhetorically linked with organized crime and terrorism.

Trafficking is described as having infiltrated the United States. Kibble indicates that trafficking impacts not only “urban high crime areas,” but also “affluent neighborhoods”: “Since the enactment of the TVPA, law enforcement has learned that trafficking is not limited to urban high crime areas. It is now acknowledged that human trafficking is found in rural agricultural sectors and in private homes in affluent neighborhoods.”⁷⁶ A DHS poster similarly emphasizes that trafficking can be found even on “Main Street, USA.”⁷⁷

Trafficking is rhetorically linked to vague criminal organizations. In a statement in honor of National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, Obama declared: “slavery tears at our social fabric, fuels violence and organized crime, and debases our common humanity.”⁷⁸ In a DHS Blue Campaign poster, human trafficking is described as being supported by criminal activity in ambiguous terms: “By targeting trafficking organizations while providing support to victims, ICE is working to dismantle the criminal infrastructure behind human trafficking.”⁷⁹ CdeBaca relates the testimony of

“victims” in exchange for being eligible for visas with making progress on hindering organized crime internationally:

Victim protection in this situation is not simply a social program. It's also being able to help the folks who you've gotten out of a slavery situation, work through their trauma, and then have them as effective witnesses against the transnational criminals that you're trying to put out of business.⁸⁰

In another speech, CdeBaca equates the inability for philanthropists to fund anti-trafficking organizations as an example of the way human trafficking is connected to organized crime.⁸¹ Marilana Morales describes human trafficking as a form of organized crime:

It's not an easy task, first of all, because we are fighting organized crime. And every person that you manage to get to leave the sexual trafficking – when you do that, you're actually hurting someone's pocketbook. And the mafia – the organized crime will definitely be looking to shut down anyone is who affecting their business.⁸²

Morales describes the mafia and other major organized crime syndicates as being the primary supporters of trafficking.

Human trafficking is described as finding its foundation and support in other pre-existing criminal organizations.

Trafficking is rhetorically linked to piracy and slavery as well. For example,

CdeBaca claims:

It comes back to the most fundamental crimes that we have confronted for so long as a nation – piracy and slavery. Just as Decatur went into Algiers to deal with the Barbary pirates and their protectors who were taking American and European slaves, America in 2011 again finds itself confronting the old evils of piracy and slavery around the world.⁸³

Trafficking is connected to the older crimes of piracy and slavery. Trafficking, piracy, and slavery are all denounced as part of the same “evil.”

Trafficking is also associated with terrorism. CdeBaca argues that human trafficking is connected to terrorist networks.⁸⁴ As this statement from Deputy Director of ICE Kumar C. Kibble indicates, the Obama administration views a connection between the transportation of terrorists and trafficking:

The Administration's Strategy makes clear that due to U.S. and international pressure, terrorists increasingly are turning to crime and criminal networks to fund and facilitate their illicit activities. A threat of particular concern is the convergence of terrorist travel and human trafficking.⁸⁵

The funding and migration routes used in trafficking are rhetorically associated with terrorism. Denis McDonough, Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor, argues:

[H]uman trafficking is at the nexus of organized crimes, is a source for funding for international terrorist groups, is a source for funding for transnational criminal groups. It fundamentally endangers international security. And so while we're trying to create an international economy in which everyone can choose and be paid for their work, it by lifting this up, will strengthen our ability to be a leader in the global marketplace as well.⁸⁶

McDonough rhetorically constructs human trafficking as the core of all organized crime and the source of financial support for terrorism. It is described as a threat to both international security and the international economy.

Policies reflect this association between trafficking in persons and other forms of crime, more specifically transnational organized crime, piracy, and terrorism. Trafficking is described as operating in the same way as other types of organized crime and requiring the same tactics to stop it:

So part of it is with any kind of organized crime fight, you want to figure out what their patterns are and then how you disrupt those patterns, because that gives you a few months – not forever – it gives you a few months in which while they're trying to establish new patterns, that's when you can pick them off.⁸⁷

Because trafficking is described in similar terms to organized crime and terrorism, anti-trafficking efforts are modeled on those used by law enforcement organizations to stop organized crime and terrorism. One of the organizations dedicated toward improving the enforcement of anti-trafficking laws in the United States is the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center (HSTC). This organization addresses “the separate but related issues of alien smuggling, trafficking in persons, and criminal support of clandestine terrorist travel.”⁸⁸ According to Deputy Director of ICE Kibble: “The HSTC was established to facilitate the broad dissemination of anti-smuggling and trafficking information and help coordinate the U.S. Government’s efforts against human smuggling, human trafficking and criminal facilitation of terrorist mobility.”⁸⁹ The policies of the Obama administration reflect the rhetorical association between trafficking in persons, organized crime, and terrorism by integrating law enforcement efforts to deal with each of these types of crime separately. As Kibble explains:

The HSTC serves as a fusion center for intelligence, law enforcement and other information to enhance coordination and communication within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), including U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), along with other U.S. Government agencies in combating human traffickers, smugglers and criminals facilitating terrorist travel.⁹⁰

Trafficking, human smuggling and terrorism are described as being so similar and interlinked that coordination between the organizations that deal with each is needed.

The rhetorical association between trafficking and other forms of crime also has the effect of depoliticizing anti-trafficking efforts. Trafficking is linked rhetorically to other types of crime and by extension to types of pre-existing government initiatives for which there has already been extensive public support. By associating trafficking with organized crime and terrorism, the importance of stopping trafficking becomes implied

and magnified. Sarah L. Steele argues that the association between trafficking and terrorism is utilized to further criminalize traffickers: “By connecting traffickers with terrorists, the trafficker is, in moral terms, quite firmly depraved and dangerous.”⁹¹ Associating human trafficking with terrorism elevates support for anti-trafficking efforts by increasing the perceived moral and physical threat of trafficking. The same strategy is accomplished by linking trafficking to organized crime, piracy, and slavery.

The rhetorical association between trafficking and criminal activity has implications for the way that prevention and protection efforts are implemented. Because trafficking is treated as a criminal issue, it is determined to be appropriate for law enforcement officials to take the lead in identifying the trafficked. Law enforcement officials are seen as the best people to first come into contact with trafficked persons and are given the authority to legitimate a person’s status as a trafficked individual. This can be seen in the language of the 2013 TIPR: “Human trafficking is first and foremost a crime, so it is appropriate that law enforcement agencies lead most trafficking interventions.”⁹²

Focus on human trafficking as a piece of larger criminal networks can also have the effect of relegating trafficked persons to evidence. Emphasis is placed on the role that “victims” can play as evidence. Despite his insistence that “victims” not be treated as merely evidence, Kibble affirms this view of victims as the best evidence: “Victims are our best evidence of the crime. Yet a victim should not and cannot be treated as simply a piece of evidence.”⁹³ This is indicated in the 2013 TIPR, which emphasizes the importance of providing the conditions in which “victims” can be assets to the prosecution:

Identifying the victim is critical to understanding and prosecuting the true crime that has taken place, and ensuring adequate care and support to trafficking victims facilitates their ability to provide testimony in the prosecution of offenders. Treated as criminals, victims can be traumatized by placement in jail and will be less effective witnesses. Further, if victims are treated as criminal and deported they will be unable to support the investigation. This all-too-common practice suppresses the best evidence of trafficking and gets rid of the evidence—undermining prosecutions and often fatally compromising the government’s ability to prosecute a case successfully.⁹⁴

The rhetorical elevation of trafficking to transnational organized crime and terrorism places greater emphasis on the prosecution of crime than the well-being of the trafficked and makes it more likely that trafficked persons who are unable to help with prosecutions will be overlooked. Anti-trafficking efforts prioritize criminal prosecution and the prevention of trafficking through the eradication of criminal networks instead of focusing on other potential causes of trafficking, such as economic causes. As Steele explains:

Because trafficking is regulated as a criminal transgression, rather than as an economic or a development issue, the focus is taken off of the conditions in which trafficking happens. The current regime obscures other causes of trafficking, such as disparities in development and lack of legal migration options.... Instead, an active perpetrator is blamed.⁹⁵

Prioritizing the criminal aspects of trafficking takes the focus away from the global economic inequality that incentivizes trafficking and the immigration laws that make it difficult for people to migrate legally.

The “Evil” of Trafficking

Another common rhetorical strategy is to describe trafficking as an “evil” practice. The rhetorical elevation of trafficking to an act of “evil” is not a new strategy. The rhetoric of “evil” has been utilized by both the administrations of President G.W. Bush and that of President Obama to describe trafficking in persons.⁹⁶

Yvonne C. Zimmerman argues that this rhetoric belies the religious underpinnings of the United States anti-trafficking strategy. She argues that “evil” rhetoric can be found in the TVPA and that it’s “characterization of human trafficking as ‘evil’ is indicative of the religious rooting of the United States’ anti-trafficking project.”⁹⁷ Closely related to the description of the trafficker as “evil” is the labeling of the trafficker as a monster and a deviant: “The trafficker, in enjoying causing others pain or harm, is inhumane and different from persons of good character, and therefore a deviant.”⁹⁸ By labeling trafficking and traffickers to be “evil” they are rhetorically constructed to be immoral.

In addition to being found in the TVPA, trafficking is referred to as “evil” in several speeches by members of the Obama administration. In Obama’s remarks to the Clinton Global Initiative, he argues that trafficking is “evil” and “barbaric:”

When a little boy is kidnapped, turned into a child soldier, forced to kill or be killed – that’s slavery. When a little girl is sold by her impoverished family – girls my daughters’ age – runs away from home, or is lured by the false promises of a better life, and then imprisoned in a brothel and tortured if she resists – that’s slavery. It is barbaric, and it is evil, and it has no place in a civilized world.⁹⁹

Kerry uses the term “evil” to describe trafficking as well: “I was just stunned by the stories, the examples of the evil that Valerie just referred to and the President talked about. It is nothing less than the most predatory, extraordinarily abusive modern slavery that you could conceivably imagine.”¹⁰⁰ Similarly, CdeBaca describes trafficking as an “old evil.”¹⁰¹

The use of “evil” to label trafficking is a rhetorical strategy that places the United States on the right side against “evil.” In the face of “evil,” inaction is seen to be unjustifiable. According to Kerry:

Edmund Burke once said, 'All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.' Well, we can't stand by and do nothing as housekeepers brought to the United States find themselves imprisoned in their homes. We cannot stand by as migrant agricultural laborers are enslaved by their American employers and subjected to unfair wages and labor practices while they toil to pay off large recruiting debts.¹⁰²

In this statement, those who argue against human trafficking efforts are placed in the position of being morally culpable for the continuation of trafficking. Doing nothing is rhetorically equated with promoting trafficking. If you are not against trafficking, then you facilitate trafficking.

Trafficking is not only "evil," being against trafficking is rhetorically constructed as an action in line with Judeo-Christian morals. CdeBaca describes anti-trafficking as being a cause with which Jesus would have helped:

The Pope recently – Pope Francis has really taken a strong stand on this, which doesn't surprise anybody that worked with him when he was in the Cardinal in Buenos Aires, because he was one of the real leaders in saying, what would Jesus have done? Who would he have stood with? He would have been out there with the enslaved, with the marginalized, with the prostitutes, with the farm workers. In fact, I think the Bible actually says that he was out there with them...[the pope] challenged everybody. He said, who wept for that woman who drowned with her baby in her arms? Who wept for that man who had left Africa hoping for a better life for his families? And the traffickers took advantage of them. And for the first time, we had somebody of that stature go to where the refugees are, go to where the victims are, and challenge all of us to, as Paul said, see them. Not to say this is invisible, but to recognize that they're right in front us.¹⁰³

CdeBaca aligns the Pope with US anti-trafficking efforts. He references the Bible and argues that Jesus would have taken part in efforts to help the trafficked. Anti-trafficking efforts by the United States are rhetorically sanctioned by God.

The rhetorical linkage between trafficking and "evil" works to depoliticize the issue of formulating responses to human trafficking because it is implicitly seen to be a good idea. As Desyllas explains: "many rely on the assumption that 'evil' traffickers are

behind trafficking because it is easier to gain support for arguing to help 'victims' rather than challenge the existing framework.”¹⁰⁴ This rhetorical strategy makes it harder to reform the framework for anti-trafficking efforts. People are rhetorically situated either on the side of the United States or on the side of “evil.”

In addition, there are racial implications to the utilization of the “evil” metaphor to describe trafficking and traffickers. Sarah L. Steele argues that the trafficker is described as being both metaphorically and physically black.¹⁰⁵ The darkness of trafficking is described as a morally corrupting force or a plague.¹⁰⁶ Traffickers are described and pictured as being dark-skinned: “Recurrent references to the trafficker as “dark” imply specifically that he is non-white in appearance. Whereas the TIP reports often picture Anglo men as punters and sex tourists, overwhelmingly traffickers are pictured as Asian, black, or Slavic European.”¹⁰⁷ Solicitors of sex are depicted as being of Caucasian descent whereas traffickers are portrayed as being of Asian, African, or Eastern European descent. “Evil” rhetoric shapes which people are more likely to be suspected of trafficking based on their race and appearance.

The Scourge of Trafficking in Persons

The metaphorical representation of trafficking as a disease is also a frequently used metaphor. Trafficking is referred to as a “scourge” or a “plague” while traffickers are portrayed to be “diseased” and “ill.”¹⁰⁸ Rhetorically elevated to the level of a “scourge” or disease threat, trafficking and traffickers are considered to be a threat to public safety and national security.

This rhetorical elevation of trafficking to a disease, plague, or scourge, can be seen in the Obama administration’s trafficking rhetoric. Obama argues that his

administration is committed to ending the “scourge” of trafficking: “During National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, we renew our commitment to ending this scourge in all its forms.”¹⁰⁹ Secretary of State Hilary Clinton refers to trafficking as a “scourge” in her introductory letter in the 2010 TIPR.¹¹⁰ CdeBaca refers to trafficking in persons as a “scourge” of global proportions: “Human trafficking is a scourge on the Earth, and the United States is certainly no exception.”¹¹¹ In a different statement, CdeBaca specifically references sex trafficking as a “scourge.”¹¹² Trafficking is also referred to as a “plague.” For example, in the 2013 TIPR, trafficking is described as “plaguing” sectors of the economy without strict oversight.¹¹³

The rhetorical construction of traffickers as a plague or scourge has implications for trafficking research and policy. Steele argues that this elevates the threat of trafficking to the level of an epidemic.¹¹⁴ Traffickers are described to be “omnipresent and insidious—a plague that must be kept out and eradicated.”¹¹⁵ Because anyone can be trafficked, it represents an ever-present threat. Conceptualizing trafficking as a disease privileges treating the problem as one would treat a disease: “Physical or symbolic purification is revealed...to be deemed insufficient to remove the stain of the moral contagion, and thus nothing short of isolation or destruction of the contagion can suffice.”¹¹⁶ Trafficking is considered to be a moral contagion that requires purification and quarantine of the threat. The trafficked are subject to a “treatment regime” that involves “participation of experts who can diagnose and remedy the defect,” including “law enforcement officials, psychologists, and doctors.”¹¹⁷

This rhetorical strategy is replicated in US efforts to spread anti-trafficking efforts globally. For example, CdeBaca describes the President’s Interagency Task Force to

Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (PITF) as discussing “our nation’s efforts to fight the scourge of modern slavery and...initiatives to meet this challenge, both here at home and around the world.”¹¹⁸ The US policies that are modeled by other nations and the global anti-trafficking strategy pursued by the United States both place an emphasis on treating trafficking in persons as a “scourge” or “disease.”

The “War” on Human Trafficking

Anti-trafficking efforts are rhetorically elevated to the level of a war by the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric. This “war on trafficking” is led by the United States.¹¹⁹ Anti-trafficking efforts are referred to using war metaphors. Anti-trafficking is understood as either a form of combat or a way to “fight” trafficking.

War metaphors, such as the use of the terms “combat” and “fight” to label anti-trafficking efforts, are common in the Obama administration’s anti-trafficking rhetoric. Obama has described his administration as “deploying new technology in the fight against human trafficking.”¹²⁰ In the same statement, Obama called on a replication of these efforts globally: “This month, I call on every nation, every community, and every individual to fight human trafficking wherever it exist.”¹²¹ CdeBaca argues that “much remains to be done in this fight” against human trafficking.¹²² The 2010 and 2011 TIP Reports refer to anti-trafficking efforts as “combating” trafficking at least twenty times in each.¹²³ The United States is described as the leader of this “fight”: “Fighting trafficking in persons is the smart thing to do, and as President Obama made clear in his speech at the Clinton Global Initiative Meeting last fall, “the United States will continue to be a leader in this global movement.”¹²⁴ Several of the “heroes” that are flagged by the 2013 TIPR are mentioned for their efforts to “combat trafficking.”¹²⁵ The 2013 TIPR refers to

anti-trafficking efforts as a war by implying it has “front lines.”¹²⁶ The annual reports provided from the Ombudsman to Congress circulate these war metaphors as well. For example, in the 2013 Annual Report from the Ombudsman, the report referred to DHS and USCIS initiatives as working to “combat violence against individuals and ensure protection for victims of human trafficking, domestic violence, and other crimes.”¹²⁷ The 2011 report displays similar rhetoric.¹²⁸

Policy reflects this view of anti-trafficking as a “war.” The TVPA is considered a means of “fighting” trafficking. For example, Kibble used this language in a hearing on the recent trends in human trafficking:

The most critical piece of legislation supporting our efforts in fighting human trafficking is the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA) and its subsequent reauthorizations. ICE pursues victim-centered trafficking investigations according to the tenets of Prevention, Protection and Prosecution, familiarly known as the 3 Ps.¹²⁹

The tier system put in place by the TVPA shows the way that “war” metaphors have seeped into anti-trafficking policy as well. The tier system is used to evaluate other countries’ abilities to make efforts to “combat trafficking.” The 2013 TIPR explains:

The Department places each country in the 2013 TIP Report onto one of four tiers, as mandated by the TVPA. This placement is based more on the extent of government action to combat trafficking than on the size of the problem....Each year, governments need to demonstrate appreciable progress in combating trafficking to maintain a Tier 1 ranking.¹³⁰

Grounds for placing a country on the Tier 2 Watch List include evidence that “there is a failure to provide evidence of increasing efforts to combat severe forms of trafficking in persons from the previous year.”¹³¹ Through the tier ranking system, the US has created a standard by which to judge other countries’ progress according to their ability to mimic US anti-trafficking efforts.

The institutions and law enforcement agencies that enforce anti-trafficking policies are referred to in similar terms. War metaphors are evident in the names and purposes of the organizations created to deal with trafficking. The office that is in charge of dealing with human trafficking in the United States Department of State is the “Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons.”¹³² DHS’ Blue Campaign is described as being purposed toward “combating” trafficking: “The Department of Homeland Security’s *Blue Campaign* was created to give a unified voice to DHS agencies and their dedicated partners who combat human trafficking.”¹³³

War metaphors are also used to refer to the practices of law enforcement officials that work toward the eradication of trafficking in persons. ICE is described as “fighting” and “combating” trafficking. In a DHS Blue Campaign poster, ICE is described as “a leader in the global fight against trafficking.”¹³⁴ It is the foremost organization in the United States for engaging in this “combat”: “ICE is the federal government’s lead agency with responsibility for combating human trafficking.”¹³⁵ ICE is described as working with other law enforcement agencies in “combat”:

Accordingly, ICE proudly partners with other law enforcement agencies and NGOs through the Department of Justice-sponsored Human Trafficking Task Forces (HTTFs). These task forces are located across the United States, and play a vital role in combating human trafficking organizations.¹³⁶

Much like the branches of the military, ICE and other law enforcement agencies are portrayed as a seamless trafficking “combat” unit. In addition, officers specialized to deal with trafficked persons are referred to as “front line officers.”¹³⁷ The law enforcement agencies and officials are described as being at the front of the proverbial battlefield of trafficking.

The use of war metaphors is a rhetorical strategy to bolster support for particular types of anti-trafficking policies and to depoliticize these discussions. The description of anti-trafficking as a war is used to increase the perceived stakes of anti-trafficking efforts. War metaphors are also used to connect anti-trafficking efforts to earlier historical examples of anti-slavery movements in the United States. For example, the “fight” against trafficking is rhetorically linked to the same movement against slavery during the presidency of Abraham Lincoln: “On February 1st, 1865, President Lincoln sent the 13th Amendment to the states for ratification, committing America to lead the fight against slavery and involuntary servitude.”¹³⁸ By linking US anti-trafficking efforts under the Obama administration to the administration of President Lincoln, these efforts are seen as less contestable. “Fighting” trafficking is rhetorically constructed as an American activity. The “fight” against human trafficking is described as an “American fight”:

We’ve now taken it hopefully to an even more intense fight under President Obama, and I think it just shows that you’ve got administrations that don’t always see eye to eye on things, but human trafficking and the fight against modern slavery, making it through those transition periods – I think it shows this is a bipartisan fight, it’s quintessentially an American fight.¹³⁹

Anti-trafficking is described as a bi-partisan issue with which every American can agree. Contesting the efficacies of anti-trafficking policy is rhetorically situated as an anti-American activity.

The types of policies that are prioritized by this discourse are strategies grounded in law enforcement strategies. ICE’s accomplishments are described in terms of its ability to “combat” trafficking and obtain convictions:

Let me highlight ICE investigative efforts and successes in combating human trafficking. In Fiscal Year 2008, ICE initiated 432 human trafficking investigations, an increase of over 24 percent from the previous year. These investigations included 262 cases of alleged sexual exploitation and 170 cases of

suspected labor exploitation. During the same period, ICE investigative efforts resulted in 189 arrests, 126 indictments and 126 convictions related to human trafficking.¹⁴⁰

Because human trafficking is seen to be a “war,” the tools chosen are likely to fit that description. Hard-line stances toward immigration and law enforcement tactics are likely to continue to be privileged over other strategies to stop trafficking.

The rhetorical elevation of anti-trafficking efforts to a “war” against trafficking are replicated in US efforts to include the public and other countries in these efforts. For example, the website for the Blue Campaign’s Resource Catalog urges the viewer to “become a voice in the Blue Campaign’s effort to combat human trafficking” and to “share the following resources to support us in the fight to combat this heinous crime.”¹⁴¹

Anti-trafficking is referred to as a “fight” and a form of “combat.” This view of anti-trafficking efforts as “fighting” and “combating” trafficking is exported through the collaborative efforts in which the United States engages with other countries. This is shown on the ICE fact sheet for the Blue Campaign:

DHS continues to expand engagement with its international partners via the Blue Campaign to better combat human trafficking on a global scale – actively engaging with the European Union, Canada and the International Organization for Migration. It also welcomes new opportunities for bilateral and multilateral collaboration.¹⁴²

As the United States works to increase collaborative efforts with other countries, its anti-trafficking strategies and vision of trafficking as a “war” continue to be modeled and spread.

The United States to the Rescue

The leader of the “war” on trafficking is also rhetorically situated as the leader of the rescue efforts for the trafficked. The US is as the protector and savior of the huddled

masses of the trafficked. Trafficked persons are seen as being unable to recover from being trafficked without the benevolent intervention of the United States.

The United States is portrayed as the rescuer of the trafficked. In Ambassador Luis CdeBaca's letter to the reader in the beginning of the 2009 TIPR, he indicates that "victims" lie in wait of rescue by the United States and its collaborators:

Globally, there are countless persons who labor in bondage and suffer in silence, feeling that they are trapped and alone. For too many, when they think of police, it is with fear, not with the promise of rescue. If they think of escape, it is a jump into the unknown that they dare not take, since so many do not know that NGOs stand ready to help them if they leave. This report is their story. It is the story of governments, organizations, and individuals who give such survivors a chance for freedom. It is on their behalf, and in the spirit of a common humanity, that we seek a global partnership for the abolition of modern slavery.¹⁴³

Ranked a Tier 1 country, the United States is rhetorically situated as one of the governments that is featured in the report for giving "survivors a chance for freedom." The United States is described as a safe haven for the trafficked. According to CdeBaca, "Just as African-Americans during the Civil War knew that they could find freedom if they could just reach the lines of the U.S. Army, we again find ourselves providing protection and refuge."¹⁴⁴ In this analogy, the United States is rhetorically situated in the position of the global North, a place of refuge for modern slaves from the South.

Anti-trafficking policies and efforts reflect the rhetorical positioning of the United States as the rescuer of the trafficked. The "protection" part of the "3P" model emphasizes the need for the United States to step in to rescue the trafficked. The Department of Health and Human Services created the Rescue and Restore Victims of Human Trafficking campaign to "increase the identification of trafficking victims in the United States and to help those victims receive the benefits and services they need to restore their lives."¹⁴⁵

Rescue is described as a necessary precursor to trafficked persons' ability to regain their capacity as autonomous subjects. The 2009 TIPR emphasizes the need for a "victim-centered approach" that includes the "rescue, rehabilitation, and reintegration" of trafficked persons so governments can "restore to them dignity and the hope of productive lives."¹⁴⁶ Trafficked persons are described as requiring government intervention and protection in order to reclaim their agency:

Being identified as a victim of human trafficking means more than simply being named as the complainant in a prosecution. When adequate anti-trafficking laws are enforced, identification of a person as a victim must begin with a process that respects their rights, provides them protection, and enables them to access services to recover from the trauma inflicted by traffickers. However, when authorities misclassify or fail to identify victims the victims lose access to justice. Even worse, when authorities misidentify trafficking victims as illegal migrants or criminals deserving punishment, those victims can be unfairly subjected to additional harm, trauma, and even punishment such as arrest, detention, deportation, or prosecution.¹⁴⁷

It is only through the help of government officials and through government funded protection efforts that "victims" can become "survivors." This view is reflected in CdeBaca's call for individuals of all professions to put their skills to work to help the trafficked: "Put it to work for the trafficking victims, walk with them as they become survivors."¹⁴⁸ Individuals are told they can help trafficked persons become survivors by aiding US protection efforts for trafficked persons.

The representation of the United States as a rescuer of the trafficked plays off of the image of the helpless female trafficking "victim." The innocent "victim" requires an intervening actor, the United States, to end her self-perpetuated "victimization":

"Migrants and sex workers are not holders of rights, but unconscious enablers of their own victimization. Such people are not to be listened to, but talked at [instead]."¹⁴⁹

According to Desyllas, this rhetorical strategy operates in order "to justify the current U.S.

policy that objectifies women, by turning them into oppressed, dependent victims in need of rescue.”¹⁵⁰

Samuel L. Martinez critiques this portrayal of rescue efforts. According to Martinez, in dominant rescue narratives, “rescue stories are guided by a masculinist politics, in which men but never women can stand up for their rights.”¹⁵¹ In these narratives, the West is depicted as “the world’s sole possible force for justice, as antislavery narratives omit or at best skip lightly over evidence that members of communities afflicted by coerced exploitation are organizing in defense of their own rights.”¹⁵² Martinez warns against the use of these narratives which are “framed around the representational paradigm of contemporary slavery” because they risk “[erasing] the voices and the agency of protagonists of freedom struggle...in favor of preserving a role, as rescuer or prosecutor, for an outsider with an obligation.”¹⁵³ Martinez makes the argument that rescue narratives are characterized by “a distinct *masculinist* gender politics.”¹⁵⁴ Characterized as weak “victims,” trafficked persons are feminized and infantilized. These “victims” are portrayed as requiring saving from the strong United States.

This rhetorical strategy contributes to the depoliticization of the expansion of anti-trafficking efforts. According to Soderlund, “It is commonly assumed that only the most callous would criticize efforts to free the world’s sex slaves from the clutches of organized and brutal trafficking networks.”¹⁵⁵ An example of this type of depoliticization is found in the 2013 TIPR, which declares: “There are no exceptions to this rule: no cultural or socioeconomic rationalizations should prevent the rescue of children from

sexual servitude.”¹⁵⁶ The protection and rescue of the trafficked is seen as an uncontested issue undeserving of debate.

This emphasis on the need for intervening actors to save the trafficked has implications for trafficked persons. Policies requiring recognition and identification by law enforcement officials enable a cycle of dependence wherein trafficked persons remain unable to receive services that would help them escape their traffickers because they cannot receive them without being found by law enforcement officials. For the “victims” who are not “rescued” by law enforcement, they must prove that they were unable to leave the country before law enforcement officials became involved in their case.¹⁵⁷ Cooperation requirements for visas also further this cycle of dependence on law enforcement by requiring that individuals aid in law enforcement investigations in order to receive benefits to help them. These requirements keep benefits out of reach of many who could qualify because they do not make good witnesses.¹⁵⁸

Conclusion

Metaphors are a popular rhetorical device in governmental human trafficking rhetoric. Of the metaphors used in the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric, the eight that are the most prevalent are the trafficking metaphor, the “victim” metaphor, the representation of non-trafficked undocumented immigrants as “illegal aliens,” the linkage of trafficking with other crime, the representation of trafficking as “evil,” the “scourge” metaphor, the “war on trafficking” metaphor, and the representation of the United States as the rescuer of the trafficked. The multitude of metaphors utilized in the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric are interrelated and mutually reinforcing.

The trafficking metaphor sustains each of the other corresponding metaphors. The “victim” metaphor contributes to the portrayal of trafficking as “evil” and the perceived need for a “war on trafficking” and a corresponding rescuer for the trafficked. Crime metaphors bolster policies to protect “victims.” According to Doezema: “Victim protection programs are validated behind the belief that all trafficking cases are caused by organized criminal trafficking networks.”¹⁵⁹ Similarly, the rhetorically constructed linkage between human trafficking and other forms of crime works to contribute to the need for greater anti-trafficking efforts.

Crime metaphors also work to further the association between trafficking in persons and immigration crimes. This association sponsors policies in which the organizations that focus on enforcing immigration crimes and stopping transnational organized crime are the same organizations that are given the authority to recognize and legitimate the legal status of trafficked persons.¹⁶⁰ The crime, “evil,” and “scourge” metaphors help to emphasize the need for a “war on trafficking.”

War metaphors simultaneously sustained and reinforce the images of the innocent “victim” and the United States as the rescuer of that “victim.” Desyllas argues that the term “combat” works to circulate “a language of violence and war” that necessitates that the United States step in to “‘save’ the innocent, female, childlike victim from ‘the barbaric crime of trafficking.’”¹⁶¹ The directions between these metaphors are not unidirectional. Instead, these common human trafficking metaphors work together to contribute toward the manner in which human trafficking is conceptualized, theorized, and dealt with in legislation.

Many of the metaphors prevalent in human trafficking rhetoric are similar to those deployed by the Obama administration in the context of immigration. In the following chapter, the interrelationship between the metaphors utilized in the Obama administration's human trafficking and immigration rhetoric will be explored. The implications that these mutually reinforcing metaphors have for conceptions of national identity in the United States will be analyzed.

Notes

¹ See Rutvica Andrijasevic, “beautiful dead bodies: gender, migration and representation in anti-trafficking campaigns,” *Feminist Review* 86 (2007): 24-44; Elizabeth Bernstein, “The Sexual Politics of the ‘New Abolitionism,’” *Differences* 18, no. 3 (2007): 134; Jennifer Lynne Musto, “What’s in a Name? Conflations and Contradictions in Contemporary U.S. Discourses of Human Trafficking,” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 32 (2009): 281; Sarah L. Steele, “‘Combating the Scourge’: Constructing the Masculine ‘Other’ Through U.S. Government Anti-trafficking Campaigns” *Journal of Hate Studies* 9 (2011): 49; Yvonne C. Zimmerman, “From Bush to Obama: Rethinking Sex and Religion in the United States’ Initiative to Combat Human Trafficking,” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 26 (2010): 79-99.

² Aryn Martin, “Microchimerism in the Mother(land): Blurring the Borders of Body and Nation,” *Body & Society* 16, no. 3 (2010): 23-50; Musto, “Whats in a name,” 281.

³ Anthony DeStefano, *The War on Trafficking* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2007), xvi.

⁴ Musto, “What’s in a Name,” 281.

⁵ David A. Feingold, “The Burmese Traffic-jam Explored: Changing Dynamics and Ambiguous Reforms,” *Cultural Dynamics* 25 (2013): 216.

⁶ Julia O’Connell Davidson, “Will the Real Sex Slave please stand up?” *feminist review* 83 (2006): 9.

⁷ See United States Department of State, “Releases, Media and Public Affairs,” <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/>.

⁸ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 9th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2009); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2011); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 12th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2012); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013).

⁹ Musto, “What’s in a Name,” 282.

- ¹⁰ Musto, "What's in a Name," 281.
- ¹¹ Laura Agustín, "Sex and the Limits of Enlightenment: The Irrationality of Legal Regimes to Control Prostitution," *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 5, no. 4 (2008): 79.
- ¹² United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 8.
- ¹³ Jayashri Srikantiah, "Perfect Victims and Real Survivors: The Iconic Victim in Domestic Human Trafficking," *Boston University Law Review* 87, no. 157 (2007): 174-5; Moshoula Capous Desyllas, "A Critique of the Global Trafficking Discourse and U.S. Policy," *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 34, no. 4 (2007): 58.
- ¹⁴ Desyllas, "A Critique," 64.
- ¹⁵ Doezema "Loose Women or Lost Women?" 28.
- ¹⁶ Wendy Chapkis, "Trafficking, Migration, and the Law: Protecting Innocents, Punishing Immigrants," *Gender & Society* 17 (2003): 924.
- ¹⁷ Samuel Vincent Jones. "The Invisible Man: The Conscious Neglect of Men and Boys in the War on Human Trafficking" *Utah Law Review* 4 (2010): 1188.
- ¹⁸ Jo Doezema. "Loose Women or Lost Women? The Re-emergence of the Myth of White Slavery in Contemporary Discourses of Trafficking in Women" *Gender Issues* 18 (1999): 40.
- ¹⁹ Rutvica Andrijasevic, "Beautiful Dead Bodies: Gender, Migration and Representation in Anti-Trafficking Campaigns," *Feminist Review* 86 (2007): 26
- ²⁰ Caroline Joan Picart, "Rhetorically Reconfiguring Victimhood and Agency: The Violence Against Women Act's Civil Rights Clause," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6 (2003): 118.
- ²¹ Picart, "Rhetorically Reconfiguring Victimhood and Agency," 119.
- ²² Gretchen Soderlund. "Running from the Rescuers: New U.S. Crusades Against Sex Trafficking and the Rhetoric of Abolition" *NWSA Journal* 17 (2005): 82.
- ²³ Soderlund, "Running from the Rescuers," 82.
- ²⁴ United States Department of Homeland Security, "Human Trafficking: A Global Problem," www.ice.gov/images/human-trafficking/trafficking_lg.jpg.

²⁵ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 21; United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 27.

²⁶ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 9th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2009); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2011); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 12th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2012); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013).

²⁷ Desyllas, “A Critique,” 65.

²⁸ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 55.

²⁹ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 27.

³⁰ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 15.

³¹ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Fact Sheet: DHS Blue Campaign,” June 6, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/hst-blue-campaign.htm>.

³² United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “ICE gives voice to victims of human trafficking in the United States,” November 2, 2009, www.ice.gov/news/releases/0911/091102washingtondc.htm.

³³ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “ICE gives voice to victims of human trafficking in the United States,” November 2, 2009, www.ice.gov/news/releases/0911/091102washingtondc.htm.

³⁴ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Fact Sheet: DHS Blue Campaign,” June 6, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/hst-blue-campaign.htm>.

³⁵ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 11.

³⁶ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Death is not the only way to lose your life,” http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_Poster_Death_is_Not_the_Only_Way_to_Lose_Your_Life.jpg.

³⁷ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Forced Labor Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Clocked_Out.jpg.

³⁸ United States Department of State. Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition.*, 1-60.

³⁹ Luis CdeBaca, “‘Heroes’ in the Fight Against Trafficking,” June 16, 2009, <http://fpc.state.gov/125001.htm>.

⁴⁰ Luis CdeBaca and Melanne Verveer, “Secretary Clinton Convened Cabinet Secretaries for the President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons,” February 4, 2011, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/02/04/secretary-clinton-convened-cabinet-secretaries-president-s-interagency-task-force-mo>.

⁴¹ Luis CdeBaca, “United Against Trafficking in Persons,” August 6, 2009, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2009/index.htm>.

⁴² Luis CdeBaca, “Trafficking in Persons: A 3D Approach,” February 18, 2011, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2011/157573.htm>.

⁴³ Luis CdeBaca, “Trafficking in Persons: A 3D Approach,” February 18, 2011, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2011/157573.htm>.

⁴⁴ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Law Enforcement Training,” September 17, 2012, <http://www.dhs.gov/video/law-enforcement-training>.

⁴⁵ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Human Trafficking PSAs,” <http://www.ice.gov/human-trafficking/psa.htm>.

⁴⁶ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Human Trafficking PSAs.”

⁴⁷ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Fact Sheet: DHS Blue Campaign,” June 6, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/hst-blue-campaign.htm>.

⁴⁸ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Human Trafficking PSAs.”

⁴⁹ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Human Trafficking PSAs.”

⁵⁰ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Human Trafficking PSAs.”

⁵¹ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Human Trafficking PSAs.”

⁵² United States Department of Homeland Security, “Blue Campaign Resource Catalog,” <https://www.dhs.gov/resource-catalog>.

⁵³ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Blue Campaign Resource Catalog,” <https://www.dhs.gov/resource-catalog>.

⁵⁴ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Sex Trafficking Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Fairy_tale.jpg.

⁵⁵ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Sex Trafficking Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Fairy_tale.jpg.

⁵⁶ Ana Paula da Silva, Thaddeus Gregory Blanchette and Andressa Raylane Bento, “Cinderella Deceived: Analyzing a Brazilian Myth Regarding Trafficking in Persons,” *Vibrant* 10, no. 2 (2013): 400.

⁵⁷ Da Silva, Blanchette, and Bento, “Cinderella Deceived,” 400.

⁵⁸ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Sex Trafficking Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Fairy_tale.jpg.

⁵⁹ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Domestic Servitude Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Picket_Fence.jpg.

⁶⁰ United States Department Homeland Security, “Domestic Servitude Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Picket_Fence.jpg.

⁶¹ CdeBaca, “Trafficking in Persons.”

⁶² CdeBaca, “Trafficking in Persons.”

⁶³ Da Silva, Blanchette, and Bento, “Cinderella Deceived,” 408.

⁶⁴ Kamala Kempadoo, “Women of Color and the Global Sex Trade: Transnational Feminist Perspectives,” *Meridians* 1, no. 2 (2001): 43.

⁶⁵ Jones, “The Invisible Man,” 1184.

⁶⁶ Janie A. Chuang, “Rescuing Trafficking From Ideological Capture: Prostitution Reform and Anti-Trafficking Law and Policy,” *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 158 (2010): 1696.

⁶⁷ Rebecca Surtees, “Trafficked Men as Unwilling Victims,” *STAIR* 4, no. 1 (2008): 20-1.

⁶⁸ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Human Trafficking: A Global Problem,” www.ice.gov/images/human-trafficking/trafficking_lg.jpg; United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Blue Campaign Human Trafficking Poster,” http://www.ice.gov/images/news/factsheets/human-trafficking-blue-camp_11x17poster-june2013_eng.jpg.

⁶⁹ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Human Trafficking: A Global Problem.”; United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Blue Campaign Human Trafficking Poster.”

⁷⁰ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “HSI Tip Card: Trafficking vs. Smuggling,” http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/factsheets/pdf/ht_tipcard_blue-campaign-june_2013.pdf.

⁷¹ Luis CdeBaca, “Ambassador CdeBaca on 10th Annual Trafficking in Persons Report,” June 15, 2010, <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2010/06/20100615161539sblebahc0.1649243.html#axzz2t4Mp8WfW>.

⁷² Morton, “Remarks Prepared for Delivery by Director John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security *International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) General Assembly* Chicago, Illinois.”

⁷³ Kumar C. Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Combating Organized Crime.’”

⁷⁴ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims,” 205.

⁷⁵ Sharma, “Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric,” 89.

⁷⁶ Kibble, Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director of the Office of Investigations of ICE regarding a hearing on "Human Trafficking: Recent Trends" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism,” March 19, 2009.

⁷⁷ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Domestic Servitude Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Picket_Fence.jpg.

⁷⁸ Barack Obama, “Proclamation 9074 – National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, 2014,” December 31, 2013, *The American Presidency Project*, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=104553>.

⁷⁹ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Human Trafficking: A Global Problem.”; United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Blue Campaign Human Trafficking Poster.”

⁸⁰ Luis CdeBaca, “2010 Trafficking in Persons Report,” June 14, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2010/index.htm>.

⁸¹ CdeBaca, “‘Heroes’ in the Fight.”

⁸² Marilana Morales, “‘Heroes’ in the Fight Against Trafficking,” June 16, 2009, <http://fpc.state.gov/125001.htm>.

⁸³ CdeBaca, “Trafficking in Persons: A 3D Approach.”

⁸⁴ CdeBaca, “United Against Trafficking in Persons.”

⁸⁵ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Combating Organized Crime, Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources’ Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism.”

⁸⁶ Denis McDonough, “Annual Meeting of the President’s Interagency Task Force To Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons,” March 15, 2012, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2012/index.htm>.

⁸⁷ CdeBaca, “Technology as a Tool in the Fight Against Human Trafficking.”

⁸⁸ United States Department of State, “Human Smuggling and Trafficking,” <http://www.state.gov/m/ds/hstcenter/>.

⁸⁹ Kibble, “Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on ‘Combating Organized Crime, Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources’ Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism.”

⁹⁰ Kumar C. Kibble, Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director of the Office of Investigations of ICE Regarding a Hearing on "Human Trafficking: Recent Trends" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism,” March 19, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/>.

⁹¹ Sarah L. Steele. “‘Combating the Scourge’: Constructing the Masculine ‘Other’ Through U.S. Government Anti-trafficking Campaigns” *Journal of Hate Studies* 9 (2011): 49.

⁹² United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 10.

⁹³ Kibble, Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director of the Office of Investigations of ICE regarding a hearing on "Human Trafficking: Recent Trends" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism.”

⁹⁴ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 36.

⁹⁵ Steele, “Combating the Scourge,” 44.

⁹⁶ Steele, “Combating the Scourge,” 46.

⁹⁷ Yvonne C. Zimmerman. *Other Dreams of Freedom: Religion, Sex, and Human Trafficking* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2013): 50.

⁹⁸ Steele, “Combating the Scourge,” 52.

⁹⁹ Barack Obama, “Remarks by the President to the Clinton Global Initiative,” September 25, 2012, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2010/index.htm>.

¹⁰⁰ John Kerry, “Kerry, Others at Meeting on Combating Trafficking in Persons,” May 17, 2013, <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/05/20130517147618.html#axzz2t4Mp8WfW>.

¹⁰¹ Luis CdeBaca, “2012 Trafficking in Persons Report,” June 19, 2012, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2012/193365.htm>.

¹⁰² John Kerry, “Kerry Statement at Hearing on Human Trafficking,” July 17, 2012, <http://www.foreign.senate.gov/press/chair/release/kerry-statement-at-hearing-on-human-trafficking>.

¹⁰³ Luis CdeBaca, “Google+ Hangout: Human Trafficking – How Can We End Modern Slavery?” July 18, 2013, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2013/212619.htm>.

¹⁰⁴ Desyllas, “A Critique,” 68.

¹⁰⁵ Steele “Combating the Scourge” 46.

¹⁰⁶ Steele “Combating the Scourge” 51

¹⁰⁷ Steele “Combating the Scourge” 49.

¹⁰⁸ Steele “Combating the Scourge” 34.

¹⁰⁹ Obama, “Proclamation 9074.”

¹¹⁰ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010): ii.

¹¹¹ CdeBaca, “Trafficking in Persons: A 3D Approach.”

¹¹² Luis CdeBaca, “Secretary Clinton on Release of Trafficking in Persons Report,” June 16, 2009, <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2009/06/20090616152136eafas0.264599.html#axzz2t4Mp8WfW>.

¹¹³ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013): 20.

¹¹⁴ Steele ““Combating the Scourge”” 53.

¹¹⁵ Steele ““Combating the Scourge”” 51.

¹¹⁶ Steele ““Combating the Scourge”” 52.

¹¹⁷ Steele ““Combating the Scourge”” 53.

¹¹⁸ CdeBaca and Verveer, “Secretary Clinton.”

¹¹⁹ Soderlund, “Running from the Rescuers,” 74.

¹²⁰ Obama, “Proclamation 9074.”

¹²¹ Obama, “Proclamation 9074.”

¹²² Luis CdeBaca, “Conference for Potential Bidders,” November 5, 2009, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2009/131464.htm>.

¹²³ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010); United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2011).

¹²⁴ Luis CdeBaca, “The State Department 2013 Trafficking in Persons Report,” July 11, 2013, <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2013/211833.htm>.

¹²⁵ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 55.

¹²⁶ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 10.

¹²⁷ January Contreras, “Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2013,” June 29, 2013, <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cisomb-annual-report-2013.pdf>

¹²⁸ January Contreras, “Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2011,” June 29, 2011, <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cisomb-annual-report-2011.pdf>.

¹²⁹ Kibble, Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director of the Office of Investigations of ICE regarding a hearing on "Human Trafficking: Recent Trends" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism.”

¹³⁰ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 41.

¹³¹ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 55.

¹³² United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 2.

¹³³ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Forced Labor Awareness Poster,” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Clocked_Out.jpg.

¹³⁴ Department of Homeland Security, “Human Trafficking: A Global Problem,” www.ice.gov/images/human-trafficking/trafficking_lg.jpg.

¹³⁵ United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Fact Sheets,” <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/#hstu>.

¹³⁶ Kibble, Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director of the Office of Investigations of ICE regarding a hearing on "Human Trafficking: Recent Trends" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism.”

¹³⁷ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 10.

¹³⁸ CdeBaca and Verveer, “Secretary Clinton.”

¹³⁹ CdeBaca, “Technology as a Tool in the Fight Against Human Trafficking.”

¹⁴⁰ Kibble, Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director of the Office of Investigations of ICE regarding a hearing on "Human Trafficking: Recent Trends" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism.”

¹⁴¹ United States Department of Homeland Security, “Blue Campaign Resource Catalog.”

¹⁴² United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Fact Sheet: DHS Blue Campaign.”

¹⁴³ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 9th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2009), iii.

¹⁴⁴ CdeBaca, “Trafficking in Persons: A 3D Approach.”

¹⁴⁵ United States Department of Health and Human Services, “Office of Refugee Settlement,” August 16, 2012, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/resource/about-rescue-restore>.

¹⁴⁶ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 9th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2009), 6.

¹⁴⁷ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 9.

¹⁴⁸ CdeBaca, “Technology as a Tool.”

¹⁴⁹ Da Silva, Blanchette, and Bento, “Cinderella Deceived,” 408.

¹⁵⁰ Desyllas, “A Critique,” 71.

¹⁵¹ Martinez, “Taking Better Account,” 277.

¹⁵² Martinez, “Taking Better Account,” 277-8.

- ¹⁵³ Martinez, “Taking Better Account,” 279.
- ¹⁵⁴ Martinez, “Taking Better Account,” 292.
- ¹⁵⁵ Soderlund, “Running from the Rescuers,” 67.
- ¹⁵⁶ United States Department of State, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013), 31.
- ¹⁵⁷ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims,” 177.
- ¹⁵⁸ Srikantiah, “Perfect Victims,” 174-5.
- ¹⁵⁹ Doezema “Loose Women or Lost Women?” 68.
- ¹⁶⁰ Davidson, “will the real,” 10.
- ¹⁶¹ Desyllas, “A Critique,” 65.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Interrelationship Between Human Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric

Mutually Constituted Metaphors

The metaphors utilized by the Obama administration in human trafficking and immigration rhetoric are interrelated. Human trafficking and immigration metaphors are mutually constituted. They build upon one another, reinforcing and solidifying associations between different concepts.

Some of the same metaphors are circulated between human trafficking and immigration rhetoric. The undocumented immigrant is referred to as an “illegal alien” in both human trafficking and immigration rhetoric. “Illegal aliens” are contrasted to innocent trafficked persons, who are referred to as “victims” of trafficking akin to the objects of drug trafficking or trafficking in weapons. Female sex trafficking “victims” are implied to be the most prevalent type of trafficking “victim.” Immigrants are considered to be more likely to be trafficked. Immigrants are labeled “criminal aliens” and the borders are described as being vulnerable to threats from transnational organized crime and terrorism. Trafficking is rhetorically linked to this “border crime.” It is associated with organized crime, piracy, and terrorist travel.

Criminal activity on the border is described as a “plague” and immigrants are treated as disease carriers. The border between the United States and Mexico is seen to be the site of this “plague” of crime. Disease metaphors are used in reference to human trafficking as well. Trafficking in persons is described as a “scourge.”

Measures taken to enforce human trafficking and immigration law are discussed using war metaphors. Law enforcement officials along the border are described as being at the “front lines” of both wars. Anti-trafficking measures are referred to as “combating” and “fighting” trafficking. Much like declared conflicts between state actors, human trafficking and immigration are considered to be threats to public health and national security.

As the self-appointed leader of the “wars” on trafficking and immigration, the United States is given an exceptional status in this discourse. To economically productive immigrants with American values, the United States is portrayed as a “beacon of hope” and a land of opportunity. To those who are able to prove they are innocent “victims” instead of “criminal aliens,” the United States is to be a place of refuge. The United States is rhetorically positioned as the rescuer of the trafficked. U.S. anti-trafficking efforts are characterized as necessary to “combat” the “evil” of trafficking and restore the human dignity of the trafficking “victim.”

These metaphors work together to solidify the view that it is immigrants, specifically women and children, who are most at risk of trafficking. Trafficking “victims” are seen to be individuals who were taken advantage of during their pursuit of the American Dream. Like entrepreneurs and other hard-working immigrants, innocent trafficking “victims” are welcomed into the United States by the Obama administration’s rhetoric. In contrast, individuals who do not display American values or immigrate without documentation are rebuked, excluded, and/or detained and deported as part of the “wars” on human trafficking and immigration.

Human Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric and Anti-trafficking Policies

Human trafficking and immigration rhetoric impact the type of policies that are preferred to deal with trafficking. The metaphors used in human trafficking and immigration rhetoric reinforce an abolitionist “3P” approach. They also privilege restrictionist responses to immigration.

The depiction of the trafficking “victims” as primarily being composed of women and children who are trafficked for sex affirms a model for prevention and protection that focuses on sex trafficking at the expense of other forms of forced labor. “Victims” are treated as dehumanized and helpless individuals. Requirements that “victims” be certified and cooperate with law enforcement officials make it difficult for “victims” to exercise autonomy and escape their traffickers themselves because they cannot be recognized as trafficked persons and/or receive immigration relief without the help of law enforcement officials. Anti-trafficking policies generate a self-fulfilling prophecy wherein “victims” require the assistance of the United States in order to overcome their situation.

Women and children are given a disproportionate amount of attention in these prevention and protection efforts. Because they are not seen as likely trafficking “victims,” men are often overlooked as trafficked persons. Statistics on trafficking do not reflect the true amount of trafficked men. This creates a cycle in which men continue to be underrepresented in data on human trafficking and anti-trafficking efforts. Instead of being recognized as trafficked persons, men are stereotyped as traffickers and “criminal aliens.”

Men and other trafficked persons who are not recognized as trafficking “victims” are often seen as violators of immigration law or crimes associated with the border.

“Victims” are treated as invaluable evidence for these crimes and given incentives to cooperate with criminal investigations, the chance to be certified for a T visa. The association between immigration and trafficking legitimates arguments for stricter immigration controls and enforcement of existing immigration laws. Trafficking is seen as a “border crime” that must be addressed with increased efforts by law enforcement officials and stricter enforcement of immigration laws. This has been shown by the increase in detention and deportation during the Obama administration. The reverse side of the image of the United States as a “beacon of hope” has become the “deportation nation.”¹

The association between human trafficking and immigration also has the impact of generating confusion over the distinction between human trafficking and human smuggling. The association between human trafficking and the border and/or immigration more broadly, creates the misconception that transportation is a required indicator for trafficking to have taken place. This is inaccurate because the U.S. definition of human trafficking does not require travel, only forced labor.

Human Trafficking and Immigration Rhetoric and the Construction of National Identity

Together, human trafficking and immigration rhetoric contribute to conceptions of national identity. Human trafficking and immigration rhetoric shape how the nation defines itself and against whom it defines itself. Metaphor plays an important role in this formulation of national identity. As Donathan Brown explains: “At stake within such debates over the absorption and incorporation of migrating peoples is not only policy design and implementation, but grander impacts on worldview and perception toward

those we deem as ‘foreign.’”² Beyond the creation of policy, metaphors impact determinations of who belongs in the nation.

In human trafficking and immigration rhetoric, the United States is depicted as representing a particular set of values. Americans are linked together by their shared beliefs “even if there has been debate about exactly what these ways of thinking are.”³ According to Vanessa B. Beasley, American presidents have an incentive to promote a narrative of shared beliefs to make “the American *feel* united.”⁴ I argue that other government officials, such as the Secretary of State, members of the Department of State, DHS, and ICE officials in particular, similarly cultivate a narrative of shared national identity. The United States, and by extension Americans, are portrayed as valorizing hard work and ingenuity. The United States is considered a “beacon of hope” and a haven for those who love freedom and democracy. Immigrants that are considered able to be assimilated into the United States are portrayed as possessing these shared beliefs. In human trafficking rhetoric, trafficking “victims” are represented as well-intentioned individuals who sought a better life, only to be fooled into having their freedoms taken away from them. These individuals are construed as helpless individuals deserving a chance to be assimilated temporarily into American life through U.S. protection efforts in order to regain their freedom and be reintegrated into the legal labor force. Without U.S. protection efforts, trafficking “victims” are seen as continuing to lack dignity and autonomy.

National identity is not only defined by the positive articulation of shared American values and beliefs, but also by the people and practices against which America

stands. Part of the way that human trafficking and immigration rhetoric shapes how American identity is understood is by showing what is un-American.

Immigration has been involved in the construction of conceptions of American national identity since the United States became an independent nation. According to Umut Korkut, Gregg Bucken-Knapp, Aidan McGarry, Jonas Hinnfors, and Helen Drake:

The framing of immigration as a challenge to national identity has a long history in the United States. After all, the United States was the first country to have a successful anti-immigrant national political party (the American Party in the nineteenth century). It was also the first Western country to exclude a class of immigrants on the basis of race.⁵

Citizenship is used as a marker of belonging to the nation. It is after all, “the lack of citizenship status in a particular nation-state that allows one to be deported from it.”⁶ In law and scholarship, citizenship is understood as creating a dividing line between populations.⁷

Human trafficking and immigration rhetoric and policy reflect this view of citizenship as creating a dividing line between people. The metaphorical representation of undocumented immigrants as “illegal” and the depiction of both undocumented and documented immigrants as “aliens” contribute to the juxtaposition of the citizen with the non-citizen. This “alienization of the non-citizen is fundamental to the rhetorical maintenance of US identity.”⁸ The “illegal alien” serves as the “Other” “through which US identity is constituted.”⁹

In the Obama administration’s human trafficking rhetoric, citizens are encouraged to join in the “fight” to “combat” trafficking in persons. In speeches, reports, and posters, government officials emphasize the importance of awareness raising and collective efforts between law enforcement officials and members of the public from healthcare

providers to members of church congregations. The public service announcement videos and posters circulated by the DHS and ICE function as training materials for “combating trafficking.” PSAs are intended to influence the way that law enforcement officials and members of the general public identify the trafficked and traffickers and understand the concept of trafficking. Training oneself to identify trafficking “victims” and contribute to law enforcement efforts against trafficking is elevated to a social responsibility and civic duty in these PSAs.¹⁰ According to Siobahn Stiles, in trafficking PSAs the audience is confronted with “the ‘other’” in the form of “the trafficked individual whose ‘world’ is beyond the comprehension of the average person.”¹¹ Americans are invited to define themselves in opposition to traffickers and to the practice of trafficking in persons.

In human trafficking and immigration rhetoric, the threat that trafficking and “illegal” and/or “criminal aliens” pose to the nation is magnified through rhetorical linkages to border insecurity, organized criminal networks, and terrorism. The “war on trafficking” and the “war on immigration” are entangled within the “war on terror.” These wars are portrayed as threats to national security. They are also considered threats to American national identity by endangering the American way of life. This rhetoric exploits “domestic anxieties about border security” that have been exaggerated since the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States.¹² The “putative terrorist” now serves as a marker of opposition to the true American.¹³

The rhetorical construction of human trafficking and immigration as threats to national security and identity has implications for the way that non-citizens are treated. The depiction of the border as a site of trafficking and other types of crime “contributes to U.S. national identity by normalizing a particular form of boundary-making as

instrumental to contemporary statecraft.”¹⁴ The human trafficking and immigration rhetoric of the Obama administration privileges the expansion of crimmigration law. Increased exclusion, detention and deportation of non-citizens are legitimated in the name of national security and protection of American values. As long as rhetoric and policy “construct noncitizens...as groups that exist on the margins of society or outside of it, heightened sensitivity to the presence of those groups will trigger social insecurities which are then salved through political crackdowns on crime and migration.”¹⁵ While this may seem justifiable, it is important to remember that these crackdowns often result in the misclassification of U.S. citizens as non-citizens due to “relaxed procedural safeguards.”¹⁶ In addition to unfairly targeting citizens, stricter immigration controls can have the effect of putting immigration relief out of reach of trafficked individuals.

Conclusion

It is important to examine the dominant metaphors used in human trafficking and immigration rhetoric. Through rhetorical analysis, scholars can play a part in mitigating the salience of problematic metaphors. According to Gerald V. O’Brien:

Academicians and others with an interest in metaphor and rhetoric may play an extremely valuable role in the policy arena by calling attention to metaphoric themes that have the effect of supporting repressive public policies against marginalized groups, analyzing these themes, and countering the development of social myths at their root.¹⁷

Even if there is not a clear causal line between rhetorical criticism and the formulation of human trafficking and/or immigration policy, analyzing and contesting dominant metaphors is a worthwhile activity. At the very least, rhetorical scholars can challenge the circulation of metaphors that support a flawed understanding of human trafficking and foster anti-immigrant sentiments.

While this thesis contributed to a greater understanding of the connections between human trafficking and immigration rhetoric, more work needs to be done. Increased attention should be given to the way that dominant and ancillary metaphors in human trafficking and immigration rhetoric depend upon and reinforce one another. The majority of scholarship produced on human trafficking and immigration rhetoric has focused on either human trafficking or immigration rhetoric. If it has discussed the interrelationship between the two, it does so with attention to a particular metaphor. More scholarship should focus on the collective interaction between metaphors for human trafficking and immigration across time.

Notes

¹ Ayelet Shachar, "Just Membership: Between Ideals and Harsh Realities," *The Ethics Forum* 7, no. 2 (2012): 83.

² Donathan L. Brown. "Manufacturing Fear, Creating the Threat: The State of American Immigration Policy" *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies* 5 (2013): 58.

³ Vanessa B. Beasley, *You, the People* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 46.

⁴ Beasley, *You, the People*, 46.

⁵ Umut Korkut, Gregg Bucken-Knapp, Aidan McGarry, Jonas Hinnfors, and Helen Drake, *The Discourses and Politics of Migration in Europe* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), xii.

⁶ Dan Kanstroom, *Deportation Nation: Outsiders in American History* (Boston, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 21.

⁷ Rachel E. Rosenbloom, "The Citizenship Line: Rethinking Immigration Exceptionalism," *Boston College Law Review* 54 (2013): 1969.

⁸ J. David Cisneros, "(Re)Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Rhetoric, Hybridity, and Citizenship: *La Gran Marcha*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97 (2011): 26.

⁹ Cisneros, "(Re)Bordering," 27.

¹⁰ Siobahn Stiles, "'I Am Elena': Rhetorical Analysis as the First Step to a 'Best Practices' Formula for Sex Trafficking Public Service Announcements," *Visual Communication* 11 (2012): 187.

¹¹ Stiles, "'I Am Elena,'" 187.

¹² Peter Andreas, "Redrawing the Line: Borders and Security in the Twenty-first Century," *International Security* 28 (2003): 91.

¹³ Leti Volpp, "The Citizen and the Terrorist," *Immigration and Nationality Law Review* 23 (2002): 570.

¹⁴ Anne Demo, "Sovereignty Discourse and Contemporary Immigration Politics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91 (2006): 298.

¹⁵ Juliet P. Stumpf, “Two Profiles of Crimmigration Law: Criminal Deportation and Illegal Migration,” in *Globalisation and the Challenge to Criminology*, ed. Francis Pakes (New York: Routledge, 2013), 92.

¹⁶ Rachel E. Rosenbloom, “The Citizenship Line: Rethinking Immigration Exceptionalism,” *Boston College Law Review* 54 (2013): 1969.

¹⁷ Gerald V. O’Brien, “Indigestible Food, Conquering Hordes, and Waste Materials: Metaphors of Immigrants and the Early Immigration Restriction Debate in the United States,” *Metaphor and Symbol* 18 (2003): 45.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackleson, Jason. "Constructing Security on the U.S.-Mexico Border." *Political Geography* 24 (2005): 165–184.
- Ancheta, Angelo N. "Our Immigrant Heritage: A Struggle for Justice." *UCLA Asian Pac. Am. LJ* 2 (1994): 101-106.
- Andrijasevic, Rutvica. "Beautiful Dead Bodies: Gender, Migration and Representation in Anti-trafficking Campaigns." *Feminist Review* 86 (2007): 24-44.
- Agustín, Laura. "Sex and the Limits of Enlightenment: The Irrationality of Legal Regimes to Control Prostitution." *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 5 (2008): 73-86.
- Aradau, Claudia. "The Perverse Politics of Four-Letter Words: Risk and Pity in the Securitisation of Human Trafficking." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 33 (2004): 251-277.
- Ausserer, Caroline. "'Control in the Name of Protection': A Critical Analysis of the Discourse of International Human Trafficking as a Form of Forced Migration." *STAIR* 4 (2008): 96-114.
- Beasley, Vanessa B. "Presidential Rhetoric and Immigration: Balancing Tensions between Hope and Fear" in *Who Belongs in America?: Presidents, Rhetoric, and Immigration*, ed. Vanessa B. Beasley. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006.
- . *You, the People*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
- Bernstein, Elizabeth. "The Sexual Politics of the 'New Abolitionism.'" *Differences* 18, no. 3 (2007): 128-151.
- Bhatia, Aditi. "Religious Metaphor in the Discourse of Illusion: George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden." *World Englishes* 26 (2007): 507-524.
- Bigo, Didier. "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27 (2002): 63-92.
- Bush, George. "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. January 29, 1991.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=19253>.

- Bush, George W. "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. January 28, 2008.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=76301>.
- Camayd-Freixas, Erik. "Raids, Rights, and Reform: The Postville Case and the Immigration Crisis." *DePaul Journal for Social Justice* 2 (2008): 1-24.
- Campbell, David. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- CdeBaca, Luis. "2010 Trafficking in Persons Report." June 14, 2010.
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2010/index.htm>.
- . "2012 Trafficking in Persons Report." June 19, 2012.
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2012/193365.htm>.
- . "Ambassador CdeBaca on 10th Annual Trafficking in Persons Report." June 15, 2010.
<http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2010/06/20100615161539sblebahc0.1649243.html#axzz2t4Mp8WfW>.
- . "Conference for Potential Bidders," November 5, 2009,
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2009/131464.htm>.
- . "Google+ Hangout: Human Trafficking – How Can We End Modern Slavery?" July 18, 2013. <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2013/212619.htm>.
- . "'Heroes' in the Fight Against Trafficking." June 16, 2009.
<http://fpc.state.gov/125001.htm>.
- . "Secretary Clinton on Release of Trafficking in Persons Report." June 16, 2009.
<http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2009/06/20090616152136eaifa s0.264599.html#axzz2t4Mp8WfW>.
- . "The State Department 2013 Trafficking in Persons Report," July 11, 2013,
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2013/211833.htm>.
- . "Technology as a Tool in the Fight Against Human Trafficking." July 24, 2013.
www.state.gov/r/pa/pl/cwa/212411.htm
- . "Trafficking in Persons: A 3D Approach." February 18, 2011.
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2011/157573.htm>.
- . "United Against Trafficking in Persons." August 6, 2009.
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2009/index.htm>.

- CdeBaca, Luis and Melanne Verveer. "Secretary Clinton Convened Cabinet Secretaries for the President's Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons." February 4, 2011. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/02/04/secretary-clinton-convened-cabinet-secretaries-president-s-interagency-task-force-mo>.
- Chapkis, Wendy. "Trafficking, Migration, and the Law: Protecting Innocents, Punishing Immigrants." *Gender & Society* (2003): 923-937.
- Chávez, Karma R. "Embodied Translation: Dominant Discourse and Communication with Migrant Bodies-as-Text." *Howard Journal of Communications* 20 (2009): 20-24.
- Chavez, Leo Ralph. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.
- Chen, Ming H. "Alienated: A Reworking of the Racialization Thesis After September 11." *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy and the Law* 18 (2010): 411-437.
- Chuang, Janie A. "Rescuing Trafficking From Ideological Capture: Prostitution Reform and Anti-Trafficking Law and Policy." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 158 (2010): 1655-1728.
- Cianciarulo, Marisa Silenzi. "Modern-Day Slavery and Cultural Bias: Proposals for Reforming the U.S. Visa System for Victims of International Human Trafficking." *Nevada Law Journal* 7 (2007): 826-1012.
- Cisneros, J. David. "Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of "Immigrant as Pollutant" in Media Representations of Immigration." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11 (2008): 569-601.
- . "(Re)Bordering the Civic Imaginary: Rhetoric, Hybridity, and Citizenship in *La Gran Marcha*." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97 (2011): 26-49.
- Cisneros, Josue David. "The Son of a Black Man from Kenya and a White Woman from Kansas," in *American Identity in the Age of Obama*, ed. Amílcar Antonio Barreto, Richard L. O'Bryant. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Clinton, William J. "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. February 4, 1997. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=53358>.
- Contreras, January. "Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2010." June 30, 2010. <http://www.dhs.gov/topic/prior-annual-reports>

- . “Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2011.” June 29, 2011. <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cisomb-annual-report-2011.pdf>.
- . “Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman Annual Report 2013.” June 29, 2013. <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/cisomb-annual-report-2013.pdf>.
- Cunningham-Parameter, Keith. “Alien Language: Immigration Metaphors and the Jurisprudence of Otherness.” *Fordham Law Review* 79 (2011): 1545-1598.
- Davidson, Julia O’Connell. “Will the Real Sex Slave Please Stand Up?” *Feminist Review* 83 (2006): 4-22.
- Demo, Anne. “Sovereignty Discourse and Contemporary Immigration Politics.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91 (2006): 291-311.
- DeStefano, Anthony. *The War on Trafficking*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2007.
- Desyllas, Moshoula Capous. “A Critique of the Global Trafficking Discourse and U.S. Policy.” *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 34 (2007): 57-79.
- . “A Critique of the Global Trafficking Discourse and U.S. Policy” in *International Sex Trafficking of Women & Children: Understanding the Global Epidemic*, ed. Leonard Territo and George Kirkham. Flushing, NY: Looseleaf Law Publications, 2009.
- Dinkins, James A., John Wagner, and Shonnie Lyon, “Statement of James A. Dinkins Executive Associate Director Homeland Security Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and John Wanger Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner Office of Field Operations U.S. Customs and Border Protection and Shonnie Lyon Acting Director Office of Biometric Identity Management National Protection and Programs Directorate Regarding a hearing on ‘Visa Security and Overstays: How Secure is America?’ Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security,” May 21, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/130521dinkins.pdf>.
- Ditmore, Melissa. “The Use of Raids to Fight Trafficking in Persons,” Sex Workers Project. 2009, <http://www.nswp.org/sites/nswp.org/files/swp-2009-raids-and-trafficking-report.pdf>
- Doezema, Jo. “Loose Women or Lost Women? The Re-emergence of the Myth of White Slavery in Contemporary Discourses of Trafficking in Women.” *Gender Issues* 18 (1999): 23-50.

- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. "Immigration and National Identity: Constructing the Nation." *Review of International Studies* 22 (1996): 235-256.
- Ellis, Mark and Richard Wright. "The Balkanization Metaphor in the Analysis of U.S. Immigration." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88 (1998): 686-698.
- Edwards, Jason A. "Melding a New Immigration Narratives? President George W. Bush and the Immigration Debate." *Howard Journal of Communications* 23 (2012): 40-65.
- Espinoza, Jean Pierre and Jung Choi. "Overview of the U Visa: "Race between Approval and Removal." *Bender's Immigration Bulletin*, no. 15 (May 2010): 645-651.
- Feingold, David A. "The Burmese Traffic-jam Explored: Changing Dynamics and Ambiguous Reforms." *Cultural Dynamics* 25 (2013): 207-227.
- Fisher, Michael and David Murphy. "Written Testimony of CBP Border Patrol Chief Michael Fisher and Office of Field Operations Acting Assistant Commissioner David Murphy for a House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security Hearing Titled 'Border Security Oversight: Identifying and Responding to Current Threats.'" June 27, 2013, <http://www.dhs.gov/news/2013/06/27/written-testimony-cbp-house-oversight-and-government-reform-subcommittee-national>.
- Flores, Lisa A. "Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20 (2003): 362-387.
- Forman, Marcy M. "Statement of Marcy M. Forman Director, Office of Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Before The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security and International Law For a hearing regarding: "Immigration Raids: Postville and Beyond." July 24, 2008, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- . "Statement of Marcy M. Forman Director, Office of Investigations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'Priorities Enforcing Immigration Law' Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security." April 2, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- Gómez-Peña, Guillermo. *The New World Border: Prophecies, Poems, and Loqueras for the End of the Century*. San Francisco: City Lights, 1996.

Hayes, Jr., James T. "Statement of James T. Hayes, Jr. Director of Office of Detention and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'Medical Care and Treatment of Immigration Detainees and Deaths in DRO Custody' Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security." March 3, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

Horman, Thomas. "Written testimony of ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations Executive Associate Director Thomas Homan for a House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security hearing titled 'Border Security Oversight: Identifying and Responding to Current Threats'" June 27, 2013, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.

Howard, Neil and Mumtaz Lalani. "Editorial Introduction: The Politics of Human Trafficking." *STAIR* 4 (2008): 5-15.

Irwin, Mary Ann. "White Slavery as Metaphor," *Ex Post Facto: The History Journal* 5 (1996), n.p.

Ivie, Robert L. "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse: The Case of 1812." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 240-253.

Ivie, Robert L. and Oscar Giner, "More Good, Less Evil: Contesting the Mythos of National Insecurity in the 2008 Presidential Primaries." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 12 (2009): 279-301.

Jones, Samuel Vincent. "The Invisible Man: The Conscious Neglect of Men and Boys in the War on Human Trafficking." *Utah Law Review* 4 (2010): 1143-1188.

Kanstrom, Dan. *Deportation Nation: Outsiders in American History*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Kempadoo, Kamala. "Women of Color and the Global Sex Trade: Transnational Feminist Perspectives." *Meridians* 1 (2001): 28-51.

Kerry, John. "Kerry, Others at Meeting on Combating Trafficking in Persons." May 17, 2013. <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/05/20130517147618.htm?axzz2t4Mp8WfW>.

———. "Kerry Statement at Hearing on Human Trafficking." July 17, 2012. <http://www.foreign.senate.gov/press/chair/release/kerry-statement-at-hearing-on-human-trafficking>.

———. "Remarks at the World Refugee Day Event." June 20, 2013. <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2013/06/210935.htm>.

- Kibble, Kumar C. "Statement of Kumar C. Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding A Hearing on "Combating Organized Crime: Evaluating Current Authorities, Tools, and Resources" Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism." November 1, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- . "Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding a Hearing on "Does Administrative Amnesty Harm our Efforts to Gain and Maintain Operational Control of the Border" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security." October 4, 2011, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- . "Statement of Kumar Kibble Deputy Director of the Office of Investigations of ICE Regarding a Hearing on "Human Trafficking: Recent Trends" Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global Counterterrorism." March 19, 2009. <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/>.
- Lara, Dulcinea, Dana Greene and Cynthia Bejarno. "A Critical Analysis of Immigrant Advocacy Tropes: How Popular Discourse Weakens Solidarity and Prevents Broad, Sustainable Justice." *Social Justice* 36, no. 2 (2010): 21-37.
- Lakoff, George. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor" in *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Lakoff George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Leudar, Ivan, Victoria Marsland, and Jiri Nekvapil. "On Membership Categorization: 'Us', 'Them' and 'Doing Violence' in Political Discourse." *Discourse Society* 15 (2004): 243-266.
- Little, Richard. *The Balance of Power in International Relations: Metaphors, Myths and Models*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Logan, T.K, Robert Walker and Gretchen Hunt. "Understanding Human Trafficking in the United States." *Trauma Violence Abuse* 10.3 (2009): 3-30.
- Lonegan, Bryan. "American Diaspora: The Deportation of Lawful Residents from the United States and the Destruction of their Families." *NYU Review of Law & Social Change* 32 (2008): 55-81.

- Markel, Howard and Alexandra Minna Stern, "The Foreignness of Germs: The Persistent Association of Immigrants and Disease in American Society," *The Milbank Quarterly* 80 (2002): 757-788.
- Martin, Aryn. "Microchimerism in the Mother(land): Blurring the Borders of Body and Nation," *Body & Society* 16, no. 3 (2010): 23-50.
- Martinez, Samuel. "Taking Better Account: Contemporary Slavery, Gendered Narratives and the Feminization of Struggle." *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 2 (2011): 277-303.
- Mayorkas, Alejandro N. "Alejandro N. Mayorkas Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Remarks to: Immigration & American Competitiveness: The Challenge Ahead." September 28, 2011. <http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Resources%20for%20Congress/Testimonies%20and%20Speeches/Chamber%20Speech%20September%2028%202011.pdf>.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54 (1990): 274-289.
- McKinnon, Sara L. "Citizenship and the Performance of Credibility: Audiencing Gender-based Asylum Seekers in U.S. Immigration Courts." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (2009): 205-221
- Mead, Gary. "Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'H.R. 1932, The Keep Our Communities Safe Act' Before the U.S. House of Representatives Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement." May 24, 2011. <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/110524mead.pdf>.
- . "Statement of Gary Mead Executive Associate Director Enforcement and Removal Operations U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'Secure Communities Oversight' Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement." November 30, 2011. <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- Medhurst, Martin J. "Why Rhetoric Matters: George H.W. Bush in the White House" in *The Rhetorical Presidency of George H.W. Bush*. ed. Martin J. Medhurst. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006.
- McDonough, Denis. "Annual Meeting of the President's Interagency Task Force To Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons." March 15, 2012. <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2012/index.htm>.

- Mitchell, Karen S., Sonja Arsham Kuftinec, and Harry Brod, "Introduction: How Does Citizenship Mean?" *Text and Performance Quarterly* 29 (2009): 201-204.
- Morales, Marilana. "'Heroes' in the Fight Against Trafficking." June 16, 2009.
<http://fpc.state.gov/125001.htm>.
- Morton, John. "Remarks by Director John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security State of the Net Conference Washington, D.C." January 18, 2011.
<http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/011811morton.pdf>.
- . "Remarks Prepared for Assistant Secretary John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security." May 10, 2010.
<http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/100510morton.pdf>.
- . "Remarks Prepared for Delivery by Director John Morton U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security *International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) General Assembly* Chicago, Illinois." October 25, 2011.
<http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/111028morton.pdf>.
- . "Statement of John Morton Assistant Secretary U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'Visa Overstays: Can They be Eliminated?' Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security." March 25, 2010.
<http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/100325morton.pdf>.
- . "Statement of John Morton Director U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Regarding the Hearing 'Oversight Hearing on U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Priorities and the Rule of Law' Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement." October 12, 2011.
<http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/speeches/111012morton.pdf>.
- Musto, Jennifer Lynne. "What's in a Name?: Conflations and Contradictions in Contemporary U.S. Discourses of Human Trafficking." *Women's Studies International Forum* 32 (2009): 281-287.
- Nevins, Joseph. *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the Making of U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. NY: Routledge, 2002.
- Nixon, Richard. "Oath of Office and Second Inaugural Address." *The American Presidency Project*. January 20, 1973.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=4141>.

- Obama, Barack. "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress." *The American Presidency Project*, February 24, 2009,
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=85753>
- . "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. January 27, 2010.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=87433>
- . "Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. January 25, 2011.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=88928>
- . "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. January 24, 2012.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=99000>
- . "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. February 12, 2013.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=102826>
- . "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union." *The American Presidency Project*. January 28, 2014.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=104596>.
- . "Inaugural Address." *The American Presidency Project*. January 21, 2013.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=102827>.
- . "Proclamation 9074 - National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, 2014." *The American Presidency Project*. December 31, 2013.
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=104553>
- . "Remarks by the President on Comprehensive Immigration Reform." May 10, 2011. <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2011/05/10/text-of-obamas-speech-on-immigration/?mg=blogs-wsj&url=http%253A%252F%252Fblogs.wsj.com%252Fwashwire%252F2011%252F05%252F10%252Ftext-of-obamas-speech-on-immigration>.
- . "Remarks by the President to the Clinton Global Initiative." September 25, 2012.
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/rm/2010/index.htm>.
- O'Brien, Gerald V. "Indigestible Food, Conquering Hordes and Waste Materials: Metaphors of Immigrants and the Early Immigration Restriction Debate in the United States." *Metaphor and Symbol* 18 (2003): 33-47.
- Ono, Kent A. *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Immigration and California's Proposition 187*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.

- Picart, Caroline Joan. "Rhetorically Reconfiguring Victimhood and Agency: The Violence Against Women Act's Civil Rights Clause." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6 (2003): 97-125.
- President's Interagency Council on Women. "Executive Memorandum on Steps to Combat Violence Against Women and Trafficking in Women and Girls." March 11, 1998.
- Press Release Point. "HSI, Lifetime premiere 'Baby Sellers' human trafficking film at UN." Last updated August 15, 2013. <http://www.pressreleasepoint.com/hsi-lifetime-premiere-baby-sellers-human-trafficking-film-un>.
- Proclamation No. 8772, 77 Fed. Reg. 4. January 6, 2012.
- Peutz, Nathalie and Nicholas De Genova. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. United States: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Ragsdale, Daniel. "Written testimony of U.S. Department of Homeland Security for a Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs hearing titled 'Border Security: Examining Provisions in the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act (S. 744).'" May 7, 2013. <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- Reagan, Ronald. "Inaugural Address." *The American Presidency Project*. January 20, 1981. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=43130>.
- Rodriguez, Jose H. "Statement of Jose H. Rodriguez, MD, MBA, CHA Captain, U.S. Public Health Service Director Division of Immigration Health Services U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'Advances in Immigration Detainee Medical Care' Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security." March 3, 2009. <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- Rosenbloom, Rachel E. "The Citizenship Line: Rethinking Immigration Exceptionalism." *Boston College Law Review* 54 (2013): 1965-2024.
- Salter, Mark B. "We are All Exiles: Implications of the Border as State of Exception." Paper presented at the Standing Group on International Relations Conference, Turin, Italy, September 13, 2007.
- Sanghera, Jyoti. "Unpacking the Trafficking Discourse," in *Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New Perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Rights* ed. Kamala Kempadoo. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2005.
- Santa Ana, Otto. "Like an Animal I was Treated': Anti-Immigrant Metaphor in US Public Discourse." *Discourse & Society* 10, no. 2 (1999): 191-224.

- Saucedo, Leticia and Francis Mootz. "The 'Ethical' Surplus of the War on Illegal Immigration." *Iowa Journal on Gender, Race and Justice* (2012): 257-279.
- Saunders, Penelope. "Traffic Violations: Determining the Meaning of Violence in Sexual Trafficking Versus Sex Work." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20 (2005): 343-360.
- Saunders, Penelope and Gretchen Soderlund. "Threat or Opportunity: Sexuality, Gender and the Ebb and Flow of Trafficking as Discourse." *Canadian Woman Studies* 22 (2003): 16-24.
- Shachar, Ayelet. "Just Membership: Between Ideals and Harsh Realities." *The Ethics Forum* 7 (2012): 71-88.
- Sharma, Nandita. "Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric and the Making of a Global Apartheid." *NWSA Journal* 17 (2005): 88-111.
- Shimko, Keith L. "Metaphors and Foreign Policy Decision Making." *Political Psychology* 15 (1994): 655-671.
- Silva, Ana Paula da, Thaddeus Gregory Blanchette and Andressa Raylane Bento, "Cinderella Deceived: Analyzing a Brazilian Myth Regarding Trafficking in Persons." *Vibrant* 10 (2013): 377-419.
- Skonieczny, Amy. "Constructing NAFTA: Myth, Representation, and the Discursive Construction of U.S. Foreign Policy." *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (2001): 433-454.
- Soderlund, Gretchen. "Running from the Rescuers: New U.S. Crusades Against Sex Trafficking and the Rhetoric of Abolition." *NWSA Journal* 17 (2005): 64-87.
- Sreeharsha, Kavitha. "Victims' Rights Unraveling: The Impact of Local Immigration Enforcement Policies on the Violence Against Women Act." *Georgetown Journal of Gender and the Law* 11 (2010): 649-869.
- Srikantiah, Jayashri. "Perfect Victims and Real Survivors: The Iconic Victim in Domestic Human Trafficking." *Boston University Law Review* 87 (2007): 157-211.
- Steele, Sarah L. "'Combating the Scourge': Constructing the Masculine 'Other' Through U.S. Government Anti-trafficking Campaigns." *Journal of Hate Studies* 9 (2011): 33-64.
- Stiles, Siobahn. "'I Am Elena': Rhetorical Analysis as the First Step to a 'Best Practices' Formula for Sex Trafficking Public Service Announcements." *Visual Communication* 11 (2012): 185-206.

- Stumpf, Juliet P. "The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, and Sovereign Power." *American University Law Review* 56 (2006): 367-419.
- Allison S. Hartry, "Gendering Crimmigration: The Intersection of Gender, Immigration, and the Criminal Justice System," *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice* 27 (2012): 1-25.
- . "Two Profiles of Crimmigration Law: Criminal Deportation and Illegal Migration," in *Globalisation and the Challenge to Criminology*, ed. Francis Pakes. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Surtees, Rebecca. "Trafficked Men as Unwilling Victims." *STAIR* 4 (2008): 16-36.
- Talbot, Elizabeth and Mark Rodgers. "Leadership and International Community Collaborations to Impact Education and Human Trafficking Prevention." *Journal of Global Social Work Practice* 4 (2011).
- Torres, John P. "Statement of John P. Torres Deputy Assistant Secretary U.S. Immigrant and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'Securing the Borders and America's Points of Entry, What Remains to be Done' Before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Homeland Security." May 20, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "Laws and Regulations: Legal Authorities for Medical Examination of Aliens." September 20, 2013. <http://www.cdc.gov/immigrantrefugeehealth/laws-regulations.html>.
- United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. "The Beacon: The Official Blog of USCIS." <http://blog.uscis.gov/>.
- . "Questions and Answers: Victims of Human Trafficking, U Nonimmigrant Status," Last Updated November 22, 2010. <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.5af9bb95919f35e66f614176543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=1b15306f31534210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=ee1e3e4d77d73210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD>
- . "Questions and Answers: Victims of Human Trafficking, U Nonimmigrant Status" Last updated October 03, 2011. <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/victims-human-trafficking-other-crimes/victims-criminal-activity-u-nonimmigrant-status/victims-criminal-activity-u-nonimmigrant-status>.

———. “USCIS Announces Citizenship and Integration Grant Opportunities.” January 20, 2011. <http://www.uscis.gov.edgesuite-staging.net/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.5af9bb95919f35e66f614176543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=15b82dad650ad210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=a2dd6d26d17df110VgnVCM1000004718190aRCRD>.

———. “Special Naturalization Ceremony in Honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.” January 21, 2011. <http://www.uscis.gov/news/special-naturalization-ceremony-honor-dr-martin-luther-king-jr>.

United States Department of Health and Human Services. “Office of Refugee Settlement.” August 16, 2012. <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/resource/about-rescue-restore>.

United States Department of Homeland Security. “Blue Campaign Resource Catalog.” <https://www.dhs.gov/resource-catalog>.

———. “Border Security Overview.” www.dhs.gov/border-security-overview.

———. “Border Security Results.” <https://www.dhs.gov/border-security-results>.

———. “Combating Human Trafficking.” <http://www.dhs.gov/topic/human-trafficking>.

———. “Death is Not the Only Way to Lose Your Life.” http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_Poster_Death_is_Not_the_Only_Way_to_Lose_Your_Life.jpg.

———. “Domestic Servitude Awareness Poster.” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Picket_Fence.jpg.

———. “Forced Labor Awareness Poster.” https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Clocked_Out.jpg.

———. “Human Trafficking: A Global Problem.” www.ice.gov/images/human-trafficking/trafficking_lg.jpg.

———. “Law Enforcement Training.” September 17, 2012, <http://www.dhs.gov/video/law-enforcement-training>.

———. “Secretary Napolitano Announces Additional \$30 Million in Operation Stonegarden Funds to Secure the Southwest Border.” August 11, 2009. <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2009/08/11/30-million-operation-stonegarden-funds-secure-southwest-border>.

- . “Sex Trafficking Awareness Poster.”
https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/images/blue-campaign/BC_8.5x11_Poster_Fairy_tale.jpg.
- United States Department of State. “Human Smuggling and Trafficking.”
<http://www.state.gov/m/ds/hstcenter/>.
- . “Releases, Media and Public Affairs.” <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/>.
- United States Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. “Obama Administration Accomplishments in Combatting Trafficking in Persons as of February 2013.” Last updated April 9, 2013.
<http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/reports/2013/207199.htm>.
- . *Trafficking in Persons Report: 9th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2009).
- . *Trafficking in Persons Report: 10th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2010).
- . *Trafficking in Persons Report: 11th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2011).
- . *Trafficking in Persons Report: 12th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2012).
- . *Trafficking in Persons Report: 13th Edition* (Washington, D.C., June 2013).
- United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement. “Blue Campaign Human Trafficking Poster.” http://www.ice.gov/images/news/factsheets/human-trafficking-blue-camp_11x17poster-june2013_eng.jpg.
- . “Fact Sheet: DHS Blue Campaign.” June 6, 2013.
<http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/hst-blue-campaign.htm>.
- United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement. “Fact Sheets.”
<http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/#hstu>.
- . “Human Trafficking PSAs.” <http://www.ice.gov/human-trafficking/psa.htm>.
- . “HSI Tip Card: Trafficking vs. Smuggling.”
http://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/library/factsheets/pdf/ht_tipcard_blue-campaign-june_2013.pdf.
- . “ICE gives voice to victims of human trafficking in the United States.” Last updated November 2, 2009.
<http://www.ice.gov/news/releases/0911/091102washingtondc.htm>.

- Venturella, David. "Statement of David Venturella Executive Director of Secure Communities U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Department of Homeland Security Regarding a Hearing on 'Priorities Enforcing Immigration Law' Before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security." April 2, 2009, <http://www.ice.gov/news/library/speeches/>.
- Weele, Cor van der and Marianne van den Boomen. "How to Do Things with Metaphor?: Introduction to the Issue." *Configurations* 16, no.1 (2008): 1-10.
- Weitzer, Ronald. "The Social Construction of Sex Trafficking: Ideology and Institutionalization of a Moral Crusade." *Politics Society* 35 (2007): 447-475.
- White House. "The Obama Administration's Record on Human Trafficking Issues." Last modified April 09, 2013. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/04/09/obama-administration-s-record-human-trafficking-issues>.
- Williams, Kimberly. "Crime, Corruption and Chaos: Sex Trafficking and the 'Failure' of US Russia Policy." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13, no. 1 (2011): 1-24.
- Winston, Susanna E. and Curt G. Beckwith. "The Impact of Removing the Immigration Ban on HIV-Infected Persons." *AIDS Patient Care and STDS* 25, no. 12 (2011): 709-711
- Wolper, Amy. "Unconstitutional and Unnecessary: A Cost/Benefit Analysis of 'Crimes Involving Moral Turpitude' in the Immigration and Nationality Act." *Cardozo Law Review* 31 (2010): 1907-2521.
- Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children. "The U.S. Response to Human Trafficking: An Unbalanced Approach." May 2007. <http://www.humantrafficking.org/uploads/publications/ustraff.pdf>.
- Wooditch, Alese C, M.A. DuPont-Morales and Don Hummer. "Traffick jam: a policy review of the United States' Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000." *Trends Organ Crim* 12 (2009): 235-250.
- Woods, Tryon P. "Surrogate Selves: Notes on Anti-Trafficking and Anti-Blackness." *Social Identities* 19 (2013): 120-134.
- Zatz, Marjorie S. and Hilary Smith, "Immigration, Crime, and Victimization: Rhetoric and Reality." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 8 (2012): 141-159.
- Zimmerman, Yvonne C. "From Bush to Obama: Rethinking Sex and Religion in the United States' Initiative to Combat Human Trafficking." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 26, no. 1 (2010): 79-99.

———. *Other Dreams of Freedom: Religion, Sex, and Human Trafficking*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2013.