



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Chancellor's Honors Program Projects

Supervised Undergraduate Student Research
and Creative Work

5-2019

Metaphor Theory and Its Relation to Social Policy

Victoria Anita Voorhees
vvoorhe2@vols.utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj



Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#), [Political Theory Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), [Rhetoric Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Voorhees, Victoria Anita, "Metaphor Theory and Its Relation to Social Policy" (2019). *Chancellor's Honors Program Projects*.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj/2296

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Supervised Undergraduate Student Research and Creative Work at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chancellor's Honors Program Projects by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

Metaphor Theory and its Relation to Social Policy

Anita Voorhees

April 26, 2019

Table of Contents

Introduction	3-8
Gun Control	9-16
Immigration	17-28
Human Trafficking	29-38
Conclusion	39-46

Introduction

“It’s raining cats and dogs,” “Time is a thief,” and “You light up my life” are all common phrases most Americans would agree make sense and accurately serve to describe concepts in abstract terms. These are examples of metaphors, figurative comparisons between two separate concepts to relate them together that structure how we view our lives and the world we live in. Aristotle defines metaphor as “the transference of a name from the object to which it has a natural application” (Foss). Aristotle held the belief that metaphors exist simply for their decorative purposes. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* defines a metaphor as “a figure of speech that implies comparison between two unlike entities, as distinguished from simile, an explicit comparison signaled by the words ‘like’ or ‘as’” (Kovecses). While Aristotle and the encyclopedia view metaphors as grammatical structures and decorative entities, Lakoff and Johnson take a different stance, arguing that metaphors have functional purposes and performative connotations for society.

Much of language is metaphorical in nature, and the rhetoric we employ affects our everyday lives. As Lakoff states, “Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor” (Lakoff 3). People often live by the metaphors they make, which is observed by expressions like “time is money” (Lakoff 7) and “argument is war” (Lakoff 4). These metaphors are pervasive and structure the basis of our lives.

The metaphor “argument is war,” for example, forms the basis of an argument. Since war implies violence and discord, it follows that arguments should be like wars. Society structures arguments as wars by the metaphorical phrases we use, such as “your claims are indefensible” and “he attacked every weak point in my argument” (Lakoff 4). This metaphor of war is pivotal because it structures not just the language around argument but the performance of an argument altogether. The “argument is war” metaphor informs people that they need to be ready to “defend their position” and “attack their opponent.” The pervasiveness of this metaphor is seen in the fact that it is very difficult to talk about the metaphor of argument without using war metaphors. As Lakoff elaborates, if a different metaphor were used for argument such as a dance, people would have no idea an argument would be taking place. The idea of a graceful and artful argument would look incredibly foreign to people conditioned to see an argument as war.

Another critical metaphor that affects our lives is “Time is money.” People have been conditioned to metaphorically associate time with money, and this affects the way people structure their lives. Time is seen as an expendable resource that can be handled transactionally (Lakoff 8). Time is conceptualized metaphorically in phrases like “time is money,” “time is a limited resource,” and “time is a valuable commodity” (Lakoff 8). Because of this metaphor, people treat time like money and value it as a resource they can lose or gain. This has clearly structured American society, as people strive to “spend their time wisely,” “save their time,” “manage their time,” “budget their time,” and “guard their time.” These are all clear metaphorical examples of the ways we value time in a transactional sense. A quick search on Amazon reveals this same phenomenon, as it brings up books such as *Smart Ways to Spend Your Time* and *Own Your Time*. American culture structures life around this metaphorical framework.

When evaluating metaphors, an important concept to note is that metaphors fundamentally highlight some aspects of an idea and hide others. As Lakoff states, “The very systematicity that allows us to comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms of another (e.g., comprehending an aspect of arguing in terms of battle) will necessarily hide other aspects of the concept” (Lakoff 10).

Critical metaphor analysis demonstrates that the words people use have the power to influence an audience (Charteris-Black 174). This phenomenon is often observed within social policy, as politicians typically strive to sway voters toward their policies and away from their opponents’. They often use rhetoric as an effective way of achieving their aims. Metaphors have an important function in not only helping us understand unknown concepts but also framing our perceptions regarding certain issues. The first stage of critical metaphor analysis is to identify and develop questions about metaphors commonly used within governmental policies. The goal of this investigation is to identify metaphors that serve manipulative purposes within society, such as characterizing oppressed peoples as evil or misrepresenting bad policies as favorable to all. The second stage of critical metaphor analysis is metaphor identification, which involves determining which words and phrases should count as metaphors. The third stage is metaphor interpretation, in which they are organized into categories and judged as holding positive or negative connotation. The last stage is metaphor connotation, the phase where the analyzer looks back at the social and political context of the words to determine what purposes and aims the speaker has in utilizing that metaphor (Charteris-Black 175).

One example of this usage of critical metaphor analysis within the context of politics and governmental policies is examined by Charteris-Black in his analysis of Obama’s first inaugural address in January of 2009. The first metaphor Obama makes is “Yet, every so often the oath is

taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms.” Charteris-Black classifies this as a novel metaphor because it serves not to describe the weather but to compare the current economic position of the country to a storm. This comparison completes Obama’s objective of inciting anxieties and concern within the American populace. Another metaphor Obama uses is the entrenched metaphor “America has carried on” (Charteris-Black 183). It is an entrenched metaphor because it is such a commonly used phrase that it becomes invisible as a metaphor to most the audience. Many people who are highly patriotic in nature may not be able to separate the nation of America with the individuals living there. They may take “America has carried on” to mean “American individuals have persevered. In that case, it functions as a less effective, invisible metaphor to many people. Charteris-Black suggests, however, that America in this phrase can be interpreted similarly to an object being pushed against the wind. Despite the winds and storm, “America” is still pressing forward and moving. This is an example of a weather metaphor, as America is being compared to an object that stay strong in the face of winds and storm, which suggests calamitous circumstances. Charteris-Black outlines all the other types of metaphors used by Obama in this speech. Obama uses other weather metaphors to frame the turbulent situation of the nation with phrases like “gathering clouds (2.3),” “raging storms (2.3),” and “endure what storms may come (27.2).” These metaphors have the important effect of linking two concepts together and reaching the intended audience (Charteris-Black 191). With these weather metaphors, Obama was attempting to push people toward a notion of unity in which the nation can unite and fight together in the turbulent economic problems the nation was facing.

Based on these concepts by Lakoff, Johnson, and Charteris-Black, I will be analyzing metaphors within contemporary issues. I will evaluate how metaphors used when discussing

social policy issues frame and change our interpretations of several social matters. The words we use when discussing various issues frame the policies government makes. These policies, in turn, affect the ways people are treated within a country.

The social issues and metaphors I will be analyzing are gun control, human trafficking, immigration. Within these three major social issues, I will evaluate the metaphors commonly used by politicians, journalists, and policy makers that fundamentally shape society's view of them and response toward them. Most of the metaphors used when discussing these issues have developed within the last few years. These metaphors inherently affect people's conceptions of social policies and in turn affect individual lives. The issues are incredibly exigent because gun violence is becoming more prevalent, human trafficking is on the rise, and immigration is becoming more divisive every day. Real progress cannot be made without first understanding how to frame these human rights issues. Although this may seem antithetical, these issues are also all linked together. Human trafficking and immigration are interconnected issues because many immigrants are victims of human trafficking. Additionally, gun control and immigration find themselves at odds because of the racist rhetoric used gun rights advocates. Because these issues are interconnected, metaphorical framing surrounding all these issues of policy must be understood for reframing to begin.

In chapter one, I discuss the metaphors used within the issue of gun control. To do so, I examine the prevailing rhetoric used on different sides of the debate to frame and conceptualize. Liberals and Conservatives both use different terms to frame the discourse surrounding guns, with Conservatives using "gun rights" and Liberals using terms such as "gun control," "gun violence prevention," and an "epidemic of gun violence." Interestingly, the metaphors used by both Liberals and Conservatives are aimed to create fear within their hearers. Liberals invoke a

metaphor of illness when they capitalize upon gun violence as an epidemic, but Conservatives also evoke fear when they describe the utility of guns for protection from invaders and people who are intending harm.

In chapter two, I evaluate the metaphors used regarding immigration. Specifically, I analyze the names immigrants are called, the ways in which they are referenced, and how the frames have significant impacts on their realities. Immigrants are often called several different names, and these names have the power to affect their whole individual selves. Immigrants are called migrants, refugees, or even illegal aliens. The subject of immigration is flooded with metaphorical language that ultimately defines an immigrant's experience. Trump uses additional metaphors of container, invasion, and animal in reference to immigrants coming to the United States. Through this analysis of metaphor regarding immigration, my aim is to show how frames used how the power to define people's realities in both positive and negative ways.

In chapter three, I evaluate the frames that exist within the discourse surrounding human trafficking. Two different metaphors for framing exist, victim and prostitute. I further analyze the nuances in metaphorically labeling the identities of those involved in human trafficking. My aim in chapter three is to investigate how the shift toward naming prostitutes as victims is beginning to change people's lived realities.

Gun Control

Liberals and Conservatives alike are using varying metaphors and words to convey their stance on gun control. Democrats and Republicans speak in entirely different languages, which helps at least partly explain why America is such a divided nation. In a *Business Insider* article, Abadi notes that Fox News and MSNBC speak of the exact same concepts with totally different words. As Dietram Scheufele notes, “Every tribe has its own words, basically, and it becomes more and more difficult to have conversations across tribal fault lines if we can’t even agree on the terminology” (Abadi). This has come to be known as polarized language, as politicians are using entirely different words to talk about the same subject matter. Surprising to most, polarized language is a pretty new concept. To prove this, a study was conducted from 1873 to 2016 that asked people to determine whether a speech was given by a Liberal or a Republican. For speeches given before the 1990’s, the participants were only able to guess the right party a little over more than half the time. However, this number increased and by 2010, participants’ guesses were correct 73% of the time (Abadi). Frank Luntz, a Republican pollster, has been a major figure in political messaging for thirty years now. He encouraged rhetorical framing, pressing that “it might not matter what we say so much as how we say it” (Luntz). Luntz created an entire book about words and phrases to use in his playbook entitled “The New American Lexicon.” He writes of more favorable words for Conservatives to use, such as “Washington” instead of “government,” “international trade” instead of “foreign trade,” and “exploring energy” instead of “drilling for oil.” Through this change in wording, Luntz could change how people view words entirely. Lakoff, cognitive linguist at the University of California at Berkeley, is now teaching Liberals how they can change the narrative framing to their benefit.

Linked to the “argument is war” metaphor by Lakoff, it is interesting to analyze gun metaphors used in everyday speech. This type of language is seen all the time, as we say “I’m shooting to have this done by Tuesday,” “I’m taking a shot,” “I’m sweating bullets,” and of course, many others. Different phrases are continually used that implicate gun imagery. This begs the question of whether the metaphorical language surrounding guns is one of the reasons gun violence is so prevalent. As director of public affairs for the NRA Andrew Arulanandam states, “It’s almost second nature. They’re such mainstream phrases, you almost have to check yourself and double-check yourself” (Baker). This entrenchment of gun metaphors in the English language reveals how relevant guns are in America’s minds.

Gun control is a major issue in society that has created much debate and contention. It is obviously an important conversation to have, considering that in 2015 alone, the Gun Violence Archive detailed 320 mass shootings happening across the country; twenty-three of those shootings took place on college campuses (NASPA). This rise in violence has led to a grave discussion over what actions to take next to best protect all those who reside in America. Two of America’s most deadly shootings occurred during the last three years. The mostly deadly shooting occurred on October 1, 2017 when Stephen Paddock killed fifty-eight people and injured at least five hundred at a concert in Las Vegas. The second most deadly shooting in America’s history occurred June 12, 2016 when Omar Suddiqui Mateen shot up a gay night club in Orlando, killing at least forty-nine people and injuring more than fifty (CNN). These senseless atrocities leave the nation wondering what to do during such violence and cruelty.

The gun rights discussion has additionally reached the campus sphere, and universities across the country are wondering what stance they should take in the campus carry debate. Specifically, the campus shooting at Virginia Tech served as the catalyst for this nation-wide

discussion. Thirty-two people were killed at Virginia Tech in a 2007 shooting (NASPA). This tragedy, along with other recent campus shootings, leaves many questioning what to do in the face of such violence.

In the face of the gun rights issue, several different metaphors exist that implicate different stances and ways of thinking. Lucy Ferriss writes in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* the power words have in shaping and spinning discussions. Ferriss analyzes the concept of gun control, suggesting that this term fails itself because Americans do not like to be controlled. Since Americans enjoy their freedoms, other words and metaphors should be utilized to convey gun control (Ferriss). He writes on how words have immense power to frame ideas and policies. His article is very much in line with the ways Liberals and Democrats frame arguments regarding gun rights to get their stances across to the public.

Since 2013, Liberals have strayed away from the term “gun control” because it sounds unfavorable to the American people (Shapiro). When Americans hear any phrase with “control” at the end, they immediately have disdain because of the implications “control” has on limiting freedom. Instead of using “gun control,” Liberals have started alternatively using “gun violence prevention.” Mark Glaze, director of Mayors Against Illegal Guns, describes the effectiveness of this new terminology as he cites recent polling showing “gun violence prevention tests a good 17, 20 points higher than the term gun control” (Shapiro). Even though “gun control” and “gun violence prevention” are the same concept, people respond better to “gun violence prevention” because of the values it holds. “Gun control” connotes a limitation of freedom, but “gun violence prevention” suggests greater freedoms and safety. Even though they are the same idea, Liberals are playing on people’s fear surrounding gun violence to limit freedoms.

Conservatives, on the other hand, use completely different words than Liberals. They use the phrase “gun rights” and appeal to the natural right mankind has to arming oneself according to the Second Amendment. Conservatives appeal to freedom, which is a deeply entrenched American value. The words Conservatives and Liberals are using are not just words themselves; they imply deeper meanings and evoke specific responses. The differing terms between Conservatives and Liberals hold the values of safety and freedom, two concepts that are both alike and very different. As Lakoff writes, “English does not just fit the world. English fits the way you understand the world via your frames. And in politics they are morally based frames” (Shapiro).

Several metaphors exist to frame this gun violence present in America today. One metaphor consistently used by Liberals is “the epidemic of gun violence” (David, Stickles, Lakoff 225). This metaphor suggests that gun violence is a sickness that has been imposed upon humanity. It also suggests that it is a pervasive problem that must be dealt with in an organized and systematic way. The brain is immediately linked to the schema of large-scale sickness and death, leading the hearers of the metaphor to conclude that society is sick and in need of healing. Proponents of gun control often use these type metaphors to implicate the negative effects of gun use and the need to heal society (David, Stickles, Lakoff 241). In an article entitled “America’s Deadliest Disease,” Lloyd Sederer, Opinion Contributor for *U.S. News & World Report*, writes of the increasing gun violence as a type of epidemic that is “infecting” the nation. He uses the metaphor of disease as he writes, “Like a deadly infectious disease, the pathogen does not distinguish who will die; when that pathogen reaches epidemic proportions, everyone is exposed and no one is safe” (Sederer). He goes as far as to compare the “gun epidemic” with epidemics like Ebola and HIV/Aids. He states that these diseases were controlled before a vaccine was

found. He uses this comparison to claim that guns must likewise be controlled to stop the increasing numbers of death, as he writes, “The same approach of containing the means by which morbidity and mortality are delivered, controlling the spread of the pathogen, can and should be applied to mass murder. That means reducing access to the types of guns and ammunition meant only to maim and kill-in brutal and increasingly numbing numbers” (Sederer). By using this metaphor of illness, he can effectively argue his stance on gun control without sounding overbearing. He argues not that guns are evil but rather that the outcomes of their use can be devastating and deadly. Calling gun violence a “pathogen” leads the reader to feel fear and desire gun control to heal the nation.

In line with this metaphor of illness, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is tracking Firearm Mortality by state in the United States. When reading their mission statement, the tracking of Firearm Mortality seems a bit outside of their wheelhouse. CDC’s mission is to “work 24/7 to protect America from health, safety and security threats, both foreign and in the U.S. Whether diseases start at home or abroad, are chronic or acute, curable or preventable, human error or deliberate attack, CDC fights disease and supports communities and citizens to do the same.” Through tracking firearm mortality, the CDC is confirming that gun control is a health threat. This links back to the pervasiveness of the disease metaphor within society.

Liberals use fear tactics with their metaphor of epidemic, but Conservatives also use fear tactics very effectively. Conservatives have clung to the Second Amendment tightly, which they have interpreted as giving them the right to bear arms. The Second Amendment reads, “A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” Scholars have frequently debated these words, as it is

unclear whether the right to bear arms is just for individuals or for state militias as well. In 2008, the *Heller* United States Supreme Court decision held that the Second Amendment means it is the individual's right to bear arms (Elving). Conservatives cite this amendment now in favor of gun rights and in opposition to gun control. The National Rifle Association, or NRA, plays on this "inalienable right" and on people's fear in their campaign entitled "Freedom's Safest Place." Within this campaign is a sub-campaign entitled "The NRA Speaks for Me." These campaign videos serve the purpose of promoting the usage of guns and open carry laws. One of the campaign videos is called "Never Again" and covers the trauma faced by a twenty-year-old coed who was brutally victimized because she was defenseless without a gun. This video stars Kim Corban, who tells the story of the violence she faced while living in off-campus housing. She was vulnerable and without any way to defend herself when a man came into her apartment in the middle of the night and brutally raped her. Although she was told her place was safe, she was the first one to be raped there. She testifies of her near-death experience, emphasizing that she had no way of protecting herself. The attack lasted over two hours, and she truly thought she would die. Corban states that she is now a mother of two and values firearms because they enable her to protect her family. She declares she will never be without a method of self-defense again. She attributes her ability to protect herself to the NRA, identifying herself as the NRA, "freedom's safest place." The NRA in this campaign sets up the metaphorical framework of safety and protection that they can provide. By naming the campaign "The NRA Speaks for Me," they are claiming that the big organization has a voice and can speak for individuals in society. This campaign also encourages personal autonomy and the need to protect oneself.

Gun control and the NRA are metaphors for a much deeper concept within society, freedom. The right to own a gun and protect oneself has been framed as an inalienable right.

For many people in society, losing the right to own a gun would be like losing part of one's humanity. In 2014 at an NRA conference Executive Vice President Wayne LaPierre stated, "Gun rights have become a metaphor for something larger: a feeling, this sense of something that's slipping away, a yearning for individual rights" (Magaril). The right to own a gun is a deeper metaphor for people's desire to protect themselves without interference from the government. The NRA effectively encourages this metaphor using its fear tactics and appeals to self-defense in its campaigns.

Not surprisingly, the NRA is also working in tangible ways to stop gun violence research by the CDC. The NRA has strived for decades to push for legislation that will inhibit people from researching and analyzing the numbers regarding gun violence. In 1996, the NRA helped instigate Congress to pass a bill called the Dickey Amendment. The NRA accused the CDC of being biased against guns and reached out to Congress. Headed by Representative Jay Dickey of Arkansas, Congress added a provision to their 1996 spending bill that stated "none of the funds made available in this title may be used, in whole or in part, to advocate or promote gun control" (Rostron, JD). Along with that proviso, Congress also required that \$2.6 million of the CDC's budget, the amount spent on firearm injury the previous year, be utilized only for research on traumatic brain injuries. The Dickey Amendment was then put into place every year, and the CDC was not given funding for firearm mortality research year after year. The clause never said the CDC couldn't do any research at all, but since the amendment was so vague, most workers at the CDC opted to stay away from the research on gun violence to keep their jobs. After increasing numbers of deaths due to firearms, Congress passed a \$1.3 trillion spending bill that included money for gun violence research in March of 2018 (Shabad). This was voted on and passed by Congress during a time of heightened awareness on gun violence because of the

shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School that killed seventeen people. The NRA now claims that they did not hinder research on gun violence, stating that several studies have taken place over the years anyways. Jay Dickey, the leader of the Dickey Amendment, claims that “It wasn’t necessary for all research to stop. It just couldn’t be the collection of data so that they can advocate for gun control. That’s all we were talking about. But for some reason it stopped altogether.” Dr. Mark Roesenberg, the former director of the CDC refutes this statement though, as he claims that the legislation didn’t outrightly ban research on gun violence, but it did cut it by ninety percent, leaving little availability for doing research (Raphelson).

Through this conflict between the CDC and the NRA, it is clear to see that the values of the two organizations clash immensely. The CDC holds the metaphor of gun violence as disease, while the NRA profligates gun rights as the right to freedom. The Dickey Amendment came into existence because of how the two metaphor systems clashed against each other, and ultimately the NRA’s metaphor of “GUNS ARE FREEDOM” won over the CDC’s metaphor of “GUNS ARE DISEASE.” The Dickey Amendment was finally removed in March 2018 because of the increasing numbers of fatalities in relation to gun violence. The disease metaphor became stronger when facing actual death. These two different value systems between the CDC and the NRA illustrate how metaphorical structures meet and push against each other, in both positive and negative ways.

Immigration

Immigration is another such policy through which we can understand metaphor. Immigration has become a major topic of conversation everywhere, as more people are seeking asylum to the United States of America. The US Department of Homeland Security announced that February of 2019 was the busiest month for apprehensions at the U.S. Border since April 2008. More than 76,100 people were apprehended total. Those crossing the border are mainly families and lone children from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador. These people are seeking asylum to the United States because of their country's climate, corruption, organized crime, and violence. Interestingly, despite this large number of people seeking asylum, immigration rates were higher in the 1990s and early 2000s. More than 1.6 million people were apprehended in 2000. However, if current trends continue, the U.S. could be seeing immigrants at the border match the number seen in the early 2000s. Even Kevin McAleenan, commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, has said, "The system is well beyond capacity, and remains at breaking point" (Frazin).

As of 2016, about 10.7 to 11.3 million illegal immigrants lived in the United States (Forum). About 43.3 million foreign-born people live in the United States. Of this number, 20.7 million people are naturalized citizens, and 22.6 million people are noncitizens. Immigration has become increasingly more prevalent in news occurrences in 2019. Seeking asylum is a major reason why immigrants are attempting to cross the border. When immigrants have credible fear claims, they can go before an Immigration Judge and receive asylum. In 2018, about 100,000 "credible fear" claims were processed by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. About 42,000 asylum cases were also judged simultaneously, a record high number since 2001.

Although the population of immigrants in the United States is fairly large and has nearly quadrupled since 1965, the Trump administration is actively opposing immigration to the United States (Linsley). On April 9 of 2019, Trump declared in a briefing, “Our country is full. Our area is full. The sector is full...Can’t take you anymore. I’m sorry, turn around, that’s the way it is” (Smith). Many Central Americans now being detained by the Trump administration are actually legally seeking asylum to the U.S. The Trump administration plans to continue to take harsh actions against immigration, such as closing the Mexican border and trying to end birthright citizenship.

Immigrants are often called several different names, and these names have the power to affect their whole individual selves. Immigrants are called migrants, refugees, or even illegal aliens. The subject of immigration is flooded with metaphorical language that ultimately defines an immigrant’s experience.

According to Freedom for Immigrants, several different terms for immigrants exist, such as asylee, asylum seeker, refugee, alien, migrant, and immigrant. All these terms convey different connotations and meanings. In 2015, *BBC News* posted an article about the debate regarding words used to describe migrants. Migrant is defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “one who moves, either temporarily or permanently, from one place, area, or country of residence to another.” Although many consider it an impartial term, the news website al-Jazeera has chosen not to use migrant and instead utilize the word “refugee.” When describing the term “migrant,” the online editor Barry Malone wrote, “It has evolved from its dictionary definitions into a tool that dehumanises and distances, a blunt pejorative” (Ruz). He continued by stating, “Migrant is a word that strips suffering people of a voice. Substituting refugee for it is—in the smallest way—an attempt to give some back” (Taylor). Additional concern for the word migrant

is rooted in the connotations of freedom the term “migrant” possesses. If someone is described as a migrant, it sounds like they are moving of their own accord and not because of outside dangers or pressures. A UN document notes this as it states, “The term ‘migrant’...should be understood as covering all cases where the decision to migrate is taken freely by the individual concerned, for reasons of ‘personal convenience’ and without intervention of an external compelling factor” (Ruz). The 1951 Refugee Convention labels a refugee as “any person who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his/her nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself/herself of the protection of that country.” There is, however, controversy surrounding the label refugee. There is the conception that if immigrants begin to be called refugees, then assumptions are already being made about their identity and their right to asylum within a country. As Tim Stanley, historian and columnist for the *Daily Telegraph* puts it, “The moment at which they can officially say whether they are refugees or economic migrants is the moment at which the EU state that is processing their claim makes its decision.” Illegal immigrant is yet another term used, but this term is controversial as well. It implies that immigrants are criminal in nature (Ruz). Interestingly, the word alien used to be a common term for immigrants before World War Two and has since fallen out of favor. However, alien is still the official terminology in the United States for anyone who is not a documented citizen. All these words, while names for the same people, hold varying connotations that affect policy and ultimately affect individual lives.

“Invasion” is a common metaphor that has been utilized to describe immigrants coming into the United States. It is an anti-immigration metaphor that has been around for more than a century, utilized to fight the entry of basically everyone who is not white (Flynn). Trump

frequently calls what is happening at the border an “invasion,” and he even stated, “It’s like an invasion. They have violently overrun the Mexican border. You saw that two days ago” (Flynn). Although Trump employs the rhetoric of “invasion” often, he is not the first to invent this term or bring it into wide use. Talking about immigration as an invasion began in the 1850s during the antebellum era when the Protestant-majority Know Nothing party rallied against Catholic immigrants. The metaphor was again utilized against Asians in 1889. In the 1889 court decision Chinese Exclusion Act Chief Justice Stephen J. Field stated, “Their immigration was in numbers approaching the character of an Oriental invasion, and was a menace to our civilization; the discontent from this cause was not confined to any political party, or to any class or nationality, but was well-nigh universal” (Flynn). This metaphor of invasion serves to connote implications of criminality and threat onto immigrants crossing the U.S. border.

Intriguingly, this invasion rhetoric has been studied immensely, and a study was even done in 2011 called “Alien language: Immigration metaphors and the jurisprudence of otherness, 79 Fordham L. Rev 1545.” This article reviews the immigration metaphors employed by the U.S. Supreme Court and finds that three dominant metaphors govern legal documents: “immigrants are aliens,” “immigration is a flood,” and “immigration is an invasion.” The article reveals that metaphors are more than just words but serve to influence not only judicial decisions but also social conversations happening around the issue.

Justice William Rehnquist, for instance, referred to immigration in court in terms of danger and defeat. He described the fight against immigration as “national self protection.” He additionally disputed that government “must combat the employment of illegal aliens.” The rhetoric Rehnquist uses to describe immigration is in war and battle terms. He additionally used the term “wetback” to describe immigrants in court. Justice Thurgood Marshall was shocked by

this racial slur, and in defense Rehnquist argued that it is a neutral phrase used where he lives. However, as Cunningham-Parmer notes, “the image of ‘wetbacks’ focuses on immigration-related characteristics such as illegality, ethnicity, and invasion, while concealing other characteristics such as personhood, diversity, and belonging” (Cunningham-Parmer).

Cunningham-Parmer makes the point that the metaphors people believe in shape their linguistic frameworks. How people think in terms of metaphor becomes how people discuss issues and in turn how people act on those issues. This becomes a cyclical process, as the more people repeat metaphors, the more they begin believing their truths and using those negative metaphorical frameworks. This process exists exponentially in the legal system since the legal system is also composed of people who hold various viewpoints and rhetorical frameworks. As George Lakoff and Mark Johnson state, “People in power get to impose their metaphors” (Cunningham-Parmer). This article reveals that the Supreme Court is not unaffected by metaphors, and these metaphors they hold impact the legal system in tremendous ways.

Trump is performing metaphor literacy in a similar way to the Supreme Court. He crafts metaphors that persuade people to think of certain frames. His immigration metaphors are extremely divisive, as his rhetoric implicates metaphors such as “immigration as dangerous waters” and “they are pouring in.” He also speaks of “closing the border.” These metaphors indicate that America as a nation is a container that objects and materials can be put into. As Paul Chilton and George Lakoff note, “with the emergence of the modern nation-state, this metaphor has become so well rooted in the mind that it is difficult to think of the present state-in-a-container system as anything other than a natural and immutable fact” (Hodges). It is interesting to note the implications of security this container metaphor holds. Trump is essentially saying that it is not safe to let some within the container. As Paul Chilton and George

Lakoff further note, “Security for a state is conceptualized in terms of being inside an overwhelmingly strong container that stops things from getting in or out” (Hodges). Trump uses this container metaphor effectively to evoke feelings of fear and incite people to feel the need for security. One of Trump’s tweets even states, “Building a great Border Wall, with drugs (poison) and enemy combatants pouring into our Country, is all about National Defense. Build WALL through M[ilitary]!”

Beyond the container metaphor, he also utilizes a military metaphor. He frequently induces an “immigration as war” metaphor when he terms immigrants coming to the United States as an “assault” or “invasion” (Hodges). The problem with these two metaphors is that people begin to see immigrants as either objects to be taken in or kept out, or they see them as agents of war.

Animal metaphors are additionally used by Trump in reference to immigrants to link in the concepts of animals and immigrants in Americans’ minds. Examples of the phrases he uses involving the animal metaphor are “Illegal immigrants with criminal records ordered deported from our country are tonight roaming free,” and “They are being released (by tens of thousands into our communities) with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources” (Aguilar). “Releasing” immigrants brings to one’s mind the imagery of an animal being released from a cage. “Roaming freely” induces a lot of people to think of dangerous animals walking around inciting terror. Both metaphors both dehumanize and cause fear in the recipient of these words. Something that should be further noted is that Trump does not draw a clear line between terrorism and immigration. He has frequently discussed terrorism and immigration in the same sentence. He even said in a press conference, “People are pouring into our country, including terrorists. We caught 10 terrorists over a short period of time” (Gilsinan). It has been noted that

since 9/11, Trump has been the first president to so clearly tie immigration to terrorism. According to Peter Neuman, a security studies professor at King's College London, "I think this is the single most important difference between Trump and his predecessors—the extent to which he conflates Islam, immigration, and terrorism" (Gilsinan). Research has shown, however, that threats to America have come from within country and not from immigrants. According to New America, "Every jihadist who conducted a lethal attack inside the United States since 9/11 was a citizen or legal resident" (Gilsinan). Trump simply uses these metaphors of container, invasion, and animal to strike fear in American society.

These metaphors Trump uses reveal what he truly thinks about immigrants and people of other cultures and ethnicity. Stephen Miller, White House senior policy adviser, has been instrumental in pushing the Trump administration's harmful immigration rhetoric and policies. Miller has been a white nationalist since college and even joined the Duke Conservative Union. In this union, he partnered alongside Richard Miller who is now the face of the white supremacist movement. During his time, he helped host a debate where Peter Brimelow was featured, a renowned white nationalist. Brimelow has multiple works dedicated to how dangerous non-white immigrants are. Miller even wrote within one of his papers, "Inside our borders, the nation of e pluribus unum (one out of many, one) threatens to be fractured across ethnic lines by racial animus and divisive multiculturalism. We suffer from sagging patriotism, growing malaise, and a loss of faith in the noble history and principles that have made us great" (Sankin). It is interesting to note that the Trump administration is targeting non-white immigrants much more than white immigrants. According to a Department of Homeland Security report, more than 90,000 Canadian citizens overstayed their visas in 2015. The number then jumped to 130,000 in 2016. That number is double the number of Mexican immigrants. If there are more

Canadian immigrants than non-white immigrants from places like Central America, the question remains of why more attention is being paid to the Central Americans. The answer finds itself in the rhetoric of Stephen Miller and the prevailing racist rhetoric within the Trump administration.

These metaphors are far from harmless, as they have real implications on the treatment of others. When people begin to frame immigration as an attack, they become less willing to help those who may be seeking refuge because they are afraid. This leads America not to be a place of asylum and refuge but rather to be a place of hostility and antagonism. America no longer becomes a nation of immigration. Interestingly, The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services wrote as their mission statement in 2005 “U.S.C.I.S. secures America’s promise as a nation of immigrants by providing accurate and useful information to our customers, granting immigration and citizenship benefits, promoting an awareness and understanding of citizenship, and ensuring the integrity of our immigration system” (Jordan). The new agency director under the Trump administration, L. Francis Cissna, has since changed the mission statement to read “U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services administers the nation’s lawful immigration system, safeguarding its integrity and promise by efficiently and fairly adjudicating requests for immigration benefits while protecting Americans, securing the homeland and honoring our values” (Jordan). This phrase “securing the homeland” once again evokes the container metaphor used by the Trump administration to implicate safety and security within American borders. It should be noted that Mr. Cissna took out the phrase “nation of immigrants” and added “while protecting Americans.” In the mission statement from 2005, there was no clause about protection toward Americans. Trump’s rhetoric has incited this notion of protection and introduced the metaphor of “the border as protection.” By using fear rhetoric, he can keep certain kinds of people outside of America’s walls. This leads to detrimental

consequences for immigrants coming to the United States. Trump has sent more than 5, 200 troops to the border while more immigrants reach it every day. There are 2,100 National Guard members currently at the border. According to an article written in October of 2018, this number is greater than number of troops in Syria and Iraq (bbc). Comparative to other current presidents, Trump has sent many more to the border than them. President Barack Obama sent around 1, 200 National Guard soldiers to the border, while President George W Bush sent around 6, 000 troops.

Trump even called the influx of immigrants a “national emergency” in 2018. Ironically, however, he is unwittingly exacerbating the problem of immigration by cutting foreign aid funding. The Trump administration has cut funding to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras by forty percent since 2016. This has left people more vulnerable to drugs and crime. Consequentially, many more Central Americans are seeking improved lives in the United States (bbc).

Trump’s rhetoric has had consequential impacts on numerous countries. According to a policy brief detailing immigration during the Trump administration, just in 2017 Trump banned the entry of people from eight countries, mainly Middle-Eastern, from coming to the United States. They have also reduced the number of refugee acceptances to the lowest level since 1980, increased the number of arrests for illegal immigrants in the U.S., negated the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which was an American immigration policy allowing people who had been brought to the United States as children illegally to receive a two-year deferred action work permit. They also ended the Temporary Protected Status for those from Haiti, Nicaragua, and Sudan (Pierce). These policy changes were born out of this rhetorical framing and have led to significant impacts on real lives around the world.

Even though these immigration policies seem drastic, Trump has not even employed all the social policy he had hoped to in 2016. During his campaign as president, Trump promised to build a “tall, powerful, beautiful” wall that would cover the length of the entire U.S.-Mexico border of 2,000 miles. Later, he shortened it, claiming nature would cover parts of the length sufficiently. Trump is adamant about building this wall, even though according to a survey conducted by the Pew Research Center, 58% of Americans do not want it. In March 2019, Trump outlined his plans, giving eight different prototypes. Although he has received some funding, it is a very small amount compared to the 5.7 billion dollars he has asked for. Throughout his campaign and his presidency, he has pushed for exclusion through the metaphors he uses. He considers others from different countries as thieves when he makes statements like “we must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries” and “other countries stealing our companies and destroying our jobs” (Dobric).

Lakoff writes on this link between metaphor theory and social policy in his book *Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. He writes of how reframing the words people use has the power to implicate social change in the political sphere. Lakoff remarks that most of our thought occurs below the conscious level, stating that “about 98 percent of what our brains are doing is below the level of consciousness. As a result, we may not know all, or even most of what in our brains determines our deepest moral, social, and political beliefs” (Lakoff 124). He studies frames, which are constructions that shape how people see the world around them. Frames are how the human brain organizes information, and they are largely unconscious. They structure the majority of the ways people live their lives, and subsequently affect political frameworks. Frames shape people's worldviews and opinions on social policies. Lakoff builds upon this information to argue that people have the power to change and fight

against political discourse through the words they use. As Lakoff states, “In politics our frames shape our social policies and the institutions we form to carry out policies. To change our frames is to change all of this. Reframing is social change” (Lakoff 130). When he teaches framing, he says to his students, “Don’t think of an elephant! Whatever you do, do not think of an elephant” (Lakoff 1). He has found that no one can do this because the human brain of a college student automatically has a built-in framework for elephants. He gives another example from the Watergate scandal when Nixon said “I am not a crook.” After he said this, everyone thought he was a crook because that was the frame that became linked with him.

These examples describe how framing works, and this type of framing is exactly what Conservatives have been utilizing. An example of this can be seen in how George W. Bush used the phrase “tax relief.” Tax relief is, as Lakoff notes, its own kind of metaphor. It suggests that taxes are bad, and people need reprieve from them. This has set up a type of divided dynamic where those who want taxes are the bad guys, and those who do not want taxes are the heroes. Lakoff goes on to state that Conservatives have been able to become masters at framing the issues because of the substantial amount of money they invest in think tanks to do just that. Lakoff insightfully gives ideas about what progressives can do to combat conservatives and win some of the issues. He first notes that progressives must learn how to frame issues in their own language. If progressives use the same terms that conservatives use, they are helping conservatives. That is just a reinforcement of the frames conservatives created. Lakoff encourages progressives to be more proactive and create their own conceptual frames to discuss the issues.

One of the most impactful ways progressives could begin reframing the issue of human trafficking is to begin framing immigrants as refugees and exploring what that definition truly means. One of the most helpful ways to do this may be to put a face and name to refugees who

are seeking asylum to the United States. The Irish Times's "New to Parish" series details the experiences of various refugees around the world. Instead of presenting statistics about refugees, they present stories about actual refugees and the experiences they have endured (The Irish Times). They show that they are human beings just like everyone else with real feelings and real needs. Progressives could earn a winning edge in immigration discourse if they choose to focus more on the individual and their lived realities.

In accordance with creating new frames, Lakoff clarifies that reframing is not a process that will succeed overnight. He explains how reframing is related to neural circuitry, and people's brains take time to rewire. As he states, "just telling someone something usually does not make it a neural circuit that they use every day or even a neural circuit that fits easily into their pre-existing brain circuitry—the neural circuits that define their previous understandings and forms of discourse" (Lakoff 34). He explains reflexivity, which is a concept that displays how the world reflects our frames, and our frames reflect the world (35). Reflexivity, as he goes on to write, can be used for positive social change in the world. Lakoff's scholarly studies as a cognitive linguist has found that witnessing social change begins with reframing the rhetoric around issues, as he claims, "Because language activates frames, new language is required for new frames. Thinking differently requires speaking differently" (Lakoff 147). The use of strategic metaphors, as Trump and other people in positions of power have shown, have the power not only to affect people's thoughts but to mold their beliefs and activate them into particular forms of action. Evaluating the results of Trump's negative immigration metaphors, it is evident that the power of language to shape an individual's everyday experiences cannot be denied or ignored any longer.

Human Trafficking

Immigration and immigration metaphors intersect at a pivotal point with a huge human rights violation, human trafficking. Before understanding this intersection, however, human trafficking and the frames involved must be thoroughly understood. Human trafficking is a modern form of slavery in which one person manipulates, threatens, or uses violence against another person to gain control over them and ultimately take advantage of them for financial profit. The United Nations defines it as “the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring, or receipt of persons by improper means (such as force, abduction, fraud, or coercion) for an improper purpose including forced labor or sexual exploitation” (End Slavery Now). Different types of human trafficking exist: labor trafficking and sex trafficking. Within labor trafficking, victims are forced to work for little or no pay. Sex trafficking involves the recruitment of vulnerable individuals who are forced through fraud, coercion, or physical force to participate in commercial sex acts. The average cost of a slave is \$90 (dosomething). More than 40 million people are victims of human trafficking (Allies Against Slavery). To put this number into perspective, there are more slaves in the world than the populations of London, New York, and Los Angeles altogether. It is additionally a significantly lucrative crime, as it averages about \$150 billion per year (Freedom k9). Human trafficking is the third largest crime sphere in the world and the second fastest growing crime sphere, right behind drug trafficking (TBI).

Polaris outlines the circumstances that must be present for human trafficking to take place. It is called the Action-Means-Purpose (AMP) Model, and it outlines that an action, means, and purpose must all be existent for a situation to be called human trafficking. The action involves recruiting a minor into sex trafficking, the means of recruitment involves

coercion/force, and the purpose is for sexual or labor exploitation (Polaris). Polaris also displays the Power and Control Wheel on their website, which outlines different abuses that can occur in human trafficking situations. The Power and Control Wheel is also used as a guide for domestic violence. This wheel includes several different types of abuse, such as physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, economic abuse, intimidation, and isolation (Polaris).

A surprisingly large number of human trafficking victims are children, and the average age of entry into human trafficking is twelve to fourteen years of age (do something). According to UNICEF, children make up one-third of the world's total population of human trafficking victims. In Sub-Saharan Africa, Central America and the Caribbean specifically, children account for sixty-four percent of human trafficking. UNICEF and the Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking (ICAT) believe that these numbers are much higher, and children feel scared of their traffickers and unable to report the crime being done to them. Refugee, migrant, and displaced children are at an especially high risk of being trafficked because of their vulnerability. As UNICEF Executive Director Henrietta Fore states, "Trafficking is a very real threat to millions of children around the world, especially to those who have been driven from their homes and communities without adequate protection. These children urgently need governments to step up and put measures in place to keep them safe" (UNICEF). According to Operation Underground Railroad, two million children are trafficked for sex around the world. One of the major ways these children are being trafficked is through the internet. Traffickers use the internet to find vulnerable children who they can connect with and eventually take advantage of. Another way traffickers find vulnerable children is through the absence of parental supervision. In foreign countries, for example, traffickers may offer young girls in impoverished families jobs such as modeling. The parents, since they are low on

money, agree to send their daughter away to these jobs. They do not know, however, that the jobs are covers for human trafficking. In the United States, a common tactic to lure young girls in is “boyfriending,” where the trafficker presents himself as someone genuinely pursuing the girl to gain trust. Once enough trust is gained, he lures her into doing things she is not comfortable with doing (Schutz). The last tactic used with children is smuggling. Ten thousand children are smuggled into the United States each year for the purposes of sexual exploitation (Our).

The rhetoric surrounding human trafficking has shifted, as more people are recognizing prostitution as human trafficking. Labeling men and women as victims has helped them seek help when all the blame for their actions is not placed upon themselves. In former years, there has been a very narrow conceptualization of the term victim. That rhetoric has slowly begun to shift, as who constitutes as a victim has become broader. The Norwegian criminologist Nils Christie wrote of the ideal victim in 1986. His qualifications for the ideal victim were that the victim is weak or sick, the victim was involved in a valuable project at the time of victimization, the victim was in a place where he/she could not be blamed, the offender was “big and bad,” and the offender was someone the victim did not know.

The Palermo Protocol, however, sets up different legal parameters for the attributes that constitute a victim. The Palermo Protocol “stands today as the accepted international definition of trafficking” (Huda, 2006). This protocol recognizes several different avenues of which people can become victims of human trafficking, such as threat of force, fraud, deception, and abuse of vulnerability, among others. Additionally interesting, consent of a victim to prostitution is irrelevant under Article 3(b). Even if someone has consented to prostitution, a jury could still note them as a victim under the Palermo Protocol (317). The problem with identifying someone

as a victim sometimes lies in their inability to see themselves as victimized. When victims cannot see themselves as victims or are unable to tell their story of victimization, people may not apply that label of “victim” to them.

Although the phrase “modern slavery” is a good way of relating current events to a known historical event, it can have unintended consequences (326). The construction of the “ideal victim” that plays off a slavery framework has led to a gap between the “ideal victim” and the real victims in the world. Real victims of human trafficking often have much more nuanced stories of victimization as the criteria listed by Christie, but it doesn’t make their story any less valuable. When the “ideal victim” metaphor is propagated, it denies real victims justice. As the article says, “This false dichotomy may ultimately deny justice to those who are seen to have been complicit in their own trafficking; in other words, women not deemed by those with the power to label, to be ‘ideal victims’ (Hoyle, Bosworth, Dempsey 326). Defining someone as a victim or a prostitute carries real consequences for their future realities.

Women working in the sex industry, whether they self-identify as victims or prostitutes, are some of the most victimized people in the world. Some people, however, choose to present prostitution as a non-victim crime (Matthews 85). Matthews in his article “Female prostitution and victimization: A realist analysis” contests Wikipedia’s description of prostitution, as it defines it as a victimless job of supply and demand (Matthews 85). Matthews further explains that not even liberals and libertarians believe this. Many people argue that women and girls do not choose to be prostitutes but rather choose it when they feel they are out of options or feel coerced into engaging in the work (Matthews 85). Women involved in prostitution experience multiple levels of victimization, such as violence, trafficking, child abuse, sexual problems, and mental problems (Matthews 86). Violence is very prevalent toward women in the business of

prostitution, as they are fifteen to twenty times more likely to be killed than their female counterparts not engaging in prostitution (Matthews 86). Many women within the prostitution industry can tell of violent interactions they have had that were extremely scary and even life-threatening. One woman recounts her terrifying encounter as she says, “I got kidnapped by a punter when I first started working, who took me to [a town in England] and tortured me for hours, raped me, terrorised me, then when he was finished doing all that, made me beg for my life. And while I was on my knees begging for my life, he strangled me unconscious and then stamped on my face until it caved in, and my skull caved in” (Bindel et. al., 2012). Most of the women within the industry of prostitution are already vulnerable as well. Forty to sixty percent of prostitutes were sexually abused as children. The reasons this sexual abuse leads to an increased likelihood of prostitution vary. The research shows they are more likely to devalue and consequently sell their body, or they run away and leave themselves in more vulnerable positions. Many adult-age women involved in prostitution entered at a very young age. In a research study, Silbert and Pines (1982) have found that sixty percent of female prostitutes entered the industry before they were sixteen (Matthews 91).

Because prostitutes are not ideal victims, as Christie pointed out, they may be accused of doing a crime, when in fact they are more like victims. They are not usually kidnapped, but large volumes of force, coercion, and manipulation are often used against them. Although most people view human trafficking and prostitution as separate issues, much of prostitution is truly human trafficking. In 1998, eighty-eight percent of prostituted women interviewed stated that they desired to leave the sex industry. Many of those interviewed came from bad home environments and were left in vulnerable situations. The majority felt selling themselves was truly the only option available to them. Many of the women in the study described how they

were tricked into the sex trade through a “boyfriend” who eventually transformed into a pimp. The man would promise her a better life and relocate her. After this promise and relocation, the relationship changed into one of abuse, with the man controlling what she eats, wears, and does. He convinced her through manipulation that they needed the money, and this was how she would earn it. The pimp would additionally convince the woman that their family would be ashamed of them and would not offer relief if they reached out. This situation, researchers found, equates very closely with human trafficking (Hopperisingministries).

How these women are labeled, either as victims or prostitutes, is incredibly important for their well-being. One of the biggest issues with identifying whether someone is determining whether they are operating out of consent or coercion. Consent is a critical piece of information in determining if an action is mutual sexual activity or a crime. Many people assume that prostitutes give their consent, but research has found it is much more complicated. They can receive threats, manipulation, and coercion from their pimps to perform sex acts that they themselves may not be comfortable with doing (Hoyle 318). TBI has even documented, “Many forms of prostitution fall under sex trafficking, especially when there are pimps involved who use force or coercion to keep women working for them. In the case of juveniles who are trafficked, their age alone makes them victims of trafficking regardless of the use of force or coercion” (TBI 5).

The phrase “trafficking” gained momentum in the late 1990s, as NGO advocacy, documentary filmmaking, and UN responses increased (Peters 4). The term “trafficking” came into existence in the 1990s during the UN Fourth World Conference on Women in China. “Violence against women” was emphasized heavily at this conference, as people began to recognize migration and women’s rights issues. William Jefferson Clinton was the first

President to speak on trafficking, as he addressed a memo to the public, referring to “the problem of trafficking in women and girls” as “an insidious form of violence” (Peters 41). Clinton declared, “Here in the United States, we have seen cases of trafficking for the purposes of forced prostitution, sweatshop labor, and exploitative domestic servitude. The victims in these cases often believe they will be entering our country to secure a decent job. Instead, they are virtual prisoners, with no resources, little recourse, and no protection against violation of human rights” (Clinton 1998). The memo then laid out the three P’s for combating human trafficking, prevention, protection, and prosecution (Peters 41).

Many countries around the world are reacting to this shift in framing. In 2005, the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings identified trafficking as abuse of power, abuse of vulnerability, fraud, deception, abduction, and coercion. This definition of trafficking is broad enough to involve women involved in prostitution whose vulnerabilities are abused and exploited (Matthews 94). Over the past two centuries, many European countries have focused on criminalization because they have framed these women as prostitutes. Recently, however, decriminalization has increased, and a paradigm shift has taken place. People have begun framing the women in terms of their vulnerabilities and victimization, and research has shown that many women within prostitution are truly victims. Because of this shift, more countries in Europe are criminalizing the man buying the sex over the woman giving it. In the UK in 2008, posters were positioned in pubs with the phrase “Walk in a punter: walk out a rapist.” The goal of this campaign was to discourage men from purchasing because some prostitutes are human trafficking victims. The Netherlands similarly started a media campaign in 2006 in which they encouraged men to report any women they encountered who might be potential trafficking victims. Additionally, exiting programs have recently been implemented in

Europe because research has found that many women involved in prostitution have expressed the desire to leave (Farley, 2003). Because the metaphorical framing has shifted from “prostitute” to “victim,” victims of human trafficking can receive the proper care they need (Matthews 97).

Human trafficking and immigration find themselves at a very important intersection. Police often detain victims of human trafficking who are undocumented. According to the Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group, “more than 10 percent of the adults and children whose cases were referred to the NRM [National Referral Mechanism] had been detained (ATMG, 2010: 43). From the women’s perspective, such a response reinforces ‘everything that their traffickers have told them about if you try to escape...no one will believe you, you’ll be put in prison or deported’ (14). This immigration-human trafficking cross-over finds itself at an interesting place because large disconnects exist between the criminal justice and immigration systems. For example, duty solicitors, who help offenders suspected of crimes, may advise a client to plead guilty to illegal immigration charges but not recognize that she is a victim of human trafficking. One such woman found herself in this exact same situation. She even told her solicitor that she was trafficked, but she still had to serve five months in prison (Loftus 325). In order to solve this disjointed intersection, the United States has granted victims of human trafficking the right to remain in the United States. U.S. Congress now understands that human trafficking victims who are immigrants faced a harsh reality that felt inescapable. They knew that if they tried to report or leave, they would be deported back into the horrible conditions of their country they sought refuge from (Loftus). The law did not recognize these two concepts of human trafficking and immigration as co-occurring because people believed immigration to be “characterized by choice,” and human trafficking to be “characterized by coercion, deception, or force” (Loftus 145). However, the truth is that these two issues coincide and exist on a continuum. The law

tends to create frames that isolate the two issues as if they do not coexist, and this can be deeply problematic. The State Department even addressed this in their 2010 Trafficking in Persons Report, as they pleaded for governments to “bring immigration controls and practices into conformity with anti-trafficking policies” (Loftus 147). The discordance with human trafficking and immigration laws can be very problematic, as a human trafficking victim may not receive the help he/she needs. While identifying as an immigrant, they may be deported and be prosecuted for their being trafficked (Loftus 167). Human trafficking and immigration laws must start coordinating for real change to occur.


In the United States, the first law created to specifically combat victimization and prosecute traffickers was the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (Sax). The Trafficking Victims Protection Act, passed by Congress in 2000, allowed for trafficking victims to be protected, traffickers to be prosecuted, and further means of human trafficking to be prevented. The TVPA of 2000 is the foundation of Federal human trafficking law. This modern ban of human trafficking finds its roots in the Thirteenth Amendment, which prohibits slavery of any kind. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act was revised in 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2013 (DOJ).

This act found a way to identify the intersect between immigration and human trafficking. It gives relief for victims of human trafficking, imposing a 1-year renewable status for those who are victims of human trafficking (Lemke 750). The TVPA established the T-Visa, allowing victims of human trafficking and their families to become temporary U.S. residents and permanent residents after three years (Polaris). This act also gives victims the right to sue their traffickers (Lemke 751).

While the TVPA has major implications for the intersection of human trafficking and immigration, many inconsistencies still exist within policy. Under the Immigration and

Nationality Act, unaccompanied minors can be deported. Since young victims are often misidentified as criminals, this has led to a major problem in identifying victims of human trafficking (Lemke 752). As Loftus (2011) says, “authorities often fail to try to determine whether a suspect may be a human trafficking victim because they are preoccupied with enforcing immigration laws” (Lemke 753). Failure to recognize victims of human trafficking has wide-reaching implications and creates a double frame of “illegal alien” and “prostitute.” Deporting a victim of human trafficking back to their home country can lead the victim to the same place of vulnerability they were in before. Although strides have been made, the law must continue to improve upon this intersection of vulnerability. Since the rhetorical framing of human trafficking has changed, the lives of individuals are changing. When more people are seen as victims instead of prostitutes, they can receive the proper protection and care they need. The blame is no longer put on the victims but rather put on the offenders of the crime. Because of this shift in blame, a shift in policy occurs. This shift in policy ends up affecting individual lives in extremely pivotal ways.

Conclusion



While they may seem like completely different issues; human trafficking, gun control, and immigration all intersect at pivotal points. As demonstrated, human trafficking and immigration are interconnected issues since many immigrants are victims of human trafficking as well. This intersection is described in the previous chapter and is seen in section number one of the Venn Diagram with the TVPA. The gun control issue also intersects with human trafficking in major ways, as seen in section number two within the Venn Diagram. One major way the NRA interacts with human trafficking is through the conventions they host. These NRA conventions consist of over 70,000 people, and law enforcers have often had to get ready for the evident resultant crime of these conventions, sex trafficking. As assistant special agent Margie Quin has stated, “Whenever you have that sort of traffic through your state, the opportunities for crime go up. People who travel sometimes don’t make great choices” (Wadhvani). During the NRA conventions, several ads are put up onto Backpage and Craigslist. It should be noted that Backpage was shut down in April of 2018 (Ehrenkranz). However, several websites still exist, such as Craigslist, that promote ads for girls. One ad on Craigslist that specifically related to the NRA convention read, “Any ladies or couples here for NRA convention want to have some fun? -m4w-42 (Nashville).” An ad featured on Backpage at the time said “Welcome NRA members busy blonde companion for discreet encounters” (Wadhvani). While the NRA is most likely not the organization creating these ads, their large conventions propagate the circulation of these ads and thus increase human trafficking.

The second way that the issues of gun control and human trafficking intersect is found under number two in the Venn Diagram as well. The NRA has further worked against women’s rights and immigrants’ rights through the way they have lobbied against the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). VAWA, passed in 1994, seeks to improve the criminal justice system for

victims of domestic abuse. The act provides several protections, such as supporting domestic violence shelters, protecting immigrants who are experiencing domestic violence, creating prevention plans, and giving tools to continue education around domestic violence (The National Domestic Violence Hotline). One of the most important protections it provides, however, is barring domestic violence abusers from possessing guns. This limitation only applies to a spouse, ex-spouse, live-in-lover, or co-parent. It does not apply to stalkers or boyfriends, which is surprising because approximately half of intimate partner homicides are committed by people in casual dating relationships (Levitz). Congressional Democrats recently sought to amend VAWA to include boyfriends and stalkers from owning firearms. Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi sought to add language that would close this “boyfriend loophole,” but the NRA immediately became defensive about such a provision (Levitz). The NRA is claiming that women are safer in a home with guns and that VAWA is a violation of women’s rights. Jennifer Baker, spokeswoman for the NRA, claims that “it is a shame that some in the gun-control community treat the severity of domestic violence so trivially that they are willing to use it as a tool to advance a political agenda” (Dickinson). In actuality, the gun lobby wishes to fight against this revision because this would limit the number of guns owned and thus lead to a decrease in their sales. The bill is now in the Senate being worked on by Senators Diane Feinstein (D-CA) and Joni Ernst (R-IA), but nothing has been decided yet (Levine).

The NRA is making a claim that goes against all research studies conducted about domestic violence and guns in the home. According to the National Coalition against Gun Violence, more than half of the women in the United States murdered are killed at the hands of an intimate partner with a gun. Additionally, the likelihood of a woman being killed in the home increases five times when a gun is present (Giffords Law Center). Nonetheless, against all the

research, they claim they are right and are threatening to withhold support from those who pass the VAWA bill.

Gun control and immigration also find themselves at odds with each other in today's political climate. This intersect can be found under number three in the Venn Diagram. The NRA has propagated extremely apparent anti-immigrant rhetoric while spouting their stance on the necessity of guns. Stephen Miller's anti-immigration and racist policies have been heavily influenced by NRA CEO Wayne LaPierre and his book, *Guns, Crime, and Freedom*. Miller supposedly read this book as a child, and it helped shape his views on immigration and tolerance of the other (Millhiser). The NRA has emulated many of Wayne LaPierre's views, leading to the fear rhetoric they use to warn against immigration. One such example of LaPierre's prejudiced views comes from a speech he gave in 2002 in which he says, "The first target in homeland security shouldn't be the people of the homeland. It should be finding people who are not citizens of our homeland, who don't belong in our homeland along with aliens on work visas, or green cards, or student passes. They are the ones that should get the extra wandings and random searches!" (Millhiser). LaPierre even recommended profiling people who "look like terrorists" and singling them out for searching (Spies, Weinstein). The NRA went so far as to give a speech defaming giving aid to undocumented residents, claiming, "There's a law called encouragement they're violating. We cannot allow a patchwork quilt of immigration laws to develop all over this country...it really will mean whether or not we can keep this country" (Tancredo). By using anti-immigrant fear rhetoric, LaPierre and other NRA spokesperson push their agenda for gun rights, claiming Americans need guns to fight against all the people who are not Americans. They are no longer sticking to their typical rhetoric of gun control but are now broadening their scope to include discussing race, health care, and immigration. As Adam Winkler, a UCLA law

professor, describes the shift in the NRA as he says, “We’re seeking the rise of a new NRA. It’s long been committed to a die-hard approach to gun-policy; they focused like a laser beam on Second Amendment issues. Now it’s focused on immigration, race, healthcare” (Reston).

The NRA has become increasingly racist to strike fear in citizens and convince them that they need a gun to be safe. The NRA has separated people into the “good guys” versus the “bad guys” to divide the American people. Conservative Dana Loesch filmed a video on the NRA website using this large division to demonize those who didn’t agree with the NRA and the Trump Administration. She used “they/them/their” sixteen times within fifty-nine seconds, saying things like “They use their media to assassinate real news” and “They use their schools to teach children that their president is Hitler” (Fadulu, Timmons). The ad doesn’t discuss nonviolent protests or the forty-two unarmed black people killed by the police in 2016. The “us” versus “them” rhetoric serves to demonize the other side. The video seems to discuss the violence committed by the “other,” but implies violence committed by the “us” is completely fine. This “us” versus “them” metaphorical framing simply serves to further xenophobia and promote the use of guns to fight against “the other” (Fadulu, Timmons).

VAWA intersects with the issue of immigration at a key point as well. U.S. immigration law provides three potential visas for victims of crimes, which are the U visa for serious crime, the T visa for human trafficking, and the VAWA petition for domestic abuse and violence. Immigrants who are victims of domestic violence are eligible for a U visa or a VAWA petition, and both avenues provide the opportunity of a longer stay to U.S. permanent residence via a green card (Gasson). How the VAWA is structured now, however, limits immigrants’ ability to be protected under the law, and they be at a greater risk of murder by firearms.

Besides the rejection of the “boyfriend loophole” by the NRA, Trump is also limiting opportunities for women and specifically immigrants to seek help by shifting the rhetoric surrounding domestic violence. Trump changed both the definitions of domestic violence and sexual assault in April of 2018. Under the Obama administration, the definition of domestic violence was much broader and was vetted by the National Center for Victims of Crime and the National Domestic Violence Hotline. The previous definition included psychological abuse such as a partner seeking power and control, a certain pattern of behavior, emotional abuse, economic abuse, physical violence, and sexual violence (Nanasi). Now, however, the Trump administration has limited the scope of domestic violence to only include physical harm that constitutes as a misdemeanor or a felony. Other forms of abuse, such as psychological abuse, coercive control, and manipulation are no longer a part of the department’s definition for domestic violence (Oppenheim). Holly Taylor-Dunn, senior lecturer at the University of Worcester, says, “It is quite scary how quietly it has happened...we have worked so hard since the 60s and 70s to get domestic abuse and sexual violence understood as being about more than physical violence. Changing the definition to take it back to being about physical harm completely undermines what domestic abuse is about” (Oppenheim). Under the Trump administration’s definition, this means that a woman being isolated from her family and friends, belittled, berated, and denied access to money would not be considered a victim of domestic violence. This is problematic because psychological abuse leads to physical abuse in a majority of domestic violence cases. An abuser may start with just mental and emotional abuse, but as their need for control continues, they resort to violence to seek that domination (Nanasi).

While it may be too early to tell, this definitional change will have wide-reaching consequences for victims of domestic violence. What is very clear from this change in rhetoric

surrounding domestic violence is that Trump and his administration do not value women and their safety. This change will potentially have wide-reaching consequences for victims of domestic abuse and especially for immigrants. The change will impact many immigrants who are seeking visas for protection against domestic violence. If the parameters of what constitutes as domestic violence decrease, this impacts an immigrant's ability to apply for the U-Visa and seek refuge in the United States. They may fear deportation if they are experiencing only mental, emotional, or economic abuse because they interpret that their experience does not align with the definition of domestic violence the Trump administration has laid out. In many ways, although this has not been said explicitly, one could say that Trump's change in the definition of domestic violence is also an anti-immigration rewriting of the law.

All of these issues intersect with each other under VAWA. The NRA has opposed the latest rendition of VAWA, which affects victims of human trafficking and immigrants. VAWA is a bill made up of two divisions. Division A is the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 1994, and Division B is the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Smirnova). By preventing the closure of the "boyfriend loophole," the NRA is harming victims of human trafficking even more. A common strategy used to lure girls into human trafficking is "boyfriending," and abuse is often a common form of control within human trafficking scenarios. It follows that if the NRA continues to let boyfriends and partners own guns, this increases the likelihood that victims of human trafficking will continue to be abused. Since the Trafficking Persons Act of 2000 protects immigrants, giving them relief and a 1-year renewable status under the T-Visa (Lemke 750). The ways in which the NRA has sought to protect the reputation of guns and gun rhetoric through limiting VAWA is the central connection point between gun control, immigration, and human trafficking. Because NRA did not like the wording and limitations that come with the

proposed amendment to VAWA, they are essentially opposing the improvement of human rights issues like human trafficking and immigration. Even within this central connection, it is clear that the main cause for concern is the way in which language formation interact with people's ideas and lifestyles.

Clearly, metaphor plays a pivotal role in shaping not only people's thoughts but a country's conceptions about a group of people. With gun control, the competing "GUNS ARE FREEDOM" and "GUNS ARE DISEASE" metaphors interact in pivotal and clashing ways. These metaphors shape not only people's opinions but also laws, and ultimately, life and death. Within the immigration debate, several different metaphorical frameworks present themselves and shape the political climate. Immigrants are called a variety of names, including migrant, refugee, illegal immigrant, and illegal alien. When immigrants are labeled differently, this changes not only people's perceptions but also the laws surrounding immigration. These laws then affect immigrants' lived realities. Lastly, the metaphorical framework surrounding human trafficking is pivotal because a person will have a very different experience depending on whether he/she is called a prostitute or a victim. Being called a prostitute inflicts blame and shame, but being called a victim provides protection and help.

Through these case studies, I have sought to show how metaphor functions as more than just a decorative figurative term within the human language. Rather, it has real implications and consequences on public policy and the lives of others. Further, these metaphors from the three social issues I have evaluated, gun control, immigration, and human trafficking, serve to intertwine these issues together. While they may seem separate, these issues are interconnected entities among a web of metaphorical structure.

Works Cited

- Abadi, Mark. "Democrats and Republicans speak different languages—and it helps explain why we're so divided." *Business Insider*, 11 Aug. 2017. Web. Accessed 12 Feb. 2019.
- Aguilar, Julián. "Trump administration policy shift could force tens of thousands of Salvadorans to leave Texas." *The Texas Tribune*, 8 Jan. 2019. Web. Accessed 21 Mar. 2019.
- Allies Against Slavery*.
- Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group: Anti-Slavery*.
- Baker, Peter. "In Gun Debate, Even Language Can be Loaded." *The New York Times*, 15 Jan. 2013. Web. Accessed 12 Feb. 2019.
- Bindel et al. Female prostitution and victimization: A realist analysis.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. "Critical Metaphor Methodology." *Analysing Political Speeches (2nd Edition): Rhetoric, Discourse, and Metaphor*. Red Globe Press. Print.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. "Purposeful Metaphor and Social Cognition." *Analysing Political Speeches (2nd Edition): Rhetoric, Discourse, and Metaphor*. Red Globe Press. Print.
- Clinton, William J. *Public papers of the presidents of the United States*.
- Cunningham-Parameter. *Alien Language: Immigration Metaphors and the Jurisprudence of Others*. *Fordham Law Review: Vol. 79 (4)*. 2011. Web. Accessed 28 Mar. 2019.
- David, et. al. "Cascades in Metaphor and Grammar: A Case study of metaphors in the gun debate." Berkeley: *John Benjamins Publishing Co*. Web. Accessed 18 Feb. 2019.
- "Deadliest Mass Shootings in Modern US History Fast Facts." *CNN*, 15 Dec. 2018. Web. Accessed 12 Feb. 2019.
- Dickinson, Tim. "The NRA is trying to block the Violence Against Women Act." *Rolling Stone*.

Web. Accessed 30 Mar. 2019.

“Dismay after Trump moves to cut aid to Central America.” *BBCNews*, 31 Mar. 2019.

Web. Accessed 1 Apr. 2019.

Do Something.

Elving, Ron. “Repeal the Second Amendment? That’s Not So Simple. Here’s What it Would Take.” *NPR*, 1 Mar. 2018. Web. Accessed 22 Feb. 2019.

End Slavery Now.

Farley, Melissa. Theory versus reality: Commentary on four articles about trafficking for prostitution. *Women’s Studies International Forum* 32, 311-315.

Ferriss, Lucy. “Speaking of Guns.” *Lingua Franca*, 17 Dec. 2012. Web. Accessed 15 Feb. 2019.

Flynn, Maegan. “An invasion of illegal aliens: The oldest fear-mongering metaphor in America.” *The Washington Post*, 2 Nov. 2018. Web. Accessed 22 Mar. 2019.

Foss, Sonja K. “Metaphor Criticism.” *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice 4th Edition*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2009. 267-306. Print.

Frazin, Rachel. “Border chief says ‘breaking point’ has arrived.” *The Hill*, 27 Mar. 2019. Web. Accessed 28 Mar. 2019.

Hodges, Adam. “A Demagogue’s Words Matter.” *Anthropology News*, 2 Nov. 2018. Web. Accessed 29 Mar. 2019.

Gasson, Kristina. “Should you apply for a U Visa or for VAWA?” *NOLO. Giffords Law Center: To Prevent Gun Violence.*

“9 US immigration facts worth knowing in 2019.” *Forum Daily*, 2 May. 2019. Web. Accessed 24 Apr. 2019.

Gilsinan, Kathy. “Trump keeps invoking terrorism to get his border wall.” *The Atlantic*, 11 Dec.

2018. Web. Accessed 27 Mar. 2019.
- “Guns on Campus: The Architecture and Momentum of State Policy Action.” *NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education*. Web. Accessed 12 Feb. 2019.
- Holpuch, Amanda. “Is the US-Mexico Border already at breaking point?” *The Guardian*, 7 Mar. 2019. Accessed 3 Apr. 2019.
- Hope Rising Ministries*.
- Hodges, Adam. “A Demagogue’s Words Matter.” *Anthropology News*, 2 Nov. 2018. Web. Accessed 29 Mar. 2019.
- Hoyle et. al. Labelling the victims of sex trafficking: Exploring the borderland between reality and rhetoric. *Social & Legal Studies* 20(3), 313-329.
- Huda, Sigma. *ISHR’s Summaries of Documents for the 5th Session of the Human Rights Council*.
- JD, Rostron, Allen. *The Dickey Amendment on Federal Funding or Research on Gun Violence: A Legal Dissection*. *Am J Public Health*. 2018 July; 108(7): 865-867. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2018.304450.
- Jordan, Miriam. “Is America a “Nation of Immigrants?” Immigration Agency Says No.” *The New York Times*, 22 Feb. 2018. Web. Accessed 25 Mar. 2019.
- Kovecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: University Press, 2002. Print.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.
- Lakoff, George. *Don’t Think of an Elephant!: Know your values and frame the debate*. White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing. 2014. Kindle Edition.
- Linsley, Brennan. “The facts on immigration today: 2017 edition.” *Center for American Progress*, 20 Apr. 2017. Web. Accessed 24 Apr. 2019.

Lemke, Melinda. Trafficking and immigration policy: Intersections, inconsistencies, and implications for public education. *Educational Policy, Vol 31(6)*, 743-767.

Levitz, Eric. "NRA rallies to preserve the gun rights of convicted stalkers, abusive boyfriends." *Intelligencer*, 1 Apr. 2019. Web. Accessed 28 Mar. 2019.

Loftus, Elizabeth F. Eyewitness Science and the Legal System. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*.

Luntz, Frank. *Words that Work: It's not what you say, it's what people hear*. Hyperion book.

Magaril, Paul. "Guns: A metaphor for individual rights." *Timesunion*, 28 Apr. 2014. Web. Accessed 23 Feb. 2019.

Matthews, Roger. *Female prostitution and victimization: A realist analysis*. *International Review of Victimology 2015, Vol 2(1)* 85-100. DOI: 10. 1177/0269758014547994.

Millhiser, Ian. "The disturbing thread of white nationalism woven into the NRA's rhetoric." *ThinkProgress*, 15 Aug. 2017. Web. Accessed 4 Apr. 2019.

Nanasi, Natalie. "The Trump administration quietly changed the definition of domestic violence and we have no idea what for." *Slate*, 21 Jan. 2019. Web. Accessed 25 Mar. 2019.

National Rifle Association of America. Web. Accessed 22 Feb. 2019.

"National Center for Health Statistics: Firearm Mortality by State: 2017." *Centers for Disease and Control Prevention*. Web. Accessed 22 Feb. 2019.

Now This News.

Operation Underground Railroad.

Oppenheim, Maya. "Trump administration 'rolling back women's rights by 50 years' by changing definitions of domestic violence and sexual assault." *Independent*, 24 Jan. 2019. Web. Accessed 1 Apr. 2019.

- Peters, Alicia W. *Trafficking in Meaning: Law, Victims, and the State*. Columbia University, 2010.
- Pierce, Sarah and Andrew Selee. "Immigration under Trump: A review of policy shifts in the year since the election." *Migration Policy Institute*, Dec. 2017. Web. *Polaris Project*.
- Raphelson, Samantha. "How the NRA Worked to Stifle Gun Violence Research." *NPR*, 5 Apr. 2018. Web. Accessed 24 Feb. 2019.
- "Remarks by Representative Tom Tancredo (R-CO) at NRA'S 'Celebration of American Values' Conference in Washington, DC—9/21/07." *NRA-ILA: Institution for Legislative Action*.
- Ruz, Camila. "The battle over the words used to describe migrants." *BBC News*, 28 Aug. 2015. Web. Accessed 21 Mar. 2019.
- Sankin, Aaron. "The Hate Report: The hate behind the immigration crackdown." *Reveal*, 22 Jun. 2018. Web. Accessed 26 Mar. 2019.
- Schutz, Elizabeth. "The Truth about Trafficking." *Elizabeth Schutz*, Accessed 2 Apr. 2019.
- Sederer, Lloyd. "America's Deadly Gun Disease." *U.S. News & World Report*, 7 Dec. 2015. Web. Accessed 20 Feb. 2019.
- Sax, Robert. "Human Trafficking: A Problem of Language?" *Huffington Post*, 21 Sept. 2009. Accessed 5 Apr. 2019.
- Shabad, Rebecca. "Did the new spending bill really end the hold on gun violence research? Maybe not." *NBC News*, 24 Mar. 2018. Web. Accessed 27 Mar. 2019.

Shapiro, Ari. "Loaded Words: How Language Shapes the Gun Debate." *NPR*, 26. Feb. 2013.
Web. Accessed 16 Feb. 2019.

Smirnova, Marianna. *Understanding the link between human trafficking and violence against women*. Developed in collaboration with: Arcelli Anso, PHD UW-Madison.

Smith, Kate. "The facts on immigration: What you need to know in 2019." *CBS News*, 4 Feb. 2019. Web. Accessed 20 Mar. 2019.

Smith, Noah. "Demographic Decline is the real threat to the U.S." *Bloomberg Opinion*, 10 Apr. 2019. Web. Accessed 25 Apr. 2019.

Spies and Wienstein. "The NRA has been moonlighting as an anti-immigration group for years." *The Trace*, 31 Jan. 2017. Web. Accessed 30 Mar. 2019.

Taylor, Adam. "Is it time to ditch the word 'migrant'?" *The Washington Post*, 24 Aug. 2015.
Web. Accessed 22 Mar. 2019.

Tennessee Bureau of Investigation.

"Tennessee Human Sex Trafficking and Its Impact on Children and Youth." *Tennessee Bureau of Investigation and Vanderbilt Center for Community Centers*. Accessed 4 Apr. 2019.

The Irish Times.

The National Domestic Violence Hotline.

The United States Department of Justice.

"The Anti-Trafficking Monitoring Group." *Anti-Slavery*.

UNICEF.

Wadhvani, Anita. "Big conventions can draw sex trafficking." *The Tennessean*, 12 Apr. 2015.
Web. Accessed 31 Mar. 2019.