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The purpose of the thesis is to understand how the anti-human trafficking dialogue in the Cuban-American context is used as medium to express national agendas. The research data were speeches delivered by representatives of the US and Cuban governments that specifically mentioned Cuba or the United States in addition to human trafficking. The broad categories that emerged in these speeches included religion, morality, children (youth), and gender. The rhetoric employed within each of these categories was examined to reveal how the palaver on human trafficking was used to promote American and Cuban agendas.

It was found that the use of religious rhetoric is an effective tool for the American rhetorician while, in the Cuban discussion of human trafficking, religious rhetoric was largely absent. Moral metaphors or moral themes were used extensively by both Cuban and American rhetoricians. The Cuban representatives focused on the inequality and moral bankruptcy wrought by neoliberal policy and economics. The American government emphasized the moral depravity of the Cuban ‘failed revolution’ which allegedly relies on the income that human trafficking brings to the country. Finally, both countries used the rhetoric of the innocent child and the vulnerable woman to strengthen the argument that the opposing ideology, as represented by respective governments, facilitated the exploitation of innocent children and the neglect of vulnerable women.

To facilitate greater co-operation in reducing the negative impacts of human trafficking, countries that have conflicting agenda’s must refocus their energies on the commonalities they share. In this case both Cuba and the US should acknowledge that the other, fundamentally, has mechanisms for promoting the rights and dignity of man.
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INTRODUCTION

Human trafficking, according to many sources, is a heinous crime and a scourge of humanity that demands global action. Among other things, human trafficking involves, but is not limited to, illegal immigration and the subjugation of workers in sex, agricultural, and sweatshop labour.1 According to the United Nations (UN) Report on Global Trafficking, between December 2003 and November 2008, approximately 45 percent of the world’s countries created legislation criminalizing trafficking in persons for the first time. Currently, approximately 63 percent of the world’s countries have legislation criminalizing trafficking in persons.2 The increasing amount of national legislation regarding human trafficking reflects both an increase in human trafficking and an increasing awareness of human trafficking.

Given the rising frequency of trafficking, its international nature, and its propensity to become even more prolific, it is important to understand how the anti-human trafficking movement is used as medium to express national agendas. Understanding these agendas in the context of human trafficking provides a basis of understanding for constructing progressive strategies to deal with the international phenomenon of human trafficking. A rhetorical analysis of national agendas, as expressed through speeches in the anti-trafficking palaver, reveals not only how trafficking is spoken about but to whom and why it is spoken about in such a manner. Answering these who, how, and why questions is the basis of rhetorical analysis. Rhetoric is, fundamentally, “using language to help people narrow their choices among” a few select options.3 These expressions of national agendas are intended to persuade an audience at the national or international level and as such, a rhetorical analysis of these expressions is well suited to the task.

Very little research concerning anti-trafficking rhetoric as an expression of national agendas in the international sphere has been has been conducted. Nandita Sharma’s research examines how anti-trafficking rhetoric is used to support the “moral reform arm of anti-

---

immigrant politics that targets negatively racialized migrants. Vanessa Munro has written about the rhetoric of human trafficking as a violation of human rights while Gretchen Soderlund has examined how anti-trafficking rhetoric has been used to unite various positions on the political spectrum in federal American politics. Finally, some research, such as Stephanie Limmoncelli’s humanitarian research, does not focus on rhetoric, but does show how the anti-trafficking-in-women-movement, dealing with international prostitution, was used from 1875-1960 to undergird territorial interests of various states. However, none of these researchers specifically address anti-human trafficking rhetoric as an expression of national agenda in the international palaver on human trafficking. Since there is a dearth of research concerning the rhetoric of the anti-trafficking movement as medium for expressing national agendas and since it remains a monumental task to analyze in detail the relations between many countries regarding human trafficking, the following focuses on two neighbouring countries that are geographic neighbours but ideological strangers; the United States and Cuba.

The research process began with an examination of transcripts from the United Nations Thematic Debate on Human Trafficking (June 3, 2008). Most representatives used the General Assembly debate as a forum to state, in different forms, that human trafficking is deplorable and then continued to pontificate about what their country has done to fight it. The representative for Cuba however, delivered a statement that specifically implicated the United States (U.S.) as a perpetrator in human trafficking but the U.S. did not respond in kind at this debate. Interestingly, after searching outside of this thematic UN debate, it was found that the representatives of the U.S. definitively implicated the Cuban government as a passive actor that ignored human trafficking at best and, at worst, a regime that profited from human trafficking. Thus, it became obvious that both countries used the same types of language to dialogue about human trafficking in the Cuban-American palaver.

---

In the Cuban-American context, the term palaver refers to an ongoing parley or discussion between two opponents of differing ideological persuasions on a particular topic. In this case the primary topic is human trafficking. The lack of research in this area coupled with the use of the palaver on human trafficking as a forum to promote their respective ideologies and national agendas begged the question of how human trafficking was talked about in this palaver. More specifically, I wanted to know what type of rhetoric was used, how it was used, and to what effect. I suspected that representatives of both the U.S. and Cuba employed similar forms of rhetoric to sabotage their ideological opponent and present their respective countries in the best possible light.

To understand the rhetoric used in the Cuba-U.S. palaver on human trafficking I searched for speeches delivered by representatives of the U.S. and Cuban governments that specifically mentioned Cuba and human trafficking or the United States and human trafficking. Speeches were the chosen form of research material because, as Roderick Hart notes, they contain “meta-messages” which reveal the priorities of the speaker and the institutes they represent. Moreover, speeches remain as a “visible record of a complex interaction”. For example, in the following study, speeches are the only record of the human trafficking parley that has been going on between Cuba and the U.S. for several years. Consequently, an analysis of the pertinent speeches will further elucidate their relationship as international actors.

The two primary speeches used in the analysis include one delivered by the then President George W. Bush at the Training Conference to Combat Human Trafficking (July 16, 2004) and one delivered by the permanent representative of Cuba, Ambassador Ileana Mordoche at the United Nations General Assembly Thematic Debate on Human Trafficking (June 3, 2008). In addition, relevant excerpts from other speeches were also considered. These excerpts were extracted from speeches delivered by President Barack Obama, former President George W. Bush, Attorney General John Ashcroft, Luis CdeBaca, the American Ambassador-at-Large in the Office to Monitor and Combat Human Trafficking in Persons, Florida Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, President Fidel Castro, and President Raul Castro. Whenever possible, speeches were examined in their native tongue. The primary

---

8 Hart, 45.
9 Ibid., 48.
Cuban speech, delivered by Mordoche was examined in English as the transcript of the speech was only posted in English on the website of the UN General Assembly.

Following the selection of the speeches, each speech was examined for key points which were coded according to their content. Similarly coded items were then consolidated into broader categories of religion, morality, children (youth), and gender. The rhetorical type, use, and effectiveness of metaphors or phrases within each of these categories were examined to reveal how the palaver on human trafficking was used to promote the American and Cuban agendas.

Throughout the research process I strove towards objectivity. However, Kari Palonen points out in his discussion of Max Weber and objectivity, that Weber believes “scholars are necessarily involved in their research process”. Therefore, objectivity in my research is an ideal that is actualized in scholarly debate, not in attempts at neutrality. My nationality and areas of expertise; history, theology, and psychology, certainly influenced my interpretation and application of theory in my analysis. As a Canadian conducting research on Cuba and the U.S., I was conscious of the relationship that Canada has had with both the U.S. and Cuba. While the United States has made sanctions against Cuba, Canada has maintained diplomatic and trade links after 1959. Though the U.S. is Canada’s largest trading partner, Canada has also demonstrated “resistance in the form of Canadian legislation to counter the extraterritorial implications of American law [which] is regarded as a further assertion of Canadian sovereignty in the face of American hegemony”. My understanding of history and historical analysis impacted my interpretation of the classical grounding of rhetoric as well as the contemporary context of Cuba and the United States. My previous theological studies assisted me in identifying religious rhetoric as well as moral rhetoric to a lesser degree while my training in psychology guided me to employ the work of a cognitive linguist George Lakoff.

Consequently, in the first chapter, which analyzes the religious and moral elements of rhetoric, cognitive scientist George Lakoff’s notion of moral politics and the accompanying moral framework is quite prominent. After explicating the classic roots of rhetoric, Lakoff’s

11 Heather N. Nicol, ed., *Canada, the US and Cuba: Helms Burton and its Aftermath*, (Kingston. Ontario: Centre for International Relations, Queens University, 1999), vi.
discussion of metaphor in the rhetoric of American politics explains how moral metaphors are used and why they are effective. The analysis of moral rhetoric in the second chapter also relies heavily on Lakoff’s expertise in moral politics. Similarly, in the third chapter, the analysis of youth and innocence draws on Henry Giroux’s discussion of the rhetoric of innocent children. The concept of innocence is paramount in anti-trafficking rhetoric and understanding Henry Giroux’s critical pedagogy elucidates the rhetoric of childhood innocence and facilitates the comprehension of its manipulation in the rhetoric of anti-trafficking. The third chapter also includes an analysis of the rhetoric of gender, or more specifically, the rhetoric of the vulnerable woman, which was supported by many sources including Betty Friedan, John Stuart Mill, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Aquinas and Aristotle. Aristotle, as a classic thinker provides some of the first recorded thoughts on gender, Aquinas infuses the construct of the vulnerable women with the idea of sexual purity; Roseau reasserts the necessity of man’s responsibility to train women while Mill champions equal rights and freedoms for women. Friedan challenges the concept of woman being typecast as a vulnerable vessel of virtue. Her insights challenge the basis of the rhetoric of gender and indicate resistance to the implications of the rhetoric of gender. In an effort to elucidate the American-Cuban ideological clash of national agendas displayed within the international palaver of human trafficking, the following analysis examines the rhetoric employed by representatives of both governments in the context of the palaver on human trafficking.

Classical Rhetoric

The United States and Cuba share a history of contempt for one another. It is difficult to say what exactly the initial source of conflict between the two is. Perhaps it stems from the ‘liberation’ of Cuba in the Spanish-American War which exchanged one imperial power for another; or it could be the nationalization of all properties, American and foreign-owned in 1960; or it could be the clash of Cuban and American popular political ideologies which only exacerbates the grievances between the two. These grievances are carried out in many fora. For example, in the dialogue regarding human trafficking George W. Bush called Fidel Castro a dictator that welcomes sex tourism while Castro explains that Bush is a recovering alcoholic that cannot even read at an adult level, and one can’t take the things he
says seriously.  

Taken out of their context, these comments may seem puerile, but they serve a useful function in rhetoric. In the aforementioned dialogue of human trafficking, the leaders of Cuba and the U.S. are perpetuating a practice that is over 2300 years old; rhetoric. By understanding the development of rhetoric one can more easily comprehend how and why the U.S. and Cuba use rhetoric to promote their national agendas.

The examination of the Classical roots of rhetoric reveals the fundamental components of rhetoric which have remained unchanged over hundreds of years. By understanding the development of rhetoric, especially the works of Aristotle, one can better understand the relationship of rhetoric to the culture of anti-trafficking in the contemporary area of international politics. Knowing the classic foundations of rhetoric facilitates identification of rhetorical forms seen most clearly in religious and moral based rhetoric.

Some of the earliest written works about rhetoric come from Gorgias, a popular orator from the Greek colony of Leontini and later Athens. He created arguments that show how rhetoric can strengthen the most absurd argument. In the classic *Encomium of Helen*, Gorgias playfully divests Helen of Troy from any responsibility for her eloping with Paris. In doing so Gorgias pontificates about words that form “inspired incantations”. These incantations, combinations of words, or metaphors persuaded and form some of first examples of written rhetoric. Gorgias fundamental idea of the construction of rhetoric still holds true today. By identifying the ‘inspired incantations’ of the Cuban and American speeches, I was informed of the orator’s perspective. Moreover, Gorgias’ basic premise of rhetoric aided me in identifying variation in word order which, in turn, changed the understanding of the text.

Not everyone appreciated Gorgias’ use of rhetoric. Plato condemned Gorgias the orator as a sophist and opportunist in a work entitled *Gorgias*, a fictional dialogue discussing rhetoric, philosophy, and poetry. The characters in this fabricated dialogue include Socrates, Callicles, Chaerephon, Gorgias and Polus. Using the character of Socrates, Plato condemns
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Gorgias’ rhetoric as a sophistry; “as self adornment is to gymnastic …so [Gorgias’] rhetoric is to justice”. In other words, rhetoric masquerades as justice in the same way that making one’s self beautiful creates a false appearance of health. Plato abhorred Gorgias’ apparent neglect of ideals, his “discursive wisdom” and his blatant profiteering (accepting fees for speaking engagements and training). Plato goes on to make a distinction between sophist rhetoric, “a base mob oratory” that instils belief and noble rhetoric, “the persistent effort to say what is best, whether it proves more or less pleasant to ones hearers”. Though identifying the distinction between sophist and noble rhetoric is subjective, the distinction indicates that rhetoric is a versatile tool of argument.

Aristotle, a student and contemporary of Plato, analyzed components of rhetorical arguments and emphasized proofs instead of relying on deception which the sophists allegedly did. Aristotle identified three different modes of persuasion; ethos, pathos, logos. Ethos refers to the personal character or credibility of the speaker which is very important. When two opponents both make strong arguments, often the ethos of a particular speaker can sway opinion. Pathos refers to the way that “we perceive and feel reality”; it appeals to the listener’s feelings and imagination. Appeals to pathos are intended to change the way the listener evaluates a concept, idea or event. An angry person will make different evaluations and subsequent decisions compared to a person in a happy or euphoric state. Finally, logos is an appeal to reason, or the logic that is employed to support a claim. Aristotle’s classification of types of rhetoric were useful in the Cuban-American human trafficking palaver because virtually every argument identified employed one or more of these methods of persuasion. In this palaver the identification of pathos ethos, and logos helped explain why the chosen metaphors were so effective with their targeted audiences.

An important component of communication, used throughout all the different modes of persuasion is the metaphor; orators of all description use metaphors frequently to express
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16 Plato, *Gorgias*, 453 503A.
ideas with their stamp of understanding. Aristotle described the metaphor as “the transference of a word of another significance either from genus to species, or from species to genus or from species to species or by analogy or proportion.”19 The most common metaphors are by analogy. For example, the twilight of youth refers to a concept of one’s life as a day. In “Rhetorica”, Aristotle reminds his audience that metaphors cannot “be far-fetched, or they will be difficult to grasp, nor obvious, or they will have no effect”.20

Metaphors are created to express many ideas condensed into a few words, In other words, metaphors are an attempt of man to create concepts; when these concepts are linked together and believed to be true, these form a worldview or a lens with which to understand and filter new information. If a new idea compliments our existing worldview we accept and integrate it. If it does not fit our network of understanding, it is discarded. In fact, some philosophers, such as Friedrich Nietzsche, argue that the attempt to translate data from our sensory preceptors into a functioning schema is the only thing that separates us from animals.21 Nietzsche further states that the “drive toward the formation of metaphors is the fundamental human drive, which one cannot for a single instant dispense with in thought, for one would thereby dispense with man himself”22. In other words, without this constant drive to understand, through the formation of metaphors, humanity would perish. Within the American-Cuban palaver regarding human trafficking, the construction and use of metaphors is very frequent. The plenitude of metaphors reflects a metaphysical impetus; the fundamental human desire to understand, while the construction of such metaphors reflects a keen awareness of the rhetorical value of such metaphors.

---

22 Nietzsche, *On Truth and lies in a Non-moral Sense*. 
CHAPTER 1: RELIGIOUS METAPHORS

American Religious Metaphors

Not surprisingly there are several types of metaphors and frameworks used in American and Cuban rhetoric regarding human trafficking. In this work metaphors are phrases that reflect and condense elements of religion, morals or values, and gender. Religious metaphors are those words or phrases that contain explicit or implicit references to ideas associated with organized religion. Moral metaphors refer to phrases that reflect value-based judgments while gender metaphors refer to phrases that illustrate the perceptions of men and women.

Groups of metaphors are often associated with different frameworks. Frameworks are abstract constructs that are often unconsciously employed by an individual to help filter and interpret information. In this chapter, religious metaphors and their rhetorical and political significance in relation to the religious framework and to the discussion about human trafficking dialogue between Cuba and the United States will be analyzed.

Religious metaphors and references are relatively common in the American texts related to human trafficking in Cuba while almost virtually non-existent in the Cuban texts about human trafficking and the United States. We begin with the primary American text for analysis, a speech delivered by George W. Bush in 2004 at the first National Human Trafficking Conference in Tampa Florida. This text illustrates religious framing and explicitly addresses human trafficking in Cuba.

Following the opening greetings and recognition of attendees, Bush singles out a volunteer who serves with Catholic Charities:

She (Lawn Pham) is a reminder that the greatest strength of this country is the heart and souls of our fellow citizens, people who are willing to help people who are hurt. Lawn is such an example. She is involved with the rescuing of innocent victims that have been brought here and have been harmed.23

The first religious metaphor used here is heart and soul. The pairing of these terms is very common throughout the Bible and in their contexts “heart and soul” refers to a total commitment to God, his edicts, or an action, not to the physical heart and psyche. The heart

represents “man's entire mental and moral activity, both the rational and the emotional elements”.24 The soul, known as nehpesh in Hebrew or psuche in Greek, refers to the sentient inextinguishable immaterial component of a person.25 Therefore, the individuals who are helping the innocent trafficking victims are portrayed as totally committed to the cause while simultaneously being patriotic because, the outflowing of their heart and soul is contributing to the “greatest strength of America”. Linking the helpful Americans with the portrayal of all trafficked persons as innocent victims creates an image of goodwill and thus illustrates the pathos component of rhetoric. The audience is imbued with good feelings about their fellow citizens.

Bush continues to elaborate on the strength of America:

You know, the great strength of America is the fact that we’ve got millions of our fellow citizens who heed a call to love their neighbors just like they’d like to be loved themselves. And Lawn is such a person.26

Bush indicates that a positive attribute, strength, is composed of many people who carry this philosophy of action. The “millions” indicate that this is not a small scale ideological stirring but rather a large expanding group. Though the idea of doing “good” to one’s neighbours is present in many religions the particular phrasing of this philosophy of action is nearly identical to the admonition to, “love your neighbour as yourself” which is found in at least nine places throughout the Bible.27 In addition, by phrasing this admonition as a “call” Bush’s language suggests that this is a duty. Those who have heeded the call are affirmed for their actions of fulfilling a duty, strengthening America, and conforming to a positive norm. This call has been given directly by God in the Old Testament and reaffirmed many times by Jesus Christ in the New Testament. Those who employ the biblical framing are implicitly commended for obeying this command.

The negative implication of this statement is that those who do not heed the call are keeping America from being its strongest, they are neglecting their duty and they will be outliers compared to the millions that are conforming. Moreover, the statement suggests that those who identify with the biblical framing and are not actively fighting human trafficking are not heeding a commandment and are falling short. In other words, they are guilty of a ‘sin of omission’; not doing something that they know is right. Continuing down the pathos line, this statement creates a positive feeling and the audience can empathize easily with this feeling when a face is put to the virtue. Regardless of the listener’s framework, the conclusion is that there are millions of Americans, like Pham, ‘being prompted by their ‘hearts and souls’ to help their neighbours. In heeding this call, they all contribute to the great strength of America.

Following the approbation, Bush refers to a concept associated with religion; evil:

You [that fight human trafficking] are in a fight against evil and the American people are grateful for your dedication and service.28

An examination of Bush’s other speeches delivered during his presidency yields a plethora of references to evil. Evil acts, according to Bush’s other speeches, include murder, hatred, bigotry, biological warfare, and depriving people of basic health care, education, and food. 29 It is important to note that Bush refers to communism as an evil ideology; an ideology which inspired the evil and hatred that led to “the deaths of tens of millions of people”.30 The quintessence of evil, according to these speeches, is the abuse of people. Given this definition, Bush has used the religious metaphor of fighting against evil to describe human trafficking as an abuse of sentient beings. Bush’s use of evil coincides with the concept of evil in the context of the religious framework including the dimension of action in regards to evil. Evil is regarded with obvious distaste in the Bible and is seen as something to be shunned, hated,

28 Bush, “President Announces Initiatives to Combat human Trafficking” July 16, 2004
purged of, and disposed of. Likewise, Bush speaks of evil as something to be fought and eradicated.\textsuperscript{31}

Certainly, with the religious framework in mind, fighting against evil is perceived as a noble endeavour. Those that “fight” against human trafficking are following the religious exhortations to purge and dispose of evil. Even if one does not hold this religious framework in mind, stopping the abuse of others is an admirable pursuit. Bush goes on to thank these fighters for their dedication and service. Those who subscribe to the religious framework receive positive reinforcement twofold for fighting trafficking. First, there is the President’s thanks on behalf of the American people, and secondly the implicit recognition that they are obeying biblical exhortations. This religious metaphor portrays the fight against human trafficking as a God-given mandate (based on the beliefs that God is all good and that God detests evil) while implying that those associated with trafficking are an evil to be eradicated. Consequently, those that oppose the fight against trafficking are facilitating an evil practice. Delivering thanks on behalf of the people of America suggests that all Americans view human trafficking in the same way and consequently this projection of common belief serves as a force to unify the people.

After labelling trafficking as an unwanted evil in society, Bush is obligated to explain why trafficking is evil and once again he uses religious metaphors, the offspring of his religious framework.

\begin{quote}
Human life is the gift of our Creator -- and it should never be for sale. It takes a special type of depravity to exploit and hurt the most vulnerable members of society.\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

The declaration of “human life as a gift of the Creator” reminds the listener that human life is not something that mankind can arbitrarily create and destroy; it is something that should be preserved and honoured. Moreover, by assumption of the belief in a common Creator, Bush projects his belief of a universal bond upon all people. These assumed commonalities facilitate further group cohesion and support for the rhetorician. In addition, declaring that life is not something to be sold resonates with the listeners who understand the religious

\textsuperscript{31} Proverbs 3:7, Romans 12:9, Deuteronomy 24:7, & James 1:21 (NIV).
framework. Indeed, the Bible indicates that man has been made in God’s image; therefore by debasing and abusing others, His image is being desecrated. Given the previous points, the listener understands that trafficking is evil and that “selling” lives is despicable because traffickers both profit from evil and perpetuate evil.

Distinguishing this depravity from other types of depravity indicates a belief in some kind of hierarchy of moral deficiencies. In the religious framework it would be viewed as a special type of sin or evil. Exploiting the vulnerable (widows and orphans) is condemned across many religions and there are multiple indicators of a hierarchy of corruption or sin across Catholicism and Protestantism. Evidence of this belief in Catholicism includes the concepts of confession and penance. In addition, religious themed literature also reflects this idea. In the classic Dante’s Inferno there are nine circles of hell with the first and largest being the most benign waiting area for those in limbo, who have not yet been reconciled to God. Conversely, the ninth circle, bordering the centre where Lucifer dwells, is the most severe; reserved for the sin of betrayal. Though there is no official uniform theology of Protestantism the hierarchy of depravity is emphasized less but it still exists. The Bible clearly states that all people are depraved (have sinned). In the teaching about the sins of apostasy and blasphemy, blasphemy is referred to as the unforgiveable sin, which reinforces the notion of a hierarchy of depravity. By drawing on the rich religious ideological tradition of ranking sin, labelling human traffickers as especially depraved or corrupt serves several purposes. First, it polarizes the groups into those that are especially depraved (traffickers) and those that aren’t. Secondly, while the trafficking fighters were commended earlier in the speech, this statement places the group of non-traffickers and trafficking-fighters on a less depraved or more righteous level. Finally, categorizing the traffickers as more depraved or corrupt justifies unspecified actions that may be taken against them in the future.

33 Genesis 1.27.
34 Job 24:3, James 1:27 (NIV); An-Niia, 4:2-3 for example.
This statement illustrates two methods of persuasion; pathos and logos. The pathos is seen in the linking the sale of human beings to the concepts of depravity exploitation and an implicit disregard for the Creator. Disregard for both created and Creator certainly arouses emotion, likely anger against the unjust treatment of the unprotected. The logos of this particular discourse is quite plain. Human life is a gift of a Supreme deity. Those who capitalize on and commercialize this gift are especially depraved. Therefore human traffickers are especially depraved. The special depravity of traffickers suggests that these individuals spurn or anger the Creator more than other wrongdoers. According to this argument, since it ‘takes’ a special depravity or capacity to exploit innocent people, this depravity is a pre-existing condition, which, as stated above, lends credence to any future actions that might be taken against these exploiters.

Later in this speech, George W. Bush identifies Cuba as a country that accepts depraved perpetrators in human trafficking.

We also face a problem only 90 miles off our shores, where the regime of Fidel Castro has turned Cuba into a major destination for sex tourism….the dictator welcomes sex tourism.38

In addition, Bush comments that Cuba has also become a choice destination for pedophiles. In the human trafficking literature, sexual exploitation, including but not limited to sex tourism and prostitution, is linked with human trafficking and migration.39 Therefore the Cuban “dictator”, Fidel Castro at the time of this speech, and his government is charged with facilitating human trafficking. Consequently, according to Bush, the religious framework, and the religious metaphors that were employed earlier, the Cuban government is ignoring the needs of its people and allowing innocent people to be victimized. In addition, use of these religious metaphors implies that the government of Cuba is especially depraved because it welcomes the income human trafficking provides. Moreover, the Cuban government, by tacitly approving of such exploitation, is a manifestation of the ‘evil’ that must be fought.

Former President George W. Bush is not the only one to deal with human trafficking using religious metaphors. Attorney General John Ashcroft, at the same conference commented that the term human trafficking does not capture the “unique evil that is the making of our fellow man into a commodity”. Ashcroft’s religious metaphor of a “unique evil” reiterates and reinforces Bush’s comment of a special depravity. Ashcroft has the following to say about freedom:

He [President Lincoln] understood that the freedom that is endowed by our Creator, and which no man has a right to hinder or abuse, is the most transformative force in human history.41 In this statement, Ashcroft argues that freedom is a transformative force, a God-given gift. Therefore, any abuse or hindrances are a violation of this freedom and as such, are an offence against the gift giver, God. Accordingly, the pathos of this statement arouses the listener’s ire against those who block or prevent the full exercise of freedom that is ‘endowed by our Creator’. Interestingly, the conceptual freedom that is talked about throughout the Bible does not refer to one’s own “rights” but rather to a personal freedom, that is, freedom from the bondage of sin.42 In the Bible people are generally admonished to care for one another and to pursue justice but there is no mention of man’s freedom as such. However, the projection of man’s freedom as an inalienable God-given right remains deeply embedded within the psyche of the American people. It emerges in dialogue across parties and across time.

President Barrack Obama stated, while he was a Senator, that he believes in the power of religious tradition to fight for freedom and spur “social change”.

And in its [the Church’s] historical struggles for freedom and the rights of man, I was able to see faith as more than just a comfort to the weary or a hedge against death, but rather as an active, palpable agent in the world; as a source of hope.43

42 For example, Galatians 3:22-24 (NIV)
Obama identifies the power of the church to initiate social change in the pursuit of freedom. Freedom is portrayed as a value which the church has always pursued. The pathos of this passage appeals to a sense of pride in the past. The church actively fights for freedom. It follows that if the church has fought for freedom in the past it will also do so in the future. Moreover, in other addresses Obama frequently mentions the oppressiveness that the Cuban people are suffering under. In a speech entitled “Renewing Leadership in America”, Obama declares:

Throughout my entire life, there has been injustice in Cuba. Never, in my lifetime, have the people of Cuba known freedom. Never, in the lives of two generations of Cubans, have the people of Cuba known democracy.44

Obama’s association of freedom, faith, and religion has been made clear earlier. It is obvious in this speech that Cubans are presented as an enslaved people, a people who are not free. Those who subscribe to, and identify with, a religious framework believe a place and people without justice and without freedom are a place and people that must be liberated. It is interesting to note that Obama mentions that two generations of Cubans have not known democracy when in reality Cuba is the closest to democracy now and in the past two generations than it has ever been in a prior period. An examination of Cuba’s history shows that they were controlled by the Spaniards, the Americans, and then endured the Batista police state before Fidel Castro’s revolution.45 Nevertheless, Obama, through his two addresses, has tied justice, freedom, and democracy to a religious framework. Therefore, to those who comprehend the religious framework, the call of liberty is more than a man calling for their freedom, it appears as a mandate from God.

Former President George W. Bush shares the sentiments of Barack Obama in regards to freedom and Cuba. At an address to the United States Chamber of Commerce Bush commented that America’s commitment to freedom was being tried in Cuba and that “liberty

is both the plan of heaven for humanity, and the best hope for progress here on earth."  
Freedom and democracy for Cubans, the American objective, is being pedaled as God’s mission for the betterment of humanity.

Freedom is not only associated with God but it also is a god-term. Kenneth Burke defines god-terms as terms which “sum up a manifold of particulars under a certain head”. In this case the god-term ‘freedom’ also represents the whole ideology of democracy. In an adaptation of Burke’s example given in Rhetoric of Motives, it is as if both Bush, Obama, and other representatives of the US government believe freedom is the “pure abstraction” of democracy; “as though it were pure divinity that came down to earth and took this particular [political system of governance] as its bodily form”. The pursuit of the sacrosanct god-term ‘freedom’ justifies a multitude of actions; actions that may be interpreted as the product of hegemony. These actions will be discussed in the next chapter on moral metaphors.

Presidential religious rhetoric, the presidential use of god-terms and other religious elements has been subject to examination by several scholars. Presidential religious rhetoric, according to Wade Clark Roof, a sociologist, falls into one of two broad categories, priestly or prophetic. “Priestly rhetoric blesses America as a chosen nation with a special mission to fulfill and legitimate its actions (while)...prophetic rhetoric calls the country into question when it fails to live up to its own ethical ideals”. Traditionally American Republican presidents tend to employ priestly religious rhetoric while their Democratic counterparts prefer prophetic religious rhetoric. In the dialogue about Cuba in relation to human trafficking, and freedom both George W. Bush and Barack Obama employ priestly rhetoric.

George Bush frequently uses religious metaphors across many topics of speech while Obama seems more reserved in the frequency of his use of religious terms. However, both recognize the importance of using religious metaphors. To not use religious metaphors in
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some capacity constitutes a failure to reach a significant segment of the population. Barack Obama summarizes this thought succinctly:

We cannot abandon the field of religious discourse, … if we scrub language of all religious content, we forfeit the imagery and terminology through which millions of Americans understand both their personal morality and social justice. 50

It is patently clear that Bush, through frequent use of religious terminology, and Obama, through outright declaration, both believe that the use of religious terminology is indispensable. By linking religious discourse to the function of understanding, Obama, like Bush, endorses the notion of a religious framework.

**Effectiveness of Religious Metaphors**

The prevalence of religious metaphors in both Republican and Democratic speeches about human trafficking, freedom, and Cuba beg the question as to why their use is effective. George Lakoff, a prominent cognitive linguist posits that Americans understand their country as a prototype of the family. Envisioning the state as a family is a concept that can be traced to Aristotelian thought. Aristotle posited that familial exchanges and power hierarchies are replicated in government. 51 Moreover, he concluded that the state was born of a “union of families and villages in perfect self-sufficient life, by which we mean a happy and honourable life”. 52 If the family is the building unit of the state and familiar interactions and conditions are replicated within a state it seems logical to use familial terms to describe the state. Indeed with terms such as “founding fathers”, “daughters of the American revolution”, “sons of freedom” and Uncle Sam it is reasonable to assume that Americans view their nation as some sort of family. 53

Lakoff identifies two types of parenting systems, the Strict Father and the Nurturant Parent. In the Strict Father system the father is:

51 Aristotle Politics Book I, Sections II & IX.
52 Aristotle Politics Book III, Section IX.
The moral authority, and the master of the household, who dominates the mother and children and imposes needed discipline. Contemporary conservative politics turn these family values into political values; hierarchical authority, individual discipline, military might.…

Conversely,

The strong nurturant parent is protective and caring, builds trust and connection, promotes family happiness and fulfillment, fairness, freedom, openness, cooperation, and community development. These are the values of strong progressive politics.54

The nation as a family metaphor “links conservative and liberal worldviews to family based moralities (and) projects the Strict Father and Nurturant Parent moral systems onto politics to form the conservative and liberal political worldviews”.55 It is important to note that family values are projected or transformed into political values. Religious values, upon which a religious framework and religious metaphors are based, are not exclusive to conservative or liberal politics.56 The religious metaphors that Bush, Ashcroft, and Obama used in their discourses about Cuba and human trafficking appeal to values of both liberals and conservatives.

Bush mentions that the great strengths of America are the hearts and souls of Americans, which compel them to love their neighbours as themselves and to help the wounded innocent victims.57 The phrasing appeals to the values of protection and caring, which are commonly associated with what George Lakoff calls “progressive politics”. Bush commends those that are fighting against evil (human trafficking) and thanks them on behalf of the country for their service and dedication. The practice of fighting evil appeals to conservative notions of justice (discipline) and hierarchy (discipliner and the disciplined) while service and dedication connotes individual self-discipline which also resonates strongly with the conservative audience.

54 Lakoff, 47-48.
56 The terms conservative and liberal are used instead of Republican /Democrat because the author views the former as being more inclusive and applicable to the international audience.
Bush also promotes human life as an invaluable gift of the Creator that should not be sold and condemns those that exploit others as especially depraved. The elements of this statement that reach both sides of the political spectrum include hierarchy, protection, and fairness. The reference to hierarchy includes the notion of an omnipotent deity who bestows gifts. As has been mentioned earlier, to profit from the commoditization of humanity who has been made in the Creator’s image sullies the image, and defies the authority of the Creator. The protection and fairness values are simultaneously appealed to through the notion that the intrinsic value of a human is not something to lay a price on and the implied protection that is needed to prevent this.

Ashcroft reiterates this theme with a slight variation. He claims that freedom is a gift from the Creator that no person has a right to trifle with. Freedom is a nebulous term that appeals to people on all parts of the political spectrum. Those who are more liberal tend to associate freedom with civil liberties, human rights, and equality while those who have more traditional or conservative views tend to support individual liberty. If a group of people is not free then the implication is that they are oppressed or enslaved in some manner. In this speech Ashcroft clearly is referring to trafficked people as having their freedom hindered and abused. This is an extremely effective religious metaphor to identify freedom as God’s gift because the differing concepts of freedom allow each person along the political spectrum to assume the freedom they are hearing about refers to their own definition of freedom.

Indeed, politicians across the spectrum, extremes and moderates, all use the politics of freedom. Bush pontificates on Cuban freedom in his 2008 state of the union address and we have also seen that Obama is no stranger to combining religion and freedom while promulgating freedom for Cubans either. Obama identifies the church and faith as an “active palpable agent” that struggles for rights and freedoms. By linking faith, religion and freedom, Obama continues in the religious metaphorical footsteps of his Republican predecessor.

58 George W. Bush, “President Announces Initiatives to Combat Human Trafficking”, July 16, 2004
According to Lakoff, there are thematic words that conservatives and progressives tend to repeat often within their discourses. As with Ashcroft, Obama associates freedom with religion and uses words associated with conservative and progressive values. Obama refers to the rights of man and comfort (care) in his “Call to Renewal” speech which caters to the progressive audience. Then, in his speech on “Renewing U.S. Leadership”, Obama appeals to the conservative population by focusing on a lack of justice and freedom in Cuba. According to Lakoff, conservatives are willing to fight ruthlessly against the forces they view as evil and those that are oppressive and unjust are definitely seen as evil.

It has just been shown that the use of religious framework and religious metaphors are effective because the metaphors appeal to different religious beliefs that are emphasized on different points on the political spectrum. There was one obvious exception, the shared value of freedom. The nebulous definition of freedom allows conservative and liberal speakers to effectively employ this term both while they are on the stump and while in office. The rich American history is the counterpart to religious values in terms of explaining the effectiveness of religious metaphors and a religious framework.

The first significant migrations to America were undertaken by people groups fleeing political, religious, or economic forms of oppression. Since the impetuses for migration to the U.S. were diverse, a variety of ethnic and religious populations coexisted in this “new” land. Lutherans, Catholics, Puritans, Anglicans and Huguenots, to name a few, migrated from Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, Britain and other countries to pursue a new ‘freer’ life. Given the vast array of nationalities and beliefs, religious pluralism was prevalent. It is no surprise that religious culture was an intrinsic part of the creation of what is now the United States of America. Jon Meacham, in *American Gospel: God, the Founding Fathers, and the Making of a Nation*, makes it patently clear that the founders of the U.S. “lived in and consciously bequeathed a culture shaped and sustained by public religion, one that was not Christian or Jewish or Muslim or Buddhist but was simply transcendent, with reverence for the ‘Creator’ and for ‘Nature’s God’.

---

64 See pg 12 of this text for the full quotes.
Though the founding fathers of the US made it clear that they did not want to replicate the model of European entities which promoted state religions, religious references and metaphors persisted throughout history. Nineteenth century politicians such as Daniel Webster created a sacrosanct account of the establishment of the U.S. infused with religious metaphors. Webster, who served as a Senator and Secretary of State, claimed that the immigrant’s “Cultivated mind was to act on uncultivated nature; and, more than all, a government and a country were to commence, with the very first foundations laid under the divine light of the Christian religion”. Such accounts emphasize the religious influences but minimize the myriad other factors that necessitated the formation of the government and consequent country. The presidents of the 20th century have honoured the founding principle of keeping the state separate from the church but the impact of the religious heritage of the American forefathers still resounds throughout the speeches of contemporary politicians. In recent history religious metaphors and references are present in the speeches of Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter, Lyndon B Johnson, George H. W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Barack Obama. From this brief glimpse of American history it is evident that religious themes and metaphors have been engrained within the American populous since the inception of their government.

Despite the fact that many of the first emigrants to America were fleeing religious persecution and oppression, many of the countries from which they fled maintain a religious element. In fact, as of 2000 there were at least 58 countries that maintained a state religion. Of these countries identified, 90% of their governments promote religions that endorse a deity as Creator, the principles of loving ones neighbour, and justice for the defenceless. This shared understanding of the same beliefs allows citizens of many other countries to understand and identify with what is being said. This does not mean that citizens of these countries agree with every speech, declaration or article that employs religious metaphors. It merely means
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that citizens of these countries are more likely to understand the religious metaphors and references. In addition, there are countries with strong religious traditions that currently have no official state religions such as Japan, China, Russia, and Canada. Since the influence of religion has not been washed away by time, the religious metaphors used remain effective for significant portions of the international audience as well.

The speeches by Bush and Ashcroft were delivered at the National Conference to Combat Human Trafficking but were definitely noticed abroad. Perhaps most importantly, Cuba noticed this address. The day after it was delivered, many headlines in the Cuban media clamoured about Bush’s speech. The Cuban Ministry of Foreign affairs, Minrex, and the National News Agency of Cuba (AIN) posted articles in English that made it very clear they had heard Bush’s speech and did not approve. Moreover, Fidel Castro responded in a July 26th speech suggesting that President Bush’s alcoholism between the ages of 20 and 40 compromised his academic acumen and gave rise to these “inconceibibles e irresponsables afirmaciones por parte del Presidente de la potencia más poderosa del planeta”. It is patently clear that local speeches, such as Castro’s, demonstrate the simultaneous delivery of a message to an international audience, which in this case, is the US.

Cuba and the Absence of Religious Metaphor

It has been demonstrated that religious metaphors that are based on a religious framework have been very beneficial for the American representatives that speak about human trafficking, Cuba, and freedom. In the Cuban speeches regarding human trafficking there are plenty of references to human trafficking in America but virtually no use of religious metaphors or evidence of a religious framework. This is not to say that the Cuban government is not conscious of the potential of religious forces. Both Raul and Fidel Castro were Catholics in their youth and were educated for some time at La Salle, a Christian Brothers School. However, before Fidel was a teenager, their family was told to withdraw the brothers
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from the school because of the brothers’ unruly behaviour. Later in life Fidel Castro clearly viewed religion as a tool, as a means to an end, if it is effective. For example, Castro spoke at great length with Frei Betto, a Brazilian liberation theologian. In their discourse, it becomes apparent that Castro believes that religion has a plethora of forms. He states that religion and socialism are closely related and promoted the idea of an alliance. However, the “religion of the landowners” was problematic and was not aligned with the goals of socialism.

The socialism promoted by Castro is based upon Karl Marx’s writings. Generally Marx seems to be disillusioned with religion. As a child, Karl Marx’s father switched from Judaism to Lutheranism to “enjoy the practical social benefits afforded by such ‘emancipation’. It appears that Karl’s father had no deep attachment to a specific religion and treated religion as a means to maintain a comfortable lifestyle. Marx’s distaste for religion is illustrated in an 1843 essay titled “The Jewish Question”. Marx claims that the Jewish religion is practical need and egoism, and the “god of practical need and self-interest is money”. Marx goes on to argue that money, “the estranged essence of man’s work”, commodifies all the gods of man, enslaves the man, and the man worships it. So it appears that Marx is disillusioned with the Jewish religions propensity to commodify all of life.

Religion in Marx’s eyes is a man made construct. In his infamous quote Marx states that:

The wretchedness of religion is at once an expression of and a protest against real wretchedness. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is a demand for their true happiness. The call to abandon illusions about their condition is the call abandon condition which requires illusions.

In other words, the call to eliminate religion, a man-made construct created to cope with despair and poor living conditions, is a call to eliminate the conditions that make such a coping mechanism necessary.

---

74 Karl Marx, “The Jewish Question” (Braunschweig 1843) <http://marx.eserver.org/1844-jewish.question.txt> (30 March 2010).
75 Marx, *Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, 131.
Fidel may very well been driven by the same disillusionment with religion and the conditions Cubans had been living in under the Batista regime, the Americans and the Spanish. In Cuba, religion also represented foreign powers; the Catholic Church supported Spain during the Cuban independence wars while the Protestant Churches were closely tied to the United States.\textsuperscript{76} Crisis tends to draw people to religion and those that were socializing in religious circles exhibited great animosity towards Marxism. Therefore organized religion was a threat to the revolution. The new government, established by the Castro-led revolution, monitored and restricted “outdoor processions and religious instruction”. In addition, church officials were subjected to travel restrictions and over 400 religious based schools and buildings were seized and nationalized.\textsuperscript{77}

The history of unpleasant interactions with religion has changed the vocabulary of Cuban rhetoric. Considering this history, it is not surprising that religious metaphors and a religious framework are not employed in the Cuban discussion of human trafficking. In fact, Fidel claims that George W. Bush’s religious fundamentalism causes Bush to view things as absolute truths despite contradictory “los datos, los argumentos, las verdades, los razonamientos, [y] las realidades”.\textsuperscript{78} Castro continues:

Ojalá que, en el caso de Cuba, Dios no quiera "dar instrucciones" al señor Bush de atacar a nuestro país, y lo induzca más bien a evitar ese colosal error! Él debería cerciorarse de la autenticidad de cualquier mandato bélico divino, consultándolo con el Papa y otros prestigiosos dignatarios y teólogos de las iglesias cristianas, preguntándoles qué opinan.\textsuperscript{79}

Castro makes light of the religious framework and metaphors that have been used throughout Bush’s speech about human trafficking as well as other speeches. The use of humour here discredits the American position by treating the manipulation of religious elements with veiled contempt. Indeed, Castro also brings the divine to the human level with a human check of power on the divine ordinance that may come. Further, the reference to the human religious

\textsuperscript{76} Margaret E. Crahan, "Salvation Through Christ or Marx: Religion in Revolutionary Cuba,” \textit{Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs} 21, no.1 (1979), 158-184.


\textsuperscript{79}“Hopefully, in the case of Cuba, God does not ‘instruct’ Mr. Bush to attack our country but that he rather inspires him to avoid this colossal mistake! He had better check on any divine belligerent order by consulting the Pope and other prestigious dignitaries and theologians of the Christian churches, asking them for their opinion” \textit{Ibid}. 
authorities reinforces Marx and Castro’s view of religion as a man–made construct. Castro contrasts this humanizing of future hypothetical divine directives with the Cuban decision making policy based on hard facts and evidence. Castro’s anti-religious rhetoric and his belittling of the religious rhetoric and framework employed by Bush, implies that the Cuban government makes rational decisions while the representatives of the U.S. Government rely on irrational impulses. Elements of religious rhetoric appeal to American conservative and progressive audiences while the absence of religious rhetoric and the smattering of Cuban anti-religious rhetoric reflect the history and prevailing ideology of the Cuban government.

This chapter has shown that representatives of the American government use religious metaphors to appeal to both progressives and conservatives. The religious metaphors employed described the attributes of good Americans who were fighting the evil of human trafficking in order to preserve the divinely endowed gifts of life and freedom. Moreover, the religious metaphors implied that the members of the Cuban government were depraved because they allegedly devalued the free gift of life by profiting from abuses. Conversely, the Cuban representatives avoided using religious metaphors in the Cuban American palaver on human trafficking. In fact, due to several influences, religion was discredited and dismissed as an unreliable basis for making decisions. Despite the criticism of religion, Cuban representatives did not hesitate to make moral evaluations and employ moral metaphors. The value-based metaphors of both Cuban and American representatives will be examined in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 2: MORAL METAPHORS AND FRAMEWORK

Cuban Moral Metaphors

When the Cuban revolution succeeded, the Castro government created what David E. Apter identifies as political religion. Political religion replaces the function of ‘normal religion’ by “identify[ing] the individual with the state” instead of with a religion. Apter elaborates:

Modern political leaders come to recognize quickly...that no ordinary ideology can prevail for long in the face of obvious discrepancies between theory and practice. A more powerful symbolic force, less rational, although it may include rational ends, seems necessary to them. This force is what I call political religion. It feeds its own categorical imperatives into authoritarian political structure on the one hand. On the other...it affects the most fundamental needs of individuals by specifying through the state religion the permissible definitions of individual continuity, meaning, and identity.80

Perhaps most significantly, the Cuban political religion was and is an “affective discourse; [that] touches people directly as it deals with issues of immediacy couched in moral language”.81 In other words, in Cuba, the state replaced the church as the predominant moral authority. Resistance from the institution of the church, especially the Catholic Church, quickly diminished as significant portions of the religious fled Cuba. Shortly after 1959 approximately “70% of the Catholic priests and 90% of the Catholic religious [missionaries] together with 50% or better of the protestant clerical and lay leaders” left Cuba.82 This exodus increased the willingness of the people to more readily accept the moral language and edicts that were delivered by the new government. Though there has been a trend of relaxing religious restrictions in the early 1990’s, the speeches delivered by Cuban state representatives still remain free of religious elements. The Cuban rhetoricians, however, consistently use language that reflects moral elements. According to Fernández, political religion was most prevalent from 1959-1961, when it was used extensively to condemn Batista, “consolidate Fidel Castro’s leadership… and shape the principal features of a new regime”.83

82 Crahan, 161, 162.
83 Fernández, 63.
metaphors employed in Cuban speeches regarding human trafficking and the U.S. have been somewhat muted over the decades but they still echo the sentiments of the political religion that burst on to the Cuban political scene in 1959.

Ileana Núñez Mordoche, Cuba’s UN representative, begins her speech by condemning human trafficking. According to Mordoche, human trafficking is a

Contemporary and abhorrent form of slavery whereby the human being is utterly degraded, violating its most basic rights…[and] Cuba has a long and honorable record in the promotion and protection of all human rights for all.84

Like Bush, Ashcroft, and Obama, in their speeches about human trafficking, the first thing Mordoche does in her speech is establish the wretchedness of human trafficking. Identifying trafficking as a contemporary and abhorrent form of slavery is an evaluative statement. This current form of slavery is particularly repugnant because it completely degrades the human and violates the most basic rights. The description of slavery brings out the differences between human trafficking and the ideal moral values of the Cuban state in clear relief. The listener is informed that, according to this discourse, Cuba disapproves of human degradation and approves of protecting and promoting human rights.

The metaphor of basic human rights is, at once, familiar and complex. Firstly, this metaphor implies that all people have rights equally which in turn implies that there is an overarching moral set of values that all people are subject to. The philosophical roots of the idea of a set of inviolable human rights can be traced to the period of Enlightenment, when values such as freedom, representative government and reason were extolled. Given the location of the delivery, the General Assembly of the UN, it is likely that the touchstone for such human rights is the Universal Declaration of Human rights. Therefore, the term ‘basic human rights’ represents, at the least, a document composed of 30 articles in which the first three focus on freedom, dignity and liberty, while the fourth article expressly forbids slavery, slave trading and servitude.85 Makau Mutua, a leading figure in the human rights field, further posits that the term ‘human rights’ contains a savage-victim-saviour construction within which

each of these components is a metaphor itself. By invoking the moral metaphor of basic human rights, Mordoche establishes Cuba’s moral position in regards to human trafficking. In this case the victims are those who are trafficked, the savages are the traffickers and the saviour is Cuba, the acclaimed protector of human rights.

Mordoche has begun her statement with an appeal to pathos. By capitalizing on a common evil, the condemnation of trafficking, she builds rapport with her audience. Murray Edelman, a political scientist, promulgates the notion that the construction of the political opponent serves to “renew the actors own commitment and mobilize allies”. In this case the political opponent has not been identified yet but the construction of a moral nemesis has a similar effect. The die is cast for the opponent to be one that permits or promotes human trafficking and the subsequent human degradation and rights violations. The roots of this rhetorical device can be traced to Aristotle. Aristotle postulated that in the accusatory line of reasoning one must show that the offence was planned with extraordinary intent and the “errors committed by one’s opponents must be amplified”. In this case the effects of the errors have been identified, but the listener has yet to hear about the extraordinary intent with which the opponent planned them. Mordoche’s condemnation of human trafficking on Cuba’s behalf indicates that Cuba supports the integrity of the person and that the rights of an individual should be protected, especially the individual’s basic rights. Therefore, any actor that facilitates human trafficking degrades the person and is a human rights violator.

Mordoche continues her discourse and begins to describe some of the root causes of human trafficking:

The roots of human trafficking lie in underdevelopment and poverty. This dreadful reality brings about that many people, attempting to migrate to improve their working and living conditions are deceived and enslaved by the traffickers.

Since Mordoche has established that human trafficking is a morally unacceptable phenomenon, the identification of underdevelopment and poverty as a root cause of human trafficking suggests that underdevelopment and poverty are also morally wrong because they are the

---

88 Aristotle, Rhetorica Book IV, 1426b.
89 Mordoche, “Thematic Discussion of the General Assembly on Human Trafficking” (3 June 2008).
impetuses for attempted migration which often leads to human trafficking. The term underdevelopment is arguably used as a morally infused metaphor; in some ways similar to the use of human rights. The term underdevelopment creates a hierarchy in the listeners mind. Since underdevelopment exists, there must be a benchmark or a standard of being developed. Consequently, a basic standard of development exists, and all other units of development (individuals, communities, or nations) can be compared to this standard. If the hierarchy of development was a natural acceptable state of affairs then this would be a moot point. However, since underdevelopment (inequality) is viewed as a morally unacceptable phenomenon the state of development inequality must be the issue.

The physical and conceptual link of poverty to underdevelopment in the speech and ideology suggests a discrepancy in the quality of human life, especially economic equality. It is implied that those that are at the highest level of development have a moral obligation to help those at a lower level. Mordoche emphasizes the detrimental effects of underdevelopment further; human trafficking is

Boosted by the existence of more than 2.1 billion people under extreme poverty who live basically in developing countries; more than 850 million hungry whose number will grow from the crisis of food prices and more than 800 million adult illiterate.90

The repeated reference to extreme poverty and underdevelopment suggest that these people located in developing countries are in a position of need. Consequently, developed countries, which are in a position to provide assistance, in addition to having a moral responsibility, hold a certain power over the developing countries and their citizens.

The Cuban use of the moral value infused metaphor of underdevelopment is convenient and clever because it is nebulous enough to allow the listener to interpret the meaning of it within their own framework, but narrow enough to encourage broad agreement with the premise of the argument. The implicit reference to the value of equality, coupled with mentioning the hungry and illiterate appeals to pathos.

Mordoche established that extreme inequality drives people to a point where they are drawn into the vortex of trafficking. She then proceeds to elucidate the causes of the demand for trafficked persons:

90Ibid..
From the opulent side of the world come factors that encourage and impose at the same time human trafficking. The industrialized countries are the main destination of this trafficking, because, due to banal and stereotyped consumption patterns, as well as their high and exaggerated income based on the neoliberal globalization, that benefit them, they promote the sex industry and the increasing demand for women, girl children and boy children for this purpose; the consumption of sex tourism and pornography, including child pornography, and the use of the internet to facilitate all kinds of exploitation of this sort; the sale of children and their organs; and servitude.91

Labelling destination countries in the moral laden term of the “opulent side of the world” serves two purposes. First, it reinforces the unjust hierarchy of development versus underdevelopment by contrasting opulence with underdevelopment, illiteracy and poverty. Secondly, it suggests that the residents of destination countries live ostentatiously which is frowned upon by the Cuban government. For example, in addition to castigating inflated payrolls, Raul Castro, in a speech about the ideological and economic struggle to preserve the social system, said:

“sin eliminar gastos superfluos y el derroche, no se podrá avanzar en la elevación del nivel de vida de la población, ni será posible mantener y mejorar los elevados niveles alcanzados en la educación y la salud que gratuitamente se garantizan a todos los ciudadanos”92

Therefore, opulence is a negative moral metaphor because it represents a stratified society as well as a gross lack of self-control.

Mordoche states that excessive incomes based on neoliberal globalization lead to banal and stereotyped consumption patterns. Neoliberal globalization is therefore the root cause of opulence. Like the prior use of underdevelopment, in this context neoliberal globalism is presented as a term infused with moral values. Indeed, neoliberal globalization is a newer term for the dependency theories’ essential nature; the development of underdevelopment. The development of underdevelopment, a phrase coined by André Gunder Frank refers to the “expropriation of economic surplus from the many and its appropriation by

91 Mordoche, “Thematic Discussion of the General Assembly on Human Trafficking” (3 June 2008).
92 “without eliminating superfluous spending and waste, it will neither be possible to raise the living standards of the population, nor will it be possible to maintain and improve the high standards achieved in education and free health care guaranteed to all citizens.” Raul Castro, “Clausura del IX Congreso de la Unión de Jóvenes Comunistas “, Havana, 4 April 2010. <http://www.cuba.cu/gobierno/rauldiscursos/2010/esp/r030410e.html> (15 April 2010).
the few”.93 In other words, the developed countries are responsible for the underdeveloped condition(s) of the developing countries.

The implied lack of self discipline and moral acumen in the developed countries is reflected in the phrases “promotion of sex industry, consumption of sex tourism and pornography”. The phrases “promotion of sex industry” and “sex tourism” connote images of economic development which suggest profiting from exploitation of the most physically intimate act, sex. The Cuban leaders frown upon this exploitation and deny the existence of sex tourism in Cuba. Castro indicates that regular tourism was allowed as an economic necessity and, in a speech in the Asamblea Nacional del Poder Popular (ANPP), that there is no tourism cleaner than Cuba’s. He goes on to say that “There are no women forced to sell themselves to a man, to a foreigner, to a tourist. Those who do so, do it on their own, voluntarily, and without any need for it”94. In this case, the moral indignation about the sex trade is not that sexual exchanges occur outside of conventional institutes but rather that people are being forced into it against their will. The same is true about pornography. There is not an overt concern that pornography “imposes a fixed meaning on sexual practice and identity, turning women (and children) into objects” for pleasure.95 The concern again is that the production and consumption of pornography leads to non-consensual use of people and their bodies.

The morally loaded metaphors of sex industry and pornography are somewhat sensational and used well. For example, the commercialization of sexuality garners much more support and attention than the plight of tomato pickers in industrial agriculture. Even the United Nations Global Report on Trafficking in Persons indicates that there is an “over-representation of sexually exploited women”.96 By mentioning exploitation in the sex industry, the lack of consent appeals to the secular audience who consider themselves morally astute while those with religious sentiments almost certainly condemn the whole existence of the sex industry based on their views of the purpose and place of sex. This identification of sex
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industry is therefore, a tremendous illustration of pathos in this statement. Pathos is capitalized on yet again with the mention of children as slaves or a source for organ harvesters. Since childhood innocence is a “deeply entrenched value considered inherent in the child”\(^97\), the violation and exploitation of this innocence is viewed as being particularly perverted.

The logos of this argument, that the sex industry in developed countries is nurtured by moral deficiency in developed countries, is rooted in dependency theory. In dependency theory the periphery is plundered of its resources which develops the core and perpetuates underdevelopment in the periphery.\(^98\) It is implied in Mordoche’s speech that, in the same way, citizens of industrialized countries are plundering the poor countries of their human capital in a despicable way by their insatiable appetite for experiences related to the sex industry. This plundering or consumption has fed the practice of human trafficking. Just as all trafficked persons were unilaterally categorized as victims, all citizens of countries with neoliberal philosophies and practices are classified as having exaggerated salaries. Failure to mention the nuances of respective populations simplifies the perception of the problems and thus strengthens the argument because the listener has less to evaluate.

Indeed, Edelman argues that “symbolism is the only means by which groups not in a position to analyze a complex situation rationally may adjust themselves to it through stereotypization, oversimplification and reassurance”\(^99\). Not every listener has time to research every actor and variable involved in human trafficking. In this case, the symbols are words or metaphors that represent the oversimplification of ideas. In Mordoche’s last quote these metaphors include opulent side of the world, neoliberal globalization, sex industry and servitude to name a few. The genius of the argument is that through oversimplification it forges an intrinsic link between economic disparity, human trafficking and morality which fits in with the established moral framework. This linkage is highlighted again by Mordoche when she states that “in order to draw up a credible UN anti-trafficking in persons strategy it is necessary to advance in the creation of a more just, equitable and supportive international economic order”\(^100\).


\(^100\) Mordoche, “Thematic Discussion of the General Assembly on Human Trafficking” (3 June 2008).
Morodoche elaborates on the conditions that compromise international cooperation:

To make progress in a cooperation strategy, double standard policies, hegemonic positions and unilateral evaluations of other countries must cease for they are contrary to the principles of international cooperation. Unilateral actions are doomed to failure since rather than helping, they hinder the fight against international crime linked to trafficking.\(^{101}\)

Hegemonic positions, unilateral evaluations, and double standard policies are all morally infused metaphors representing the actions of the United States. The term hegemony first surfaced in approximately 1560 and was derived from the Greek terms hegemonia, hegemon and hegeisthai which mean leadership, leader and ‘to lead’ respectively. In its original context, hegemony referred to “the predominance of one city state”.\(^{102}\) The Cuban government in post revolution Cuba eagerly absorbed and adopted the ideas of hegemony promulgated by Marxist philosopher, Antonio Gramsci.\(^{103}\) Gramsci theorized that the ruling hegemony is based on coercion, intellectual and moral leadership. Control or order is maintained by state police and civil society. Civil society, “with its institutions ranging from education, religion and family to the microstructures of the practices of everyday life contribute to the production of meaning and values which in turn produce direct and maintain ‘spontaneous’ consent” across the hierarchy of society.\(^{104}\) In other words, cultural dominance is also part of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony. International hegemony includes dominance by military, economic and cultural relations “supported by a combination of force and persuasion”.\(^{105}\) Hegemony carries negative connotations as it implies unauthorized domination and thus the institutionalization of inequality.

Further, Gramsci indicates that a country’s position in the global hierarchy is based on territorial extension, economic power, military might and the “ability of a state to set activities on an autonomous course so influential that other powers are bound to be affected by
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it”. More recently, Robert Keohane has argued that the U.S. constructed a “liberal-capitalist world” based on the shelter of its military strength while Immanuel Wallerstein posits that the hegemon’s possession of “the sword” spells “death to the political resistant, but minimal life for the acquiescent”. Therefore, according to Gramsci, Keohane, Wallerstein, and Cuban representatives, the U.S. is a hegemon because its autonomous activities affect the world. The U.S. possesses vast physical and economic territories and it has the military capabilities necessary to “protect the international political economy that it dominates”. Moreover, Mordoche provides “hegemonic” evidence; the inexplicable rejection of a Cuban initiated Cuba-U.S. cooperative agreement on human trafficking, the dominant culture of consumption, and the American foreign policy regarding Cuba. Therefore, the morally infused term “hegemonic position” refers to the American abuse of intellectual and moral leadership. One manifestation of the abuse of moral leadership shows itself in the “banal and stereotyped” patterns of unbridled consumption.

Following hegemonic positions, the next morally evaluative term that represents injustice is “unilateral evaluations”. Unilateral evaluations refer to the Trafficking in Persons reports submitted by the U.S. Secretary of State and published annually by the U.S. Department of State. These reports draw on information provided by 186 American embassies and consulates around the world. The embassy reports are based on information collected from “host governments, local NGO’s, immigration officials, police, journalists and victims in addition to reviews of government, press and NGO reports”. Countries are then classified as to whether they have a significant trafficking issue based on the amount of trafficked persons entering or leaving a given country during one year. Any country with over 100 trafficked persons is considered to have a significant trafficking issue. The countries are then assigned a tier according to their anti-trafficking efforts. Tier 1 countries are countries that comply with the American Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000
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(TVPA), tier 2 watch-list countries are making significant efforts to comply with the TVPA and tier 3 countries are countries that are deemed to not be making significant efforts.\footnote{US Department of State, Trafficking in Persons Report 2008, 10-11. <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/05501.pdf> (03.03.09).}

Cuba was first included in the TIP report in 2003 and in its debut year and every year thereafter Cuba has been identified as a tier 3 country. Like the previous TIP reports, the most recent report declares that the government of Cuba does “not fully comply with the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking and is not making significant efforts to do so”\footnote{US Department of State, Trafficking in Persons Report 2010, 126. <http://www.state.gov/g/tip/rls/tiprpt/2010/> (June 18, 2010).}. In addition, Cuban efforts that have been made such as re-education programs for street workers and amendments to the penal code are dismissed as inadequate. For example, the current penal code does not allow prosecution in the case of the trafficking of adults for forced labour. The conclusion of the report states that the Cuban government has not ratified the 2000 UN protocol to suppress and prevent human trafficking and that the Cuban government “did not provide substantive evidence of protection of trafficking victims [and] has made limited efforts in anti-trafficking prevention efforts.”\footnote{Ibid., 126-127.}

Clearly the Cuban representatives do not appreciate such treatment. Mordoche declares the “US actions of determining, without right, who does well or bad in fighting trafficking in and smuggling of persons…is hardly acceptable when reports of this country’s authorities say that 50 000 women and children are annually trafficked across its borders to be cruelly exploited”.\footnote{Mordoche, Thematic Discussions of the General Assembly on Human Trafficking (June 3, 2008).} The term “unilateral evaluations” is a moral condemnation of the US. Unilateral evaluations refer to the alleged one sided approach of compiling and publishing the analysis of human trafficking in many countries including Cuba. This one-sidedness which illustrates inequality yet again also illustrates the aforementioned notion of American hegemony.

Morodoche also indicates that compiling and publishing these evaluations is an act of hypocrisy because there are so many people being trafficked within the U.S. In the TIP reports, before the country profiles are presented there is a discussion about the state of human trafficking in the United States including prosecution, legislation, and recommendations. However, it is interesting to note that the US does not assign itself a tier ranking while all the
other countries examined in the report are assigned a tier. One may argue that these reports are intended for internal or American use only. However, the release of the reports is an event of international note. The release of the 2008 TIP report was announced at the thematic debate in the general assembly by Mark Lagon, the Ambassador-at-Large and Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Human Trafficking in Persons which suggests that the reports are intended for the larger audience.

Mordoche’s tirade against hypocrisy continues:

We cannot accept in silence that this country, where millions of undocumented people smuggled into the country survive on its streets, without any rights and carrying out the dirtiest jobs, accuses others of not working to prevent smuggling and illicit human trafficking.115

Mordoche indicates that, in addition to representing hegemony, the unilateral evaluations represent hypocrisy; this hypocrisy camouflages at best, and at worst ignores, the plight and basic human rights of millions of people. Mordoche again relies on pathos in the discussion of these evaluations. She highlights the perpetuation of inequality by the method of data collection and dissemination while characterizing the publication of the TIP reports as hypocritical.

Keeping on with the theme of hypocrisy Morodoche employs the term double standard policies as a morally infused metaphor. The primary example of this “double standard policy is the Cuba Adjustment Act. Mordoche says the following about the act:

This act, one of its kind in the world, gives Cubans arriving in the U.S. through illegal ways and without restriction, the right to residence and other privileges that no other person of any nationality receives. With this legislation, of clear destabilization aims and political motivations, illegal exits toward U.S. territories are encouraged through very insecure channels which have claimed hundreds of human lives.116

The phrase “one of its kind in the world” conveys the notion that no other country engages in practices such as this. This law is probably the longest standing of its kind but similarly

115 Ibid.
116 Ibid.
motivated directives have been employed in other areas of the world.\textsuperscript{117} The Cuban Adjustment Act, colloquially referred to as the ‘wet foot dry foot act’, allows Cubans who have been in the U.S. for one year to apply for permanent residence regardless of their means of entry.\textsuperscript{118} This act is one of many U.S. attempts to gain influence in Cuba. An alternative view may be that this act was penned in 1965 to deal with the 300,000 refugees that voluntarily left Cuba through the Cuban Airlift or through unrestricted foreign boats departing from Camarioca, a fishing port, taking those Cubans who wanted to leave.\textsuperscript{119}

Indeed, it appears that the U.S. has politically motivated destabilization aims. In addition to the wet foot dry foot act there is a refugee processing centre in Havana that allows Cubans to apply for U.S. resettlement and a Special Cuban Migration program that provides those Cubans who might not otherwise have a chance to enter the U.S. to apply for immigration through legal avenues.\textsuperscript{120} Moreover, the U.S. openly claims that their USAID program is intended to “promote Cuba’s transition to a democratic market oriented society”.\textsuperscript{121} This program’s aims resonate with Gramsci’s and Wallerstein’s hegemony, economic imperialism and world economy respectively. The promotion of human rights and life as an intrinsic part of the program in association with American economic ideology promises greater freedoms to the Cubans if they pursue a democratic market oriented society. USAID facilitates the delivery of humanitarian aid to Cubans, the publishing of independent Cuban journalists, as well as the provision of international human rights law training. Blended with these activities is the propaganda or “information campaign”; delivery of 4.7 million “newsletters” sent by mail or e-mail to Cuban households, the thousands of shortwave radios, batteries and chargers given away as well as training for the “development of Cuban professional skills that can be deployed in a post-transition environment”.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{117} For example, in 2001 Russia granted Russian Citizenship and Russian Passports to the Georgian “breakaway” areas of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Archil Gegeshidze and Vladimer Papava, “Post-War Georgia Pondering New Models of Development” 01/14/2009 CACI Analyst <http://www.cacianalyst.org/?q=node/5012> (7.03.09).
\textsuperscript{118} Public Law 89-732 <http://www.state.gov/www/regions/wha/cuba/publiclaw_89-732.html> (7.03.09).
\textsuperscript{119} Ian Chadwick, The History of Cuba-America Relations <www.ianchadwick.com/essays/cubahistory.html> (08.03.09).
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{121} USAID, Latin America and the Caribbean <www.usaid.gov/locations/latin_america_caribbean/country/cuba> (08.03.09).
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.
The clear demarcation of America’s overt transitional preparatory activities reinforces Mordoche’s claim that the U.S. is engaging in destabilizing activities. Failing to recall the aforementioned American activities within Cuba, especially regarding the routes of immigration, logically establishes the notion that the neoliberal U.S. is luring Cubans to risk the waters. The implied message to the audience is that if exploitation through trafficking does not take place while trying to get to the U.S. then it almost certainly will take place once the person arrives there. The discussion of the Cuban Adjustment Act illustrates an appeal to logos. The inductive argument outlined in this local discourse regarding the Cuban Adjustment Act is a pragmatic argument. Pragmatic arguments “permit us appraise a fact through its consequences [and] thus the truth of an idea can only be judged by its effects.” In this case, the effects; loss of human life and exploitation, are attributed directly to the Cuban Adjustment Act. A direct criticism of this style of argument is that it is difficult to determine the degree to which a certain behaviour should be considered a primary cause of the events that follow. Neglecting to mention some of the pertinent US immigration activities within Cuba illustrate how this argument may be rendered ineffective. The Cuban Adjustment Act is a double standard policy in Mordoche’s eyes because it lures Cubans with promises of easy immigration but in the process it often costs lives that it is intended to improve. It also discourages immigration through the appropriate channels by rewarding risky, life threatening behaviour with an expedited immigration process.

Mordoche’s reference to the Adjustment Act indicates American premeditated action. Indeed, a national act that has been amended and enforced for over 40 years must have been planned with a purpose in mind. Mordoche suggests a subversive purpose and her message to the international audience is intended to mobilize them as allies. In this case it is not a military mobilization but rather a mobilization of will and action within the General Assembly. The other purpose of this statement is to renew commitment to the audience of Cuban nationals. The construction of an America as a subversive opponent symbolically renews the Cuban government’s resolve to protect its people.

In employing the morally infused terms of hegemonic positions, unilateral evaluations, and double standard policies Mordoche illustrates the rhetorical practice of moral
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condemnation as a means to unite the audience. Inequality, loss of life, and a violation of basic rights are all American moral shortcomings that Mordoche identifies. Mordoche rebukes her political opponent for a locally directed activity and simultaneously constructs the same activity as a globally divisive action. Dependency theory declares that the production of knowledge is a process which is controlled by hegemonic powers that stunts the capacity of peripheral societies to “articulate their identities and worldviews”. Thus by presenting the TIP reports as an Americentric hegemonic production, they are portrayed as a deliberate condemnation of Cuba. Not surprisingly, the 2008 TIP indicates that some data were not readily available as “U.S. attempts to engage officials [were] viewed as politically motivated”. Aristotle indicates that deliberate wrong-doings reflect the bad qualities of the actor himself and that “evils draw men together”. Mordoche shows the Cuban Adjustment Act to be a deliberate wrong that promotes dissension. To the Cuban audience this argument conveys and reinforces the message of American hegemony. By portraying the U.S. in a poor light Cuba tries to dissuade its people from being attracted to both the physical and ideological America.

In the past Cuba has had success rallying support from the United Nations General Assembly. For the past 18 years Cuba has garnered international support within the UN to end the American economic commercial and financial embargo against Cuba. In 2009 the General Assembly voted 187-3 to end the embargo. The success in accruing support of developing and developed countries within such an audience makes it plausible to expect a high level of support for condemnation of the U.S. unilateral practices.

The international audience this argument is being presented to is one that thrives on consensus building. The UN General Assembly is one that is intensely focused on consensus which occasionally serves as a detriment to its effective functioning. Cuba, realizing this

---
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practice, attempts to show the U.S. as a country whose alleged good practices actually prevent the very thing their reports are intended to do. This rhetorical practice is commonly known as antithesis. By contrasting two opposing actions, ‘rather than helping, they hinder’, the orator creates a logical effect that is satisfying to the audience. The American pressure to combat human trafficking exerted by the publication of their annual report is contrasted here with the Cuban accusation of America retarding international cooperation for the prevention human trafficking with their report and legislation.

American Moral Metaphors

The American uses of morally infused terms, or moral metaphors, are generally less specific in their direction towards Cuba but they are no less passionate. In the returning to Bush’s speech at the national training conference it is evident that the moral terms or themes relate to the concepts of compassion for the victims and justice or punishment for the perpetrator. In the pursuit of justice Bush begins his speech by stating:

Human trafficking is one of the worst offences against human dignity. Our nation is determined to fight that crime abroad and at home…. I am honored to be with the courageous men and women who are serving on the front lines in the fight against human trafficking.

By labeling trafficking as an offence to dignity Bush reaches back to the philosophy of the Enlightenment. As has been mentioned, the popular ideas of freedom, representative government and reason were being rediscovered and promoted in the Enlightenment. At this time dignity was one of the values being discussed as well. Immanuel Kant stressed that “that which is elevated above all price, and admits of no equivalent, has a dignity,” an inner worth. Kant continues, “morality and humanity, insofar as it is capable of morality, is that alone which has dignity”. It is precisely this dignity that Bush is referring to. The value of humans is unparalleled, priceless in fact. By putting a price on a priceless being, the dignity of humankind is being assaulted. Since humanity alone possesses dignity, an offence to
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dignity is a crime against humanity that violates innate rights. Bush, ever the slave to pathos, passionately provides the assault on dignity as motivation for action.

Bush continues and claims that his nation is determined to fight human trafficking abroad and at home. This is the first occurrence of the notion of fighting or struggling against this practice. George Lakoff identifies this type of speech as employing a metaphor of moral strength. According to this metaphor, the actor sees a “strict dichotomy between good and evil” and this evil must be “fought ruthlessly”. It is also interesting to note the order in which the crime is to be fought, first abroad and then at home. The choice of word order suggests that, because of the severity of the crime, human trafficking needs to be dealt with first in other countries and then in the United States.

Bush continues reiterating the theme of fighting by stating his pleasure at being with the “courageous men and women who are serving on the front lines in the fight against human trafficking”. This phrase has several implications. Firstly, by using the term “front lines” an image of war is conjured up. The fight is not a small skirmish but a full scale conflict. Bush simplifies a highly complex issue into a simple image of fighting a war. It is easier to mobilize moral support for a simplified ‘war’ on human trafficking than for a well defined comprehensive anti-trafficking program. Political Scientist Nancy Marion states that, “when talking about crime, they [presidents] are most likely to use symbolic statements that are designed to make people feel satisfied about government action”. In this case the symbolic statement honours courageous men and women while the larger audience is reassured that the government is intent on pursuing an honourable course of action.

In employing the metaphor of moral strength by simplifying the complex issue of trafficking to a simple war, Bush eliminates the listener’s need to evaluate and question while reassuring the audience that the government and citizens in general are doing an adequate job. There are two clearly demarcated groups of good and evil in this moral war; those that fight trafficking and those that traffic people or facilitate human trafficking. Therefore in applying this metaphor, those that oppose the ambiguous and nebulous “war” are automatically traitors despite the fact that their opposition may lead to the development of more effective strategies.
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that address human trafficking. Moreover, the audience would not expect to see decisive results immediately while simultaneously being able to rationalize and be satisfied with everything done in the name of this war. One only has to look at the “war on terror” to see how this can be abused. The rationalization of counter-terrorism measures in the name of the “war on terror” had negative repercussions including restrictions of some rights, decreased trust in the government, and large investments with little visible returns.\textsuperscript{135} So despite the apparent innocuous appearance of the front lines metaphor it contains within itself both the pathos of moral appeal and clandestine approval for broad undisclosed actions.

Bush continues to praise the courageous men and women:

\begin{quote}
You’re hunting down traffickers, you’re serving justice by putting them behind bars, you’re liberating captives, and you’re helping them recover from years of abuse and trauma.\textsuperscript{136}
\end{quote}

In this moral expedition to fight human trafficking, Bush shifts from the metaphor of war to one of hunter-prey. The workers are the hunters and the traffickers, the prey. In society the only living things that are hunted are animals. Therefore, the traffickers are considered to be something akin to animals. Indeed, if one recalls the religious metaphors of the last chapter, Bush claimed that the traffickers possessed a special depravity; this depravity coupled with the metaphor of hunting paints a picture of the trafficker as something altogether less than human. Lakoff expounds further on the metaphor of moral strength. “The metaphor entails that one cannot respect the views of one’s adversary: evil does not deserve respect, it deserves to be attacked”.\textsuperscript{137} By degrading the perception of the trafficker to a sub-human life form, it is not difficult for the listener to perceive the trafficker as an animal, or evil that needs to be hunted and obliterated. As Edelman indicated, the construction of an opponent “renew(s) the actor’s commitment and mobilize(s) allies”.\textsuperscript{138} In this case, Bush is seeking to mobilize or persuade allies via moral metaphor.

By engaging in the activity of ‘hunting down’ and prosecuting traffickers, these courageous men and women are ‘serving justice by putting them [traffickers] behind bars’.

\textsuperscript{136} Bush, President Announces Initiatives to Combat Human Trafficking” July 16, 2004.
\textsuperscript{137} Moral Politics 74.
\textsuperscript{138} Edelman, \textit{Constructing the Political Spectacle}, 66.
While Mordoche’s moral metaphors, which dealt with opulence, hegemony, and hypocrisy, ultimately focused on distributive justice in the metaphor of justice, Bush begins by focusing on retributive justice and secondly on restorative justice. Hundreds of years ago, Cicero wrote that the fear of punishment was one of the greatest deterrents to crime. Through the dialogue about the commonwealth and laws, Cicero asks, “what worry would trouble the wicked if the fear of punishment were removed”?\textsuperscript{139} In the 20th century Michel Foucault relates that a system which promotes equal rewards and punishment creates a hierarchy in which, among other things, the “rank itself” functions as a reward or punishment.\textsuperscript{140} Bush’s action of equating justice with punishment of the offenders indicates a retributive view of justice. Bush’s moral rhetoric endorses the concepts that both Cicero and Foucault refer to. From Cicero, Bush adopts punishment for the offender and deterrence for those thinking of offending while his previous creation of hierarchy in society with the religious reference to special depravity illustrates Foucault’s philosophy of reward and punishment.

Bush turns to the liberation of victim after the punishment of the offender has been addressed. The juxtaposition of liberation with incarceration heightens the effect of the positive pathos because it creates an emotional contrast from the grim face of justice to the sword of delivery. As was discussed before, the value of liberty, in addition to being lauded as inalienable right, has been cast as a religious metaphor; as an endowment from God. Therefore, to liberate captives places the deliverer as a messenger delivering God’s gift. Two prominent people in the Bible who were deliverers were Isaiah the prophet, who was appointed to set captives free, and Jesus who was called the Messiah, which means deliverer.\textsuperscript{141} In a more contemporary context, representatives of the United States government and military definitely wanted to be perceived as liberators in Iraq.\textsuperscript{142} George Bush said “I’d like to be a President (known) as somebody who liberated 50 million people and helped


\textsuperscript{141} Isaiah 42:7, 61:1, and John 1:41 &4:25(NIV)

achieve peace.” It is patently clear that the perception of a liberator is a powerful force in America. Therefore, by presenting those courageous men and women who fight trafficking as liberators, Bush appeals to a tradition of “liberator perception” that reaches at least as far back as the Spanish American War in 1898 when the US “liberated” Cuba.

After retributive justice is dealt with, Bush turns to restorative justice. He indicates that those fighting human trafficking also serve a restorative function of justice by helping the victims recover from ‘years of abuse and trauma’. By appealing to the pathos of punishment for the perpetrators and restoration for the victims Bush cleverly appeals to both conservative and progressive audiences. According to Lakoff, conservatives promote punishment as discipline or a corrective measure while progressives emphasize the responsibility that every person has to care for their fellow beings. One may ask about the responsibility to restore and reintegrate the perpetrators into society but by presenting these very perpetrators as sub-humans that are to be hunted down, it unconsciously affirms the idea that they are not worth the effort to be reformed. In this way Bush’s idea of punishment and retributive justice is very much like that of Aristotle. Aristotle claimed “he who violates the law can never recover by any success, however great, what he has already lost in departing from virtue”. Consequently, Bush, like Aristotle, believes it is natural for the unequals, because of their actions, to be treated unequally, that is to say, they deserve to be punished, not reformed.

In continuing to dehumanize the traffickers, Bush states that:

Traffickers tear families apart. They treat their victims as nothing more than goods and commodities for sale to the highest bidder.

In addition to being, especially depraved animal type creatures, traffickers are labelled as destroyers of families. Families remain, in popular opinion, as a fundamental and essential unit of society. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights defines families in the following manner; “the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to
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protection by society and the State”.147 Lest one think that this is an archaic reflection of stale post-war sentimentalism one should also consider also the 1994 UN establishment of the International Day of Families celebrated yearly on May 15 with almost the exactly same phrasing. This day and the year of the family (1994) were established “with a view to creating among governments, policy-makers and the public a greater awareness of the family as the natural and fundamental unit of society”.148 Considering this general sentiment of families, traffickers are viewed as agents that erode the foundations of society by assaulting and destroying the natural and fundamental unit. The appeal to pathos in this argument, like the nebulous war reference, employs a broad term successfully. The definition of what a family consists of is not defined. Staunch conservatives can freely assume that it refers to a family that contains a mother father and children unless one of the spouses had been widowed while those on the opposite extreme can interpret family to mean same-sex parents with an adopted child. Regardless of the listener’s definition of what constitutes a family, all understand that the destruction of the family is a negative consequence of trafficking. According to the UN definition of family, in addition to eroding the fundamental units of society, the destruction of the family is an assault on society and the state. Destruction of the family erodes the citizen’s trust in the state’s ability to protect them and consequently it undermines the role of the state as a protector. To place this in terms of John Locke’s social contract, by “breach of trust they (the government) forfeit the power the people had put into their hands”.149 In other words, if the government fails to protect their citizens’ rights and liberties, citizens have the right to pursue a new government to provide for their own safety and security. Therefore, any action taken against these perpetrators at a national or international level can be condoned as measures taken to preserve the structure of a given society.

To compound this grievous offence to the individual, the family, and society, the traffickers treat their victims as ‘goods and commodities for sale to the highest bidder’. It is clear that the commodification of people is viewed as a heinous moral transgression. This phrase contains three elements that further besmirch the trafficker. Firstly, there is the

dehumanizing action of placing a monetary value on the life of the individual. This is a flagrant violation of the principles of the “free, equal, and independent” person which is enshrined in the American Declaration of Independence.\(^{150}\) Secondly, as has been mentioned, this illicit practice undermines the perception and belief in the state as a protector and preserver of life and liberties. Thirdly, the sale of beings is a perversion of the capitalist economic system. The American capitalist system guarantees the right to own means of production and to pursue wealth. Ayn Rand, a contemporary American author relates that “in a capitalist society, no man or group may *initiate* the use of physical force against others”.\(^{151}\) Moreover, Rand argues that “The moral justification of capitalism lies in the fact that it is the only system consonant with man’s rational nature, that it protects man’s survival *qua* man, and that its ruling principle is: *justice*”.\(^{152}\) Therefore, the commodification of people violates the moral justification of capitalism and insults the American belief in capitalism. Like the appeal to the concept of the family unit, the appeal to the commodification of people appeals to the moral indignation at people being treated like property and to the desecration of the principles of capitalism.

After condoning the work that has been done to combat human trafficking Bush presents fighting human trafficking as a moral duty:

> The American government has a particular duty, because human trafficking is an affront to the defining promise of our country. People come to America hoping for a better life. And it is a terrible tragedy when anyone comes here, only to be forced into a sweatshop, domestic servitude, pornography, or prostitution...This trade in human beings brings suffering to the innocent and shame to our country, and we will lead the fight against it.\(^{153}\)

The promise of America, ‘a better life’, is ideologically synonymous with the American dream, a phrase coined by James Truslow Adams in the *Epic of America*. Adams states, “The American dream is that dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for every man, with opportunity for each according to ability or achievement”.\(^{154}\) Adams was merely rephrasing the founding principle of the Locke-inspired Declaration of Independence.

---
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which promoted “certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness”.\textsuperscript{155} This promise of America is contrasted with the sweatshop, domestic servitude, pornography, and prostitution. This contrast illustrates the moral image of wholeness.\textsuperscript{156} Those that enjoy their protected freedoms represent the morally whole concept while those forced into labour represent the moral incongruity of their traffickers. In addition, like the use of the family construct, identifying trafficking as an affront to the promise of the country reinforces the notion of trafficking as an activity that erodes the foundation of society and government. Indeed, an assault on the personal freedoms guaranteed by the declaration is viewed as an insult to the very foundations of the country. Therefore, Bush is appealing to the pathos of American patriotism when he claims that it is the duty of America to lead the fight against trafficking because it violates freedoms, and shames America.

Once again trafficking has been framed in the terms of a fight which illustrates Lakoff’s metaphor of moral strength. Moral strength creates a vision of the world in absolutes; absolute good and absolute evil. Bush has elaborated on the offences of the trafficker and added the sin of slandering (affront) to the trafficker. Bush has cast trafficking as a shame inducing insult that undermines freedom in America and a force that fractures families. Consequently trafficking demands action and the fulfillment of duty; fighting trafficking. Barry Buzan argues that “the appeal to national security as a justification for actions which would otherwise have to be explained is a political tool of immense convenience for a large variety of sectional interests in all types of state”.\textsuperscript{157} In an adaptation of Buzan’s discussion on national security Bush has identified trafficking as a threat to the moral security of the United States, a moral threat that provides the justification for action in and of itself.

The moral threat trafficking poses to America justifies the actions that the United States takes to combat human trafficking. Bush elaborates on the initiatives that have been taken:

\begin{itemize}
\item Declaration of Independence (1776) <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html> (29 April, 2010)
\item Lakoff, Moral Politics, 100.
\end{itemize}
America is also confronting nations that profit from or tolerate human trafficking. We are helping nations and we are confronting nations. Those countries face potential sanctions that include the loss of U.S. military and economic assistance, as well as the loss of support from the World Bank and the IMF. This approach is yielding results….Every nation that is complicit in human trafficking can know that the United States government is watching and there will be consequences if they don't act.  

This excerpt clearly shows that the U.S. government takes the responsibility of confronting trafficking in other countries. The rationale is that since trafficking is a problem both inside and outside of the United States, it should be addressed in all locations. As suggested before, and as presented in these speeches, the impetuses for dealing with trafficking are almost exclusively moral. The American responsibility for addressing trafficking abroad illustrates the metaphor of moral authority. According to Lakoff, moral authority exercised in this manner has several implications. The legitimacy of moral authority assumes four things. First, it assumes that those subject to the moral authority have an inability to know and act in the best interests of their country, secondly, the authority knows and has the best interests of the subject country at heart, thirdly, the moral authority will act on those interests, and finally social recognition by the subject countries that the moral authority indeed has this responsibility. It is clear in the above quote that Bush’s willingness to confront nations that do not meet the requirements for combating human trafficking portrays the U.S. as a moral authority. Moreover, the U.S. moral authority, which apparently includes the ability to control funding priorities of the World Bank and IMF, lends credence to the Cuban representative’s perception the U.S. as a hegemon.  

Lakoff elaborates on the moral authority:  

The authority figure sets standards of behaviour, and punishes those subject to authority if the standards are not met. Moral behaviour by someone subject to authority is obedience to the authority figure. But just as importantly, the exertion of authority is moral behaviour on the part of the authority figure, and it is immoral for the authority figure to fail to exert authority, that is, to fail to set standards of behaviour and enforce them through punishment.  
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The representatives of the US government exhibit these behaviours and beliefs. The US government, through its TIP reports has set standards of behaviour in regards to human trafficking and punished those who do not conform to these standards. Indeed, Bush goes on to relate that after the release of the 2003 TIP report, in addition to raising awareness and establishing victim-related programs, “10 nations avoided sanctions by moving quickly to pass new anti-trafficking legislation to train police officers”\(^\text{161}\). The ‘yardstick’ that is used to measure efforts to combat trafficking is the Trafficking Victims Protection Act’s (TVPA) minimum standards. The TVPA is an American Public law that was passed in 2000.\(^\text{162}\) So, in essence, a public law developed for a specific national context is being applied to myriad other national contexts without considering the unique characteristics of that context. The beliefs and practices of the U.S. as a moral authority are not limited to Republican administrations. President Barack Obama issued a presidential determination regarding human trafficking to “not to provide certain funding for those countries’ governments (Cuba, Eritrea, Fiji, Iran, and Syria) for fiscal year 2010, until such government complies with the minimum standards or makes significant efforts to bring itself into compliance, as may be determined by the Secretary of State in a report to the Congress”\(^\text{163}\).

According to the 2009 TIP report, Cuba has better prosecution efforts in human trafficking related offences through its penal code, than either China or Mexico.\(^\text{164}\) However, of these three countries only Cuba remains on the tier three watch-list while China and Mexico are both tier 2 countries. Interestingly, every month since March of 2001 (to August 2010) China and Mexico have been in the United States top four trading partners as measured by billions of dollars of trade per month.\(^\text{165}\) It may be more than a coincidence that Mexico and China, both large destination and source countries for human trafficking have not been placed in tier 3. In fact, none of the top ten trading countries of the U.S. since 1998 can be found in the third tier.


It is not surprising that Mordoche and the other representatives of the Cuban government bristle at America’s condemnation of Cuba’s actions in regards to human trafficking. These Cuban representatives do not believe the U.S. has a right to be a moral authority. Consequently, the Cuban government does not submit themselves to the US as a moral authority, neither do they accept the possibility that the U.S. has the Cuban best interests at heart when punishing with sanctions. At the same time, the U.S. government actions suggest a belief that if they do not exert their function as a moral authority, no other actors will. Moreover, according to Lakoff’s idea of moral authority, if the representatives of the U.S. government do not exercise their moral authority when they have the capability to do so, then they are guilty of behaving immorally. American actions based on the idea of America as a moral authority, such as the TIP reports, are what Cuban representatives deem unilateral evaluations, the evidence of a hegemon. The United States government’s acknowledgement of trafficking within the U.S. only worsens the sting as it creates an appearance of a hypocritical moral authority.

Aristotle identified the accusatory line of reasoning in *Rhetorica* and noted that the “errors committed by ones opponent must be amplified” to successfully argue along these lines.\(^{166}\) In Bush’s address he amplifies Cuban shortcomings to discredit his opponent and validate the American position as an authority. In this speech, Cuba is the only country singled out as deliberately perpetuating human trafficking.

The regime in Havana, already one of the worst violators of human rights in the world, is adding to its crimes. The dictator welcomes sex tourism. Here’s how he bragged about the industry. This is his quote, "Cuba has the cleanest and most educated prostitutes in the world." He said that because sex tourism is a vital source of hard currency to keep his corrupt government afloat. My administration is working toward a comprehensive solution of this problem: The rapid, peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba. We have put a strategy in place to hasten the day when no Cuban child is exploited to finance a failed revolution and every Cuban citizen will live in freedom.\(^ {167}\)

It is patently clear that Bush believes that the Cuban government is morally deficient as evidenced by the implication that the Cuban government relies on sex tourism and the exploitation of children to “finance a failed revolution”. Bush’s quote reflects the

\(^{166}\) Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, Book 1 4, 1426b.

propagation of the moral metaphors of moral essence and moral order. Moral essence suggests that character is determined by “significant past actions, and that it is a reliable indicator of future actions” while moral order “legitimizes certain traditional hierarchical power relations”. Bush suggests that because of Castro’s unsavoury actions, welcoming and bragging about sex tourism, he is likely to keep engaging in these practices in the future.

Since it has been established that the government of the United States has positioned itself as a moral authority, it follows that the Government representatives would also promote a moral order of which the United States government is the head. The TVPA yardstick of the TIP reports reiterates the notion that America believes it has been endowed with the responsibilities that a leading moral authority should have. In this case, this means ranking the obedience and conformity of other nations in their policies regarding human trafficking. A rapid peaceful transition to democracy is put forth as the solution to this intensely moral problem of human trafficking. In other words, Bush believes in a theory of democratic morality, the belief that political assimilation to a “democracy” would solve the problems of human trafficking. In his appeal to the pathos, the travesties of trafficking have been linked to a communist “failed revolution,” while success in combating and eradicating trafficking has been linked to democracy.

To summarize the use of moral metaphors, both Cuban and American representatives employ moral metaphors. Cuban representatives emphasize their position as a protector of human rights while presenting the American government as an actor that abuses their position in the international arena. In employing the morally infused terms of hegemonic positions, and unilateral evaluations, the Cuban representatives identify hypocrisy, inequality, loss of life, and a violation of basic rights as American moral shortcomings. The American representatives utilize the metaphors of moral strength and the family as fundamental building block of society. In addition, American representative’s appeal to the tradition of “liberator perception”, to the centrality of capitalism, and to the duty of America to lead the fight against trafficking because trafficking violates freedoms, and shames America. Finally, the American representatives amplify shortcomings of the Cuban government and their ideology to discredit the Cuban system of government and validate the American position as a moral authority.

CHAPTER 3: METAPHORS OF YOUTH AND GENDER

The Innocent Child

In the discussion of human trafficking, the United States government’s rhetoric of human trafficking condemns Cuba for allegedly not espousing the values of democracy while the Cuban government’s rhetoric condemns the U.S. for hypocritical practices that violate the very values they are promoting abroad. Despite these differences, when it comes to the rhetoric of gender and youth, both actors use youth and gender in a similar way. Bush begins his speech with praising the governor of Florida for recently signing a bill into law that made the trafficking of minors for the sex trade a felony. The theme of youth is continued and combined with that of women. For the present, the focus will remain on youth, or children:

The lives of tens and thousands of innocent women and children depend on your compassion, they depend on your determination, and they depend on your daily efforts to rescue them from misery and servitude. 169

In this excerpt, the concept of innocent children is evoked. In a heavy play to pathos, Bush relates that these innocent children depend on the listeners’, compassion, determination, and daily efforts for deliverance from their horrible conditions of misery and servitude. The association of children with the conception or construct of innocence is made repeatedly:

Human traffickers rob children of their innocence; they expose them to the worst of life before they have seen much of life.…. We will not tolerate American citizens abusing innocent children abroad… And so that's why we are going after the unscrupulous adults who prey on the young and the innocent… It's a struggle for the lives and dignity of innocent women and children. 170

Representatives of the Cuban government also associate childhood with innocence. At the opening of the first school year after the revolution Fidel Castro said “ustedes tienen que saber que los niños son inocentes” 171. More recently, in reference to an incident when 13 children

171 “You need to know that the children are innocent” Fidel Castro, “Discurso Pronunciado por el Comandante Fidel Castro Ruz, Ministro del Gobierno Revolucionario, en el Acto de Apertura del Curso Escolar,” Address,
and 17 adults were killed in an accident involving a US-based speed boat smuggling Cubans to America, Fidel Castro said, “Por los niños inocentes conducidos a injusta e inmerecida muerte, sentimos verdadero luto”.172 Castro mentions innocent children again in reference to the problem of illegal immigration and trafficking; there are many immigrants being detained in Quintana Roo including “niños inocentes transportados a la fuerza por riesgosos mares”.173 Even though Illeana Mordoche does not directly describe children as innocent it is clear that the Cuban government associates childhood and youth with innocence.

The process of innocence being associated with childhood begins with Aristotle. Aristotle posited that, the mind is a *tabula rasa* or a blank slate that is filled with all sorts of ideas and values which are generated by the mind via experience and perception.174 This blank tablet waiting to be filled suggests an uncorrupted innocence of ignorance. Conversely, Christian religious thought emphasized the concept of original sin, an inherent sin nature that every person was born with.175 Similarly, centuries later, Thomas Aquinas argued that original sin is equally in all.176 Given the prevalent view of original sin at this time, it is not surprising to note that, in the Middle Ages, children were integrated into working society at about age seven and were viewed as being miniature adults.177 Children were not innocent and received no special treatment. In fact, Phillip Ariès notes that in the early 1600’s children were exposed to sexual references and no efforts were made to stymie gestures and physical contact in prepubescent children. It was not believed that children were in possession of “innocence” and so “references to sexual matters” would not harm the child.178
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Ariès goes on to say that in the 16th and 17th centuries there was a revival in the interest of education and education. Parents started to view themselves as spiritual and moral guardians of their children and according to Ariès there was a “positive moralization of society” taking place. In the late 1600’s, John Locke revisited the idea of *tabula rasa*. He believed that all people were born with the blank mind and consequently each individual has the ability to choose what defined their character. Locke viewed the child as an unblemished innocent being who is and remains a possessor of natural human rights.

Since the 1600’s, the association of the child with innocence has been continually strengthened. Though there are academics that argue persuasively against the construct of childhood innocence, it remains prevalent in the speeches regarding human trafficking. As Kitzinger and others note, the concept of a violated childhood necessitates the existence of and comparison to an ideal childhood. Therefore, the trafficking and subsequent abuse of children destroys the perception of the ideal childhood by ‘removing’ the innocence of childhood. Indeed, Bush’s speech emphasizes this notion. The loss of innocence to human traffickers, indicated by the phrases ‘robbing children of innocence’, ‘abusing innocence’, and ‘struggle for dignity and innocence’ reinforce the perception of trafficking as a “violation of childhood”. This rhetoric of innate innocence implies that though the child is not responsible for being trafficked, they are stained by the experience if their innocence is ‘lost’ by such an experience.

The rhetoric of the innocence of childhood appeals to all members of the audience. The innocent child fits into the religious framework. Despite the apparent ambiguity in religious texts, namely the Bible, regarding the innocence of children and original sin, many religious people believe in an ‘age of accountability’ where a child is innocent until he or she can reach a stage of virtue of choosing between wrong and right. Interestingly, Herold Stern points out that Aristotle also believed that “man became ethical (or virtuous) when he

179 Ibid., 395-396.
had to choose between alternatives”; therefore, reason was essential to being virtuous.\textsuperscript{183} It appears that the paths of secular philosophy ran parallel to that of Judaism and later Christianity in this regard. In addition, the notion of the innocent child also fits into the secular moral framework. The concept of the innocent child illustrates the moral metaphors of moral strength and moral purity. As has been mentioned before, moral strength creates a strict dichotomy between good and evil. The good, pure children are contrasted with the traffickers who are thieves of virtue and perpetuators of vice. The metaphor of moral purity “associates our visceral reactions of disgust and our logic of the corruption of pure substances with the idea that morality must be unified and uniform”.\textsuperscript{184}

It is with these conceptions and ideas of childhood in mind that the examination of the American-Cuban human trafficking dialogue continues. Bush remarks that:

Sex tourism is a vital source of hard currency to keep his [Castro’s] government afloat…We have put a strategy in place to hasten the day when no Cuban child is exploited to finance a failed revolution and every Cuban citizen will live in freedom.\textsuperscript{185}

Bush clearly links the exploitation of children to the failure of communist ideology. According to the innocent child rhetoric, Cuban children are exploited in the sex trade as a resource to finance the government. However, Bush does not call it a government but rather a failed revolution. The implication of this distinction is that the current Cuban government is illegitimate and does not deserve a voice in the international arena. This contains within itself an obvious jab at the socialist/communist ideology of the revolution. Thus, the exploitation of children is presented as financing both a failing institution and ideology. Moreover, it is implied that, in addition to abating the exploitation of children, the failed revolutionary government is denying its people basic freedoms. The logos of the enthymeme combined with the pathos of innocent child rhetoric appeals to listeners. The more progressive listeners, generally those inclined to support socialist ideals, are ‘allowed’ to disapprove of these actions on moral grounds while those who are more conservative can disapprove of Cuba’s actions based on ideological, moral and religious grounds.

\textsuperscript{184} Lakoff, \textit{Moral Politics}, 100.
This innocent child rhetoric in human trafficking has been echoed by other representatives of American government as well. At the release of the 2009 TIP report, Ms Ros-Lehtinen, a congresswoman from Florida, said “in our own hemisphere, Cuba has shamefully been promoting itself as a destination for sexual tourism that exploits large numbers of Cuban girls and boys, some as young as 12”. The use of innocent child rhetoric is prevalent and effective because it appeals to pathos and the deeply rooted concept of innocence. It is difficult to argue against the exploitation of innocent people regardless of whether child-like innocence has been socially constructed or not. Some academics such as Henry Giroux argue that the conception of childhood innocence ascribes the children “the right of protection” but denies them a sense of “agency and autonomy”. Giroux continues:

Unable to understand childhood as a historical, social, and political construction enmeshed in relations of power, many adults shroud children in an aura of innocence and protectedness that erases any viable notion of adult responsibility even as it evokes it. In fact, the ascription of innocence largely permits adults to not assume responsibility for their role in setting children up for failure, for abandoning them to the dictates of marketplace mentalities that remove supportive and nurturing networks that provide young people with adequate healthcare, food, housing, and educational opportunities.

Though Giroux and others make a valid point about how the ascription of innocence to children disregards the child as an actor and power relations, the argument regarding the ‘myth of childhood innocence’, has not, at this point, been widely accepted. Moreover, there is currently no popular framework in existence (such as moral or religious) with which the myth of childhood innocence fits.

In view of the fact that there is no such framework or metaphor dispelling the alleged myth of childhood innocence, childhood innocence is a reliable rhetorical device that plumbs the depths of pathos. Since the innocent child rhetoric is so effective, and Bush has relied on it
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frequently in his speech, he is compelled to show that the United States is protecting these innocent children. And Bush does indeed deliver:

We have taken action to stop American tourists from participating in the sexual abuse of children in Cuba or anywhere else in the world. In 2003 I signed the Protect Act... The Protect Act imposes strict new penalties, doubling the maximum sentence for U.S. citizens who travel to foreign countries to sexually abuse children. We've also launched information campaigns in foreign countries to inform American travelers of penalties back home for sexually exploiting children abroad.189

Appealing to the construct of the innocent child provides an apparently legitimate rationale for their activities. It is patently clear that the U.S. government endorses the metaphor of moral order in which legitimizes “certain traditional power hierarchical power relations”.190 Consequently, the actions taken to prevent the staining of childhood innocence illustrate the United States government’s perception of itself as a moral authority. This perceived moral authority gives the government the right to discipline its own citizens as well as act a big brother to other countries. Earlier it was shown that in creating the TIP reports the U.S. engaged in activities that Cuban officials labelled as unilateral actions. In an effort to keep their own citizens in line the U.S. has created information campaigns in foreign countries to discourage the exploitation of children abroad. It is difficult to tell whether these campaigns are in place because representatives of the U.S. government do not believe in the capabilities of other countries to prosecute those who abuse children or whether the American representatives need to actually remind American tourists that they will be penalized for their actions abroad at home. Regardless of the motive, Bush has used the above actions to show that the U.S. Government is protecting innocent children.

In continuing to reinforce the actions that have been taken to protect the innocent children, Bush mentions that:

Last summer the Department of Homeland Security launched Operation Predator, a comprehensive effort to protect children from international sex tourists and traffickers and pornography and prostitution rings.191

190 Lakoff, Moral Politics, 100.
It is interesting to note that the programs name itself fits into the moral rhetoric that Bush has been using. In contemporary American culture, the term sexual predator refers to a deviant who commits crime that are of a sexual nature.\textsuperscript{192} Naming the initiative to protect children has Operation Predator has symbolic significance in addition to its descriptive property. In the chapter of moral metaphors, it was mentioned that Bush reduced traffickers to a personification of evil that needed to be hunted down. In Bush’s speech, the moral metaphor of hunting traffickers is juxtaposed to the common predator-prey analogy, in which the trafficker is the predator and the prey is an innocent child. Conversely, in ‘Operation Predator’ the trafficking predators are the prey, the ones being hunted down by the parties endowed with moral authority. In short, by exercising moral authority, Operation Predator allows the hunter to become the hunted. At the end of his speech Bush simultaneously reiterates the moral hunting metaphor and the innocent child rhetoric by thanking the “men and women at every level of government who are working hard to protect women and children and bringing the predators to justice”.\textsuperscript{193}

In the Cuban speeches, every time children are mentioned women are mentioned as well. However, the representatives of the Cuban government still employ the innocent child rhetoric. Mordoche notes that due to the industrialized countries consumption patterns and high income, “based on neoliberal globalization”, the industrialized countries:

\begin{quote}
“promote the sex industry, and the increasing demand for women, girl children and boy children for this purpose; the consumption of sex tourism and pornography, including child pornography, and the use of the internet to facilitate all kinds of exploitation of this sort; the sale of children and their organs; and servitude”\textsuperscript{194}
\end{quote}

In the same way that Bush associated the exploitation of innocent children with the “failed revolution” or Cuban government Mordoche associates the exploitation of innocent children with neoliberal globalization that is perpetuated by industrialized countries. Given the fact that the United States is the only country mentioned by name throughout the speech, it is quite plausible to believe that the U.S. embodies the quintessential nature of an industrialized nation that subscribes to the notion of neoliberal globalization.

\textsuperscript{194} Mordoche, “Thematic Discussions of the General Assembly on Human Trafficking” (June 3, 2008)
The basic tenets of neoliberalism are strong individual property rights, a legal framework to protect individual rights and freedoms as well as the “sanctity of contracts between juridical individuals in the market place”. Therefore, individuals are expected to be responsible for their own well being in non-economic endeavours. Neoliberal governments theoretically serve to protect the advancement of the economic individual and the accompanying globalization is an extension of this theory applied to many states. Furthermore, neoliberal globalization spreads the “economic, political, and cultural benefits of liberalism”. Those that espouse neoliberalism as a development model, such as Francis Fukuyama, argue that “virtually all advanced countries have adopted, or are trying to adopt, liberal democratic political institutions, and a great number have simultaneously moved in the direction of market-oriented economies and integration into the global capitalist division of labour”. Fukuyama further argues that this shift represents an “end of history in the Marxist-Hegelian sense” of reaching a final state of societal evolution.

The representatives of the Cuban government argue that it is precisely this ideology that facilitates and supports the violation of innocent children. Mordoche appeals to the pathos of the audience using the moral metaphor of moral purity. Moral purity associates “visceral reactions of disgust” with the “logic of the corruption of pure substances”. In this case, the exploitation of innocent children in prostitution, pornography, and organ harvesting is contrasted with, and attributed to, the ideology and economic system of neoliberalism that allows such exploitation. In mentioning organ harvesting, Mordoche creates an image that the very life of the innocent child is being extracted and sacrificed on the altar of neoliberal hedonism.

Mordoche also wants to emphasize that the Cuban government protects the innocent child. While Bush mentions recent activities that have been done to prevent exploitation, Mordoche creates the impression that Cuba does not have a problem with the desecration of the innocent child within their borders. Mordoche states:
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“Cuba has a long and honorable record in the promotion and protection of all human rights for all. The Constitution, the legislative, judicial, administrative, and other measures, adopted since 1959, protects women and children, as vulnerable sectors of the population”.

In other words, innocent children are well protected. The listener is supposed to understand that because of the communist system of government and centrally planned economy (in contrast to neoliberalism) the innocent children have been spared exploitation. Indeed, in a statement from the Cuban Office of Foreign Affairs regarding the 2010 Trafficking in Persons Report, Cuban representative Josephina Vadal stated:

“These shameful fallacies profoundly offend the People of Cuba. In Cuba, there is not child sexual exploitation but an exemplary performance in the protection of children, the youth, and women”.

Vadal’s statement reinforces the image of the Cuban government as a protector of innocent children.

**The Vulnerable Woman**

In addition to relying on innocent child rhetoric, both Cuban and American representatives rely on the rhetoric of the woman. The rhetoric of the woman, in a similar way to children, presents the concept of a woman as a vulnerable entity. As with the conception of the innocent child, the rise of the development of the vulnerable woman can be traced back to the philosophers Plato and Aristotle. These thinkers viewed women in mixed ways. In Plato’s *The Republic*, Plato states that though “many women are in many things superior to many men”, they are, on the whole, inferior and the weaker sex. In book V of *The Republic*, however, Plato argues that both men and women are capable of being guardians of society if they were given the same education and training. Though Plato as well promoted the idea of women as the weaker sex he did not promote the idea of women being any less virtuous than man. Aristotle expanded the idea of females as the weaker sex from Plato’s physical sense to
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include a weaker constitution of virtue. Aristotle openly discusses the many flaws of women’s virtue. According to Aristotle women are, “more void of shame or self-respect, more false of speech, more deceptive... more wakeful, more shrinking, [and] more difficult to rouse to action”.  Consequently, Aristotle argued that man, by nature of his superior intelligence, rules over women and he ought to have “moral virtue in perfection.” Moreover, it is man’s responsibility to train women and children in their respective virtues to strengthen the family and the state.

In Judeo-Christian religions women are cast as equally virtuous but submissive. In fact, in Proverbs 31, King Solomon extols the virtues of Jewish women as the foundation of a good home. Wives are supposed to submit to husbands and husbands, in turn, are supposed to be gentle with their wives, love their wives as they love their own bodies, and be willing to die for their wives. Despite a popular conception of Eve being less virtuous than Adam because she was deceived first, the Judeo-Christian religions do not promote women as being more flawed than man. Indeed, as in Plato’s Republic, the image of man caring for and protecting women is seen in I Peter 3:7 as well.

While under the influence of Aristotle’s works, Thomas Aquinas also wrote about the hierarchy or relations between men and women in the 13th century. He states that “woman is naturally subject to man, because in man the discretion of reason predominates” and this subjection is ‘civil subjection’ where the superior “makes use of his subjects for their own benefit and good”. Plato, Aristotle, and Aquinas all maintained the superiority of men in some regard. Plato believed that men were physically superior and moral equals. Aristotle believed that men were physically and morally superior to women and that it was man’s responsibility to inculcate good virtues in women and children. Aquinas, combining the sentiments of Aristotle and the apostle Peter, argues that men are intellectually superior but they have a responsibility to do what is best for the women whom they have authority over.
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Indeed, Aquinas takes the perception of women further and introduces sexual status into the conception of a pure woman. Aquinas argues that virgins are the “more honored portion of Christ’s flock” and their glory more sublime” compared to other women; and their virginity the greatest of virtues “in comparison with other degrees of chastity”. Therefore, in the Middle Ages, the concept of the undefiled woman began to be viewed as a symbol of virtue. In the 16th century, Thomas Hobbes, a philosopher of natural law, disagreed with Aristotle and posited that the laws of nature dictate that men and women are equal in natural conditions and that the inequality that exists is a result of man-made civil law. Hobbes did note, however, that men are “naturally fitter than women for actions of labour and danger”. This observation lends itself to Aristotle’s and Aquinas repeated notion that men are equipped by nature to be protectors.

In the Enlightenment era Jean Jacques Rousseau resurrected Plato’s philosophy of equal responsibility in being guardians of the state but at the same time Rousseau indicates, like Aristotle, that it is mans duty to “teach women what nobility and virtue are” if you want them to be great and virtuous”. However, some women in this era did not take the same view of this duty. In her book, *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, Mary Wollstonecraft wrote “I shall not go back to the remote annals of antiquity to trace the history of woman; it is sufficient to allow that she has always either been a slave, or a despot and to remark that each of these situations equally retards the progress of reason”. Moreover, Wollstonecraft notes that women are “exalted by their inferiority”. In other words, men who pay respect to the woman’s position are the most likely to be the ones that tyrannize and detest the taught weakness that some women cherish.

Romanticism emerged in response to the all-consuming rigorous examination and scientific rationalization of nature found in the enlightenment. Despite Wollstonecraft’s works, the concept of women remained the same in many ways. William Wordsworth praised the
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nobly planned woman as one who could be warned, comforted and commanded while Daniel Keats praised the woman that is meek kind and tender, the woman that “bleats for man’s protection”. Robert Owen, one of the most forward looking thinkers of the time who condemned the degradation of women, argued that in his New World, “the characters of all women will, by a superior yet natural training, be elevated to become lovely, good, and intellectual”. Like Aristotle, Aquinas, and Rousseau, Owen argues that women need to be trained to hold these better virtues. This natural holistic training which Owen promotes is very vague. Owen posits that if humankind engages in “due and regular exercise of all the propensity and faculties of our nature according to the strength and capacity of the individual” then “disease vice deception, and misery will soon disappear from the earth”. However, it had been argued for thousands of years by numerous philosophers that women are naturally weaker whether it is in regards to physical strength, strength of virtue, or some combination of the two. Consequently, it was still conceived as men’s job to provide this training and protection for women.

In the height of the Victorian era, the late 1800’s, according to John Stuart Mill; ideal women were viewed as selfless, submissive and meek. Their “complete abnegation” of self and “resignation of all individual will into the hands of man [was seen] as an essential part of sexual attractiveness”. He argued that men were attempting to enslave the minds of women to secure their obedience and sentiments. Though it is clear that Mill did not support the way women were being treated in society, it is clear that women were still being viewed by contemporary society as vessels of virtue to be sculpted or tailored to fit the wishes of men. Since women depended on their husbands for nearly everything material it follows that men conceived of themselves as providers, protectors, and the source of authority.

Since Mill’s, time the rights and freedoms given to women have increased visibly. For example, women in many countries have the right to vote, to own property, to pursue
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education at all levels, or to work outside of the home and have a career. Considering the scope of time, these changes have been recent. The conception of women, however, has not changed that drastically. There are new terms that encompass the perceptions of women; they are called gender roles. Moreover, sociologists and psychologists such as Carol Gilligan have promulgated notions that females and males have different paths of moral development.\textsuperscript{220} Despite the challenging of women’s roles in society by feminists such as Betty Friedan and others, it appears that women are still viewed as a population that needs to be protected.\textsuperscript{221} This persistent idea of men as providers, protectors, and an authority, which has developed over the last 2500 years forms the basis for what Gerda Lerner calls patriarchal thought.

Indicators of patriarchy, the “institutionalization of male dominance in family and society”, are visible in several facets of society.\textsuperscript{222} For example, Michèle Barrett relates that patriarchy can be seen in the “state provision of and regulation of education…in structuring the different opportunities open to men and women”, state control over legal codes and “ideological and cultural representation of sexuality”, the judiciary and penal system in operating according to “fundamental assumptions about gender”, and the medical practices’ “absorption of gender ideology into health”.\textsuperscript{223} Thus, according to Barrett, patriarchal thought and practice is present in many, if not all, facets of society.

Patriarchal thought and systems are not strictly limited to the state level; evidence of patriarchal thought is prevalent in international society. For instance, the Geneva Conventions, a body of treaties and protocols of international law that provide for the protection of victims of war, reflect this mindset. The first convention convened in 1896 and the last protocol was added in 2005.\textsuperscript{224} Article “7 of the Geneva convention IV states that “women shall be especially protected against any attack on their honour”.\textsuperscript{225} Another example occurred in 2000;

the UN created the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children.

Moreover, R. Charli Carpenter analysed gender rhetoric in documents published by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) from 1999-2003. In the UNOCHA documents Carpenter found 56 references to women as vulnerable while there was only one reference to men as vulnerable. Similarly, Carpenter found 79 references to women and children as victims and only 6 references to men as victims.226 The implication of the special emphasis on women and children is an indicator that in both the national and international arenas women and children are seen as segments of the population that are less able to defend themselves and consequently require special protection. The advances made in women’s rights and powers made in the last few centuries do not necessarily preclude the view of women as a subset of the population that requires protection nor does it undo the 2500 years of the conception of woman as the weaker sex in either a physical or moral way.

Consequently, the violation or exploitation of women in the context of human trafficking is seen as a tragedy. It is the failure of man to protect those that are less able to protect themselves; the violation of the vulnerable. Furthermore, with Aquinas’ view of virginity in mind, the sexual exploitation of trafficked women adds a dimension of besmirching innocence by the comparison of physical wholeness with morality. In a more contemporary setting, the equation of wholeness and purity with perfect virtue is what George Lakoff has referred to as moral wholeness and moral purity. The lengthy discussion of the historical perceptions of women gives an idea of the magnitude of the effect the rhetoric of the vulnerable woman has.

Mordoche’s speech uses primarily women and children as examples of people who have been trafficked:

Conservative estimates indicate that between 600 000 to 800 000 people are subject to international trafficking every year. An estimated 80% of those victims are women or girl children.227
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The emphasis here is clearly on the suffering of women and female children. The trafficking or exploitation of these females, in an appeal to pathos, evokes feelings of anger and disgust in the listener; anger that these females have not been protected and disgust that they have been violated. The failure of society to protect these females violates Lakoff’s idea of moral wholeness, while the disgust at the corruption or the perceived corruption of the female’s physical integrity illustrates the violation of Lakoff’s concept of moral purity. 228

The anger and disgust felt at the failure to protect the vulnerable women and the innocent child are channelled towards the Cuban government’s arch nemesis, the U.S.. In protesting the American unilateral practices of the TIP reports Mordoche states:

"Such behaviour is hardly acceptable when reports of this country’s authorities say that 50 000 women and children are annually trafficked across its borders to be cruelly exploited." 229

The example mentioned here combines the rhetoric of the vulnerable women with that of the innocent child rhetoric to obtain the maximum impact on the listener. As was discussed in the previous chapter, the nemesis of the Cuban government, the U.S., is portrayed as a hypocritical hegemonic actor that cares more about what other countries are doing at the expense of the vulnerable women and innocent children in its own country. By highlighting the shortcomings of the U.S. government’s efforts to combat human trafficking Mordoche challenges the effectiveness of the American system of dealing with trafficking.

Mordoche then proceeds to contrast the perceived failure of the U.S. with the success of the Cuban government:

"The Constitution, the legislative, judicial, administrative and other measures, adopted since 1959, protect women and children, as vulnerable sectors of the population, as the position that women have attained, their cultural, technical and professional level, their high rates of economic, social and political participation, the radical changes in their thought and life, as well as the recognition of their rights are important aspects of social progress that do not favour trafficking." 230
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It is shown that the very foundation of Cuba has been built to protect women and children; the “vulnerable sectors of the population”. The condemnation of the U.S. and the accolades of Cuba illustrate the construction of the political opponent. This construction, as Edelman relates, “renews the actor’s own commitment and mobilize[s] allies”. Mordoche indicates that not only has Cuba has protected its own, and will continue to do so but it also has ensured the success of females in all areas of society. Based on Cuba’s success, the listener is compelled to support Mordoche’s other claims.

Uma Narayan, a prominent feminist scholar notes that gender has been used for the “ideological service of both colonial empires and of third world nationalist movements”. Though Cuba is not a third-world country, highlighting the success of females in Cuban culture illustrates the Cuban nationalist movement. The women of Cuba are portrayed as the embodiment of socialist success that prevents trafficking while the exploited women within the U.S. are portrayed as the embodiment of failed neo-liberal policy and economics which both allegedly encourage human trafficking. The special recognition of women’s status and achievements reinforces the underlying assumption that women are a segment of the general population that need special treatment.

Finally, Mordoche provides a recommendation for a course of action to reduce the exploitation of women and children:

It is also vital to implement instruments such as conventions on the eradication of discrimination against women and on the rights of the child, the protocol of the latter on the sale of children, prostitution and child pornography.

Yet again, the audience is reminded of the necessity of protecting the vulnerable woman and the innocent child. Interestingly, Cuba has not yet ratified the UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children. Cuba’s actions reiterate the belief of the representatives of the Cuban government that human trafficking is not an issue in Cuba, and that the existing efforts within the country are more than adequate.

---
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Bush’s speech cites the same statistic of an estimated 600,000 to 800,000 people trafficked each year with 80% of those trafficked being women and girls. Even though Bush’s speech was delivered before Mordoche’s, the intent of the vulnerable women rhetoric is the same. Bush appeals to the pathos of the audience and intends to elicit feelings of anger and disgust in the audience; anger at the destruction of moral wholeness, and disgust with the corruption of moral purity. By relying on the rhetoric of the vulnerable woman and the innocent child, both the conservatives and progressives are targeted. Both conservatives and progressives want to see the victims rescued and, according to Lakoff, the conservatives want justice for the exploiters while the progressives focus on restoration and nurturing the victims. Therefore the exploitation of women and children stirs both parties.

When speaking about human trafficking, representatives of the American government use exploited women as the face of trafficking:

U.S. law enforcement has documented cases of Latvian girls trafficked into sexual slavery in Chicago, or Ukrainian girls trafficked in Los Angeles, and Maryland, or Thai, Korean, Malaysian and Vietnamese girls trafficked in Georgia, or and Mexican girls trafficked in California, New Jersey and here in Florida.

The human face of trafficking is “Willia,” who was brought from Haiti to Miami at age 14 and was forced to work 15 hours a day, 7 days a week. The human face of trafficking is “Michelle,” an American teenager forced to work in strip clubs and engage in prostitution in bars in New York and Connecticut.

Oxana Rantchev left her home in Russia in 2001 for what she believed was a job as a translator in Cyprus…Oxana's story is the story of modern slavery.

As these examples indicate, Bush, Luis CdeBaca, the ambassador at large in the Office to Monitor and Combat Human Trafficking, and Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State, all use the female face as the face of human trafficking when discussing human trafficking. Indeed, even before this, the lawmakers, drafting the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) in the late 1990’s “repeatedly referred to trafficking victims as meek passive objects of sexual

---
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exploitation” to ease the passing of the TVPA while “victims of trafficking for forced labor were largely ignored”.237 In fact, in a report published by the International Labour Organization, of an estimated 12.3 million people in situations of forced labour, about 1.39 million, or 11%, of these people are involved in commercial sexual exploitation.238 However, there is increasing reference to forms of forced labour other than the sexual exploitation of women. In the annual TIP reports, reference to other forms of forced labour increased; in the 2001 TIP Report there were only 20 references while in the 2008 TIP Report there were 535.239 Despite the increasing awareness of other forms of forced labour in trafficking, as was shown above, women and children remain as the face of trafficking for purposes of effective rhetoric.

Immediately after giving the documented examples of trafficked women in the United States, Bush declares that:

Many of the victims are teenagers, some as young as 12 years old. Many victims are beaten. Some are killed. Others die spiritual and emotional deaths, convinced after years of abuse that their lives have no worth. This trade in human beings brings suffering to the innocent and shame to our country, and we will lead the fight against it.240

Bush couples the rhetoric of the vulnerable woman with that of the innocent child for maximum impact. The failure of society is to protect women in emphasized repeatedly. The listener is told of physical abuse, implied sexual abuse, emotional abuse and spiritual abuse. By tying these components together Bush relates to the religious framework, the moral framework and the innocent child and vulnerable women frameworks. Those that share the religious framework believe that the person is made up of the heart and soul.241 As was mentioned in chapter 1, the heart encompasses one’s mental, moral, and physical components
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while the soul represents the eternal spiritual component of a person. Technically, it is not possible to have a spiritual death according to the religious framework, but the figure of speech is understood to mean a threat to the person’s spiritual awareness or beliefs. Therefore, the violation of the body and soul of a young female stirs those with the religious framework. In terms of the moral framework, both conservatives and progressives are appealed to through the presentation of a lack of nurturing, which targets the progressives and a promise to fight this injustice which resounds with the conservatives. Finally, the rhetorical package is tied together with the mention of specific cases of the exploitation of vulnerable women in Chicago, Los Angeles, Maryland, Georgia, New Jersey, California and Florida coupled with the innocent children “as young as 12 years old”.

The rhetoric of the vulnerable woman, which was used to pass the TVPA, has also been employed as a tool to condemn Cuban government through the Cuba-US palaver on human trafficking. The anger and disgust felt at the failure to protect vulnerable women and innocent children are channelled towards the Cuban government. Bush declares that the United States Government faces “a problem only 90 miles off our shores, where the regime of Fidel Castro has turned Cuba into a major destination for sex tourism”.243 Bush presents Cuba and as entity that profits from the exploitation of women and, as has been discussed earlier, the exploitation of women in Cuba is related to the support of the Cuban government’s ideology. Bush also creates an image of the Cuban government as an exploiter of women and children in Cuba:

The regime in Havana, already one of the worst violators of human rights in the world, is adding to its crimes. The dictator welcomes sex tourism. Here's how he bragged about the industry. This is his quote, "Cuba has the cleanest and most educated prostitutes in the world." He said that because sex tourism is a vital source of hard currency to keep his corrupt government afloat. 244

More precisely, Castro said:

Prostitution is not allowed in our country. There are no women forced to sell themselves to a man, to a foreigner, to a tourist. Those who do so do it on their own, voluntarily, and
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without any need for it. We can say that they are highly educated hookers and quite healthy, because we are the country with the lowest number of AIDS cases.245

Bush’s correlation between exploiting women in Cuba and the success of the government is portrayed as a disgusting thing; a morally corrupt practice. The construction of Cuba as a vile actor is further enhanced by his description of trafficker’s activities:

One of the ways traffickers keep women and girls enslaved is by telling them they will be arrested and deported if they try run away…. Often, these women have been terribly brutalized. And when they escape from their nightmare, they should find the protection and generous heart of America.246

By reiterating the damage that the traffickers cause their vulnerable female victims, Bush condemns the Cuban government for its actions. As in Mordoche’s discourse, Bush concludes his speech with mentioning how much the U.S. is doing to protect the victims, prevent abuse, and provide punishment. To illustrate America’s efforts in fighting human trafficking Bush mentions the maximum sentencing of seventeen and a half years for traffickers convicted in New Jersey, the Protect Act, and Operation Predator. In his speech Bush first mentions $50 million that the US government provided for “anti-trafficking programs in Brazil and Cambodia and India and Indonesia and Mexico, Moldova, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania” and then the $35 million in grants to 36 organizations in the U.S. that deal with rehabilitating victims.247 In chapter 1 it was mentioned that Bush spoke of fighting trafficking abroad and at home which indicated a primary focus, so to the mention of monies allocated first refer to the other countries and then to the U.S. The repetition of this theme of fighting human trafficking abroad first and home second reiterates the message that human trafficking is more of an issue abroad than in the US.

At the conclusion of his speech Bush sums up the fight against human trafficking:

It's a struggle for the lives and dignity of innocent women and children. And that's why all of us must be dedicated to --to the strategies that will enable us to prevail.248
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According to Bush, the fight against human trafficking comes down to a struggle for the ‘lives and dignity of innocent women and children’. Since Bush previously has clearly linked the exploitation of women and children to the financial benefit of the Cuban government, dedication to the strategies includes dedication to the desired ideological reforms in Cuba including a ‘peaceful transition to democracy’ in Cuba. According to this statement the listener is supposed to believe in the theory of democratic morality, that is, to believe that if Cuba could only get democracy then the exploitation would be severely curtailed.
CONCLUSION

Analyzing the anti-trafficking rhetoric in the speeches of American and Cuban representatives clearly revealed the promotion of national agendas. The examination of religious, moral, innocent-child, and vulnerable woman rhetoric indicated that countries are aligned according to ideology. The use of religious framework and religious metaphors are effective tools for the American rhetorician as it allows the orator to utilize pathos for maximum benefit. Conversely, in the Cuban discussion of human trafficking, religious metaphors and framework were largely absent due to the fundamental belief of religion as a human construct and the association of religion with previous illegitimate and restrictive colonial and neo-colonial governments.

Moral metaphors or moral themes, which also relied on pathos, were used extensively by both Cuban and American rhetoricians. The Cuban government focused on the inequality and moral bankruptcy wrought by neoliberal policy and economics. Cuban representatives argued that the hegemonic practices of the United States, coupled with hypocrisy and the insatiable American appetite for hedonism fostered human trafficking. The American counter argument was that the failed revolution was relying on the income that human trafficking brought to the country to prop itself up. In a nutshell, both countries accused the others’ ideology of perpetuating the practice of human trafficking.

Finally, both countries used the rhetoric of the innocent child and the vulnerable woman to strengthen the argument that the opposing ideology, as represented by respective governments, facilitated the exploitation of innocent children and the neglect of vulnerable women. Representatives of both countries accused the other of not cooperating. Cuban representatives accused the U.S. government of promoting uncooperative hegemonic practices through the creation of the TIP reports while the U.S. representatives accused Cuba of failing to share information. Both accused each other of exploiting women and children for selfish gain. The Cuban and American preoccupation with faultfinding and blaming the opposing ideology exacerbates the international issue of human trafficking and works against both countries’ official mandates to protect their respective populations.

As was mentioned in the introduction, the materials and methods of analysis were chosen because of my areas of expertise. However, if different materials were analyzed, such as speeches and publications from prominent NGO’s focused on human trafficking
interventions in both countries, the presence of such national agenda’s would likely be significantly diminished. Similarly, the picture of the rhetoric of anti-human trafficking would likely be much less clear cut if qualitative materials such as interviews with average Americans and Cubans were analyzed instead. Again, if tools such as questionnaires and quantitative analysis in random sampling of population groups were used to analyze this phenomenon, I suspect that the themes presented would be much more varied and much less specific.

In this analysis, at every turn the anti-trafficking rhetoric was employed for a larger purpose; that of expressing and promoting respective national agendas. Countries of opposing political ideologies such as the U.S. and Cuba often refuse to co-operate in anti-trafficking endeavours for fear of soft power or hard power. For example, one country may appear to be inferior in a comparison of the culture of human rights or, in the case of hard power, conditions that may be attached to trade. Or worse yet, countries are afraid that co-operation on any front will equate to tacit approval of their ideological opponent’s regime. However, if anti-trafficking solutions are presented as concepts that are intrinsically linked with the dignity of mankind and not linked to a national agenda or ideology, they will be more widely accepted in authoritarian, democratic, and ‘in-between’ states. Similarly, if leaders at all levels would refrain from employing rhetoric that exclusively links their ideology to anti-trafficking solutions, perhaps we could begin to move towards broader acceptance and greater promotion of the dignity and rights of mankind. It is a lot to ask of leaders such as these but it is a step that must be taken if we are to truly pursue eradication of human trafficking at a global level. To facilitate greater co-operation in reducing the negative impacts of human trafficking, countries that have conflicting agenda’s must refocus their energies on the commonalities they share. In this case both Cuba and the US should acknowledge that the other, fundamentally, has mechanisms for promoting the rights and dignity of man. Understanding the rhetoric that these actors use and consequently their relationship is just the first of many steps toward reaching a cooperative solution to human trafficking in both countries.
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