

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, "REMARKS ON THE RELEASE OF THE 10<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS REPORT" (14 JUNE 2010)

Karrin Vasby Anderson  
Colorado State University

**Abstract:** On June 14, 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton released the State Department's 10<sup>th</sup> annual Trafficking in Persons Report. Clinton used her speech to expand the neo-abolitionist frame that dominated anti-trafficking discourse, presenting human trafficking as a global human rights issue rather than as a problem primarily of law and border enforcement. Clinton's speech also asserted the continuing moral authority of the United States and showcased her pragmatic sensibilities and presidential gravitas.

**Key Words:** Hillary Clinton, Human Trafficking, Abolition, Modern-Day Slavery, Rhetoric and Diplomacy, Gender and Leadership.

The problem of human trafficking has a long history, as does the record of oratorical opposition to it. Historically, abolition discourse not only condemned slavery and the transatlantic slave trade, but also offered radical reformers the opportunity to promote universal suffrage, expand the meaning of citizenship, and challenge dominant power structures.<sup>1</sup> Contemporary anti-trafficking rhetoric often is less radical, having emerged from faith-based opposition to both legal and forced prostitution, and from governmental efforts to police borders. Much of this discourse is shaped by a "neo-abolitionist" understanding of human trafficking as "modern-day slavery"—a crime that Western governments and law enforcement agencies could prosecute and eradicate. Neo-abolitionism also posits that people with economic and political privilege are duty-bound to rescue those being "victimized" by traffickers. This view of the problem of human trafficking is challenged by a contrasting "human rights" perspective, which asserts that labor and sexual exploitation is a systemic problem—an outgrowth of poverty, misogyny, globalization, and technological change. Those operating from this perspective assert that policy responses to the problem of trafficking must correct systemic injustices in ways that respect the dignity and autonomy of individuals. The neo-abolitionist view took hold in the 1990s, when the issue of human trafficking began to garner public attention.<sup>2</sup> Anne Gallagher explains that the "United States government was at the front line when trafficking emerged (or re-emerged) as an issue of global concern in the mid-1990s."<sup>3</sup> At that time, U.S. anti-trafficking efforts focused on international trafficking of women and girls for sexual exploitation. By the late 1990s, "public attention to the problem of human trafficking

gained institutional legitimacy as prominent political figures such as First Lady Hillary Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright took active roles in the international campaign for women's human rights—a movement vocally opposed to sex trafficking of women and children.”<sup>4</sup>

Hillary Clinton's commitment to anti-trafficking persisted throughout her long and varied public career.<sup>5</sup> Yet, this issue took center stage on June 14, 2010 when, as U.S. secretary of state, she released the Department of State's 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report. This report was unique because it was the first TIP Report to recognize the United States as a “source, transit, and destination country for men, women, and children subjected to trafficking in persons, specifically forced labor, debt bondage, and forced prostitution.”<sup>6</sup> Prior TIP Reports had assessed other nations' responses to the problem of human trafficking but had failed to systematically evaluate the detection and enforcement efforts of the U.S. government inside its own borders, something that understandably undermined the legitimacy of previous reports.<sup>7</sup> Clinton's decision to include the United States in the 2010 TIP Report made her speech more significant than it otherwise would have been. Specifically, Clinton used her speech to expand on the neo-abolitionist frame that dominated anti-trafficking discourse in the 1990s and early 2000s, presenting human trafficking as a global human rights issue rather than as a problem primarily of law and border enforcement. At the same time, however, Clinton's speech reinforced the perspectives of earlier TIP Reports that positioned the United States as the world's dominant force for international social justice. It also presented Clinton as a prudent and experienced leader—someone with pragmatic sensibilities and presidential gravitas. An analysis of this rhetorical event reveals the ways in which even brief speeches on relatively uncontested political issues can involve complex rhetorical maneuvering. After situating Clinton's tenure as U.S. secretary of state within her broader political career, I outline the evolution of contemporary anti-trafficking policies and discourses. I then assess the ways in which Clinton's speech balanced the neo-abolitionist and human rights frameworks while reinforcing the moral authority of the United States and asserting her own capacity for leadership.

### **Hillary Rodham Clinton as Diplomat-in-Chief**

Hillary Rodham Clinton has had a long, distinguished, and unique political career, serving as first lady of the state of Arkansas (1979-1981 and 1983-1992), first lady of the United States (1993-2001), U.S. senator from New York (2001-2009), U.S. secretary of state (2009-2013), and launching two bids for the Democratic presidential nomination (2008, 2016). She took an active role in her husband Bill Clinton's gubernatorial and presidential administrations, leading a successful education reform effort in Arkansas,<sup>8</sup> and an unsuccessful attempt to overhaul the U.S. health care system as first lady.<sup>9</sup> A perpetual trail-blazer, Clinton has accomplished many “firsts.” She was the first student chosen to speak at Wellesley College's commencement ceremony, delivering a speech which garnered coverage in *Life* magazine in 1969, the year she graduated.<sup>10</sup> She was the first U.S. first lady to win a seat in the U.S. Senate, the first former first lady to serve as U.S. secretary of state, and the first woman to be a formidable frontrunner in two major-party presidential primaries. Given the novelty and longevity of her political career, Clinton has been the subject of extensive media scrutiny.<sup>11</sup> Discussions in which pundits,

journalists, and scholars have evaluated her public persona also have served to prompt a national dialogue about the role of women in politics.<sup>12</sup> Feminist leader Betty Friedan once remarked that “[c]overage of Hillary Clinton is a massive Rorschach test of the evolution of women in our society.”<sup>13</sup>

Throughout her public career Clinton has been a strong advocate for women and girls. One of her most impactful and memorable speeches was her keynote address to the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing, China in September of 1995. Clinton’s participation in the conference was controversial due to the host nation’s abysmal human rights record. Some critics asserted that Clinton’s presence at the conference signaled the Clinton administration’s willingness to overlook human rights abuses, while others expressed concern that any attempt by Clinton to critique the host nation in her speech might disrupt the fragile diplomatic relations between the United States and China.<sup>14</sup> She did not name China specifically in her address, yet Clinton sharply criticized many of its policies. She also condemned policies in other countries which negatively impacted the lives of women and girls. Her refrain in the speech that “human rights are women’s rights and women’s rights are human rights”<sup>15</sup> was lauded by delegates and pundits alike. Theresa Loar and Laura Ardito noted the “thunderous applause” Clinton garnered during the speech,<sup>16</sup> and the *New York Times*’s coverage of the speech was characteristic of much of the news media’s reaction: “Speaking more forcefully on human rights than any American dignitary has on Chinese soil, Hillary Rodham Clinton catalogued a devastating litany of abuse that has affected women around the world today and criticized China for seeking to limit free and open discussion of women’s issues.”<sup>17</sup> After the Beijing speech, Clinton was widely recognized as a powerful voice for women and a diplomatic force with which to be reckoned. In fact, throughout her tenure as first lady, Clinton combated the criticism she received during the health-care reform campaign by serving as what Shawn J. Parry-Giles calls an “international emissary,” positioning herself in “spaces of ceremony and diplomacy.”<sup>18</sup>

Due, in part, to Clinton’s successful role as an international envoy for her husband’s presidential administration, she was tapped to be President Barack Obama’s first secretary of state. When announcing her nomination for the position, Obama called Clinton an “American of tremendous stature” who “knows many of the world’s leaders, who will command respect in every capital, and who will clearly have the ability to advance our interests around the world.” Obama concluded: Hillary’s appointment is a sign to friend and foe of the seriousness of my commitment to renew America diplomacy and restore our alliances.”<sup>19</sup> As a diplomat, Clinton made promoting and protecting the rights of women and girls a key component of the State Department’s mission. During her confirmation hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Clinton stated explicitly her intention to use her post to fight human trafficking: “I take very seriously the function of the State Department to lead our government through the Office on Human Trafficking to do all that we can to end this modern form of slavery. We have sex slavery, we have wage slavery, and it is primarily a slavery of girls and women.”<sup>20</sup> In order to understand the ways in which Clinton’s speech at the release of the 2010 TIP Report represented a victory for human rights and gender equity, it must be placed within the broader context of global human trafficking policies and discourses.

## Contemporary Anti-Trafficking Policies and the “Modern-Day Abolition” Movement

The primary difference between historical slavery and contemporary human trafficking is that, prior to the mid-nineteenth century, slavery was legally and socially sanctioned in much of the United States and in many European countries. The original abolition movement focused on 1) eradicating the transatlantic slave trade, 2) overturning laws that made chattel slavery legal, and 3) emancipating those held in slavery. For much of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, citizens of Western democracies considered slavery to have been successfully abolished and credited themselves with its abolition. The prevailing view held that modern slavery existed only in underdeveloped, non-Western societies. This perspective obscured the structural exploitation that persisted after legal slavery was abolished. It also turned a blind eye to the deleterious effects globalization had wrought on workers worldwide, and to the ways in which vulnerable populations were exploited for labor and sex in wealthy democracies. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, however, a transatlantic sex trade emerged, with young women and girls from Eastern European countries trafficked by organized crime to customers residing in wealthy Western European and North American countries. A coalition of women’s rights and faith-based activists formed and called on the world to eradicate slavery once more. Much of this discourse employed the language of the historical abolition movement, framing contemporary slavery as a criminal injustice and a moral failure of “civilized” society. As the fight against human trafficking progressed, advocates began to emphasize the systemic factors that make certain populations more vulnerable to being trafficked. Many now urge that anti-trafficking efforts must extend beyond enforcement and emancipation. Fostering the dignity, independence, and well-being of individuals—irrespective of their gender, nationality, or citizenship status—is the goal of anti-trafficking advocates who operate from a human rights perspective.

The notion that all human beings should be accorded certain rights which emanate from their status as individuals rather than from the protective arm of a sovereign nation was formally recognized after World War II. The atrocities of the Holocaust “served as a catalyst for the human rights movement, propelling the issue into the international arena.”<sup>21</sup> In 1948, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), a broad pronouncement of “the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family . . . .”<sup>22</sup> Article four of the document expressly prohibits “slavery and the slave trade . . . in all their forms.”<sup>23</sup> More recently, the United Nations issued a position paper which explores the “relationship between human rights and human trafficking,” and details state obligations and enforcement measures.<sup>24</sup>

Despite this international attention to the connections between human rights and anti-trafficking efforts, anti-trafficking organizations contend that more people are enslaved now than were held at the height of the transatlantic slave trade. The U.S. State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons uses “human trafficking” and “trafficking in persons” as “umbrella terms for activities involved when someone obtains or holds a person in compelled service,” and identifies eight distinct types of trafficking: “forced labor,” “sex trafficking,” “bonded labor,” “debt bondage among migrant laborers,” “involuntary domestic servitude,” “forced child labor,” “child soldiers,” and “child sex trafficking.”<sup>25</sup> Given the breadth

of activities that can be classified as “human trafficking,” determining the precise number of individuals trafficked globally is a difficult task.<sup>26</sup> The 2013 TIP Report noted that although “social scientists estimate that as many as 27 million men, women, and children are trafficking victims at any given time,” in 2013 “only around 40,000 victims ha[d] been identified in the last year.”<sup>27</sup> Experts agree that the number of governmentally-identified victims is a fraction of the actual number of trafficked individuals since the crime of human trafficking usually goes unreported and laws against trafficking are under-enforced. In 2014, Secretary of State John Kerry estimated that “more than 20 million” victims of human trafficking existed worldwide,<sup>28</sup> a number likely obtained from a widely-cited study by the International Labour Organization, which places the number of trafficked individuals at 20.9 million.<sup>29</sup>

Because human trafficking is a violation of basic human rights, the task of eradicating it falls both to the global community and to individual nations. Tensions arise when individual nations perceive that attempts by international coalitions to curb human trafficking encroach on their own national sovereignty. When considering the importance of national sovereignty, U.S. officials and the public at large historically have been influenced by the competing foreign policy traditions of realism and internationalism. Realists urge a foreign policy that bolsters the power and autonomy of the United States, and seeks to “maintain a global balance of power to safeguard peace.”<sup>30</sup> Internationalists stress the importance of upholding “American ideals” in foreign policy and “rel[y] mightily on negotiations and international agreements that reserve the use of force as a ‘last resort’ to be used only after negotiations fail.”<sup>31</sup> During the twentieth century, internationalism was promoted in the United States by President Woodrow Wilson, whose quest to secure congressional approval for the United States to join the fledgling League of Nations after World War I was ultimately unsuccessful. J. Michael Hogan contends, however, that “[a]fter World War II, Wilson’s vision of American internationalism became his greatest legacy—a legacy that shaped cold war policies but that also continues to influence American foreign policy to this day.”<sup>32</sup> The post-war turn towards internationalism prompted the United States to help found the United Nations, becoming an original signatory to the United Nations Charter.<sup>33</sup> Contemporary U.S. presidents and diplomats, however, have been constrained by public and political pressure both to work productively in the international community and to preserve U.S. authority in international affairs. That tension is illustrated by U.S. responses to public policy involving human trafficking.

In 2000, two important public policy developments occurred that put the issue of human trafficking on the international diplomatic agenda. First, the United Nations formally defined human trafficking in its “Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking Persons, Especially Women and Children,” a supplement to the *United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime*.<sup>34</sup> That document, which came to be known as “the Palermo Protocol,” defined trafficking in persons as:

[T]he recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual

exploitation, forced labour or other services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs.<sup>35</sup>

In addition to defining human trafficking more expansively than it had been to date, the Palermo Protocol introduced the “3P” anti-trafficking paradigm which emphasized prevention, protection, and prosecution—activities that nation-states were urged to undertake within their own borders and legal systems. Assessing its impact in 2010—one decade after its passage—Kelly Hyland Heinrich asserted that the “Palermo Protocol’s most observable result has been its rapid adoption by 141 countries as of October 2010.”<sup>36</sup> Heinrich credited the Protocol with creating an international “consensus on an agreed upon definition of trafficking in persons rooted in exploitation” and lauded the “criminal laws that countries have adopted to comply with the Protocol . . . .”<sup>37</sup> Heinrich noted, however, that although countries were stepping up efforts to prosecute cases of human trafficking, prosecution was not always done in ways that protected victims. Speaking from a human rights perspective, Heinrich urged officials to recognize the “interdependence between prosecution and protection” and to adopt policies that “respect[ed] trafficked persons’ human rights and yield[ed] better prosecution results.”<sup>38</sup>

A second important development in twenty-first-century anti-trafficking policy in the United States was the congressional approval of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, which mandated that the State Department would “issue annual Reports describing the ‘nature and extent of severe forms of trafficking in persons’ and assessing governmental efforts across the world to combat such trafficking against criteria established by U.S. law.”<sup>39</sup> The State Department’s annual Trafficking in Persons Report, generated after the passage of the TVPA, rates a government’s commitment to anti-trafficking best practices using a tiered system. Tier One countries exhibit “minimum compliance” with standards requiring them to: 1) prohibit and punish human trafficking; and 2) make “serious and sustained efforts” to eliminate human trafficking within their borders.<sup>40</sup> Tier Two countries are those “making an effort but not fully compliant” with the State Department’s minimum standards for anti-human trafficking practices.<sup>41</sup> Tier Two Watch List countries also are not fully compliant with State Department standards. Additionally, however, Tier Two Watch list countries meet one of the following conditions:

- a) The *absolute number* of victims of severe forms of trafficking is very significant or is significantly increasing;
- b) There is a failure to provide evidence of *increasing efforts* to combat severe forms of trafficking in persons from the previous year . . . ; or
- c) The determination that a country is making significant efforts to bring itself into compliance with minimum standards was based on commitments by the country to *take additional future steps over the next year*. [emphasis in original]<sup>42</sup>

Tier Three countries not only fail to meet minimum standards for the prohibition, punishment, and prevention of human trafficking, but they also fail to show adequate effort in becoming compliant.<sup>43</sup> According to the TVPA, the president “is authorized to deny the provision of non-humanitarian, non-trade-related assistance to any Tier Three country,” and the United States may also oppose the applications of Tier Three countries for funds from the World Bank and the

IMF.<sup>44</sup> Consequently, TIP Reports have foreign policy implications that make their annual release politically and rhetorically important.

TIP Reports historically have been highly political documents. Critics charge that “performance of governments with respect to trafficking is currently being assessed, not with reference to the international rules that states (including the USA) have collectively developed and freely accepted, but against criteria drawn up and imposed by U.S. bureaucrats and politicians.”<sup>45</sup> For example, the *New York Times* reported that the president often waives sanctions “for countries with important strategic value to the United States,” identifying Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen as countries whose record of “forced labor, child labor, prostitution, and, in Yemen’s case, the remnants of chattel slavery” were overlooked in 2013.<sup>46</sup> That same article lists Cuba and North Korea as countries “clearly at odds with American policy” that were subject to sanctions.<sup>47</sup>

TIP Reports have been controversial historically not just because of political overtones or the unwillingness of the United States to report on itself. They also have been shaped by the neo-abolitionist rhetorical framework that dominated journalistic and political discussion of human trafficking during the 1990s and 2000s. As previously noted, when a booming cross-border sex trade turned policymakers’ attention to the problem of human trafficking, slavery was defined primarily as sex trafficking and trafficked individuals were cast as “victims” who needed to be “rescued.” Mosoula Capous Desyllas notes that even the legislation’s title—the “Trafficking Victims Protection Act”<sup>48</sup>—demonstrated “how the government depicts women as ‘victims’ to be ‘rescued’ and ‘protected.’”<sup>49</sup> Karen E. Bravo contends that “[n]eo-abolitionist thinking manifests a deep-seated conviction that this vastly complex and intricately networked economic, social, and political issue will be eradicated or controlled through legal mechanisms that focus almost exclusively on prohibition and punishment of the trafficker and rehabilitation of the violated victims.”<sup>50</sup>

The neo-abolitionist framework dominated journalistic framing of human trafficking throughout the 1990s, when “[n]ews reports about trafficking . . . were nearly always about sex trafficking; labor trafficking or the trafficking of men or boys was virtually nonexistent.”<sup>51</sup> This narrow conceptualization of the problem had policy implications. Girish J. Gulati notes that “[a]lmost all of the attention during the Bush Administration was placed on the trafficking of women and children for the purpose of sexual exploitation, while other forms of labor slavery and trafficking involving men were largely ignored.”<sup>52</sup>

In an attempt to expand policymakers’ focus, academics and anti-trafficking advocates proposed a human rights framework for understanding human trafficking. Distinguishing between the neo-abolitionist and human rights perspectives is not meant to suggest that “modern-day abolitionists” are unconcerned with human rights. Historically and contemporarily, abolitionists have been passionately committed to the rights and welfare of those they are seeking to help, and much good has come out of their efforts. What the distinction is meant to illuminate, however, is a difference of emphasis regarding the nature, cause(s), and scope of human trafficking and the sometimes divergent solutions that are proposed as a result of this difference in perspective.

The human rights perspective on human trafficking presents trafficking as a complex social problem rather than as primarily a criminal offense. Experts operating from this perspective urge that until policymakers address “the structural underpinnings of and

incentives for the activities of the actors involved, mere prohibition and criminalization of the activities will not and *cannot* transform exploitative relationships” [emphasis in original].<sup>53</sup> Advocates of the human rights perspective prioritize social, political, and economic transformations that recognize individual rights and promote personal autonomy and agency. This perspective also acknowledges that people vulnerable to being trafficked are sometimes responding rationally to very limited and equally undesirable choices.<sup>54</sup> Minors trafficked into sex work in exchange for housing, for example, may have been driven to the streets by abuse at home. Undocumented workers in the United States may accept exploitative employment if non-exploitative employment is unavailable both in the United States and in their country of origin. Removing people from their immediate trafficking situations without addressing the sources of their vulnerability to traffickers does nothing to solve the problem of human trafficking in the long term. Finally, the human rights framework also presents labor and sex trafficking as equally significant, and sometimes deeply connected, forms of exploitation.

Recent TIP Reports have begun to acknowledge the human rights framework, reporting more systematically on labor trafficking and other forms of exploitation such as debt bondage and child soldiering. The 2015 TIP Report, for example, placed “special emphasis on human trafficking in the global marketplace,” highlighting “hidden risks that workers may encounter when seeking employment and the steps that governments and businesses can take to prevent trafficking, including a demand for transparency in global supply chains.”<sup>55</sup> One key moment that challenged the hegemony of the neo-abolitionist approach to human trafficking in the U.S Department of State was the 2010 release of the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Trafficking in Persons Report. In her remarks, Clinton augmented neo-abolitionist metaphors and arguments with those emanating from a human rights framework. Describing the global problem of human trafficking without ceding U.S. political and moral authority, Clinton spoke authoritatively as the chief diplomat of the United States. She also foreshadowed the feminist leadership persona she would adopt as a candidate for the 2016 Democratic presidential nomination.

### **Hillary, Human Rights, and U.S. Hegemony**

#### *Crafting a Collaborative Response to Trafficking*

The first rhetorical task Clinton undertook as she announced the release of the 2010 report was to introduce a human rights perspective into the discussion, fusing it with the language of neo-abolitionism. Like her feminist abolitionist foremothers, however, Clinton deployed her abolitionist rhetoric in service of a feminist message of gender equity and collaboration that represented a continuation of the political philosophy she had espoused throughout her public, political career.

The first and most significant way in which Clinton challenged a strictly neo-abolitionist perspective with the release of the 2010 TIP Report was to include the United States in the report. As previously noted, neo-abolitionists traditionally position Western democracies (Great Britain and the United States specifically) as purveyors of freedom historically and contemporarily. A human rights perspective, however, recognizes that slavery exists even in developed democracies and the economic policies and practices of rich nations are implicated in exploitative labor practices around the globe. Clinton orchestrated the Department of State’s decision to rank the United States in the TIP Report shortly after she became secretary of state



in early 2009. In an editorial released to coincide with the publication of the 2009 TIP Report, Clinton wrote, “To some, human trafficking may seem like a problem limited to other parts of the world. In fact, it occurs in every country, including the United States, and we have a responsibility to fight it just as others do.”<sup>56</sup> In her speech the following year, Clinton announced that “for the first time ever, we are also reporting on the United States of America because we believe it is important to keep the spotlight on ourselves” (5).<sup>57</sup> The notion that she was the first secretary of state to include a U.S. ranking in the TIP Report was important to Clinton; she repeated the phrase “for the first time” twice in her discussion of the report (8).

In addition to including the United States in the report, Clinton used her speech to call out and own up to the problem of trafficking within U.S. borders, tying the report’s findings to the Department of State’s diplomatic mission. Clinton stated: “Now, we talk often here in the State Department about shared responsibility. Indeed, it is a core principle of our foreign policy. So we have to ensure that our policies live up to our ideals. And that is why we have for the first time included the United States” (8). Next, Clinton identified specific ways in which trafficking was occurring in the United States, noting that “cases of trafficking persons are found in our own communities. In some cases, foreign workers drawn by the hope of a better life in America are trapped by abusive employers. And there are Americans, unfortunately, who are held in sexual slavery. Some find themselves trapped through debt to work against their will in conditions of modern-day bondage” (8). This statement exemplifies a human rights framework insofar as it references a variety of types of trafficking—including debt bondage and involuntary servitude—and recognizes the ways in which U.S. capitalism is sometimes implicated in trafficking. Clinton concluded her paragraph on U.S. culpability with a call to action directed at her fellow citizens: “And this report sends a clear message to all of our countrymen and women: human trafficking is not someone else’s problem. Involuntary servitude is not something we can ignore or hope doesn’t exist in our own communities” (8). That claim localizes the fight against trafficking within citizens’ “own communities,” making it more difficult for individuals to deflect responsibility for their part in trafficking systems.

Although the inclusion of the United States in the report represented a challenge to a strictly neo-abolitionist perspective, Clinton did not relinquish the language of abolitionism completely, perhaps recognizing the powerful emotional appeal inherent to that perspective. One strategy popular with nineteenth-century abolitionists was to use their public platform to share narratives of slaves and slaveholders so that audiences (particularly in the northern U.S. states) could be exposed to the horrors of slavery.<sup>58</sup> Clinton indicated that the TIP Report served a similar function, saying that “behind these statistics on the pages are the struggles of real human beings, the tears of families who may never see their children again, the despair and indignity of those suffering under the worst forms of exploitation” (6). Although the horrors of modern slavery had been well-documented by 2010, Clinton’s speech suggested that in order to capture the attention of the privileged, trafficked individuals continually must make their stories public. Only then will citizens be motivated to act. Clinton asserted that “through this report we bear witness to their experience and commit ourselves to abolishing this horrible crime” (6). With that statement, Clinton echoed the perspectives of historical abolitionists who urged citizens to act on behalf of those powerless to act themselves.

In addition to bearing witness to trafficking as it occurred within and outside of U.S. borders, Clinton offered an expansive, systemic view of contemporary human trafficking that

combined elements of the neo-abolitionist and human rights frameworks. For example, as she had done in earlier speeches on the subject, Clinton discussed trafficking as a gendered problem, asserting that “human trafficking not only exploits and victimizes women and girls; it also fuels the epidemic of gender-based violence around the world” (2). Shortly thereafter, however, Clinton underscored that people of all genders may be trafficked and that trafficking is not limited to sexual slavery, saying that the 2010 Report was designed to “tell the stories of men, women, boys, and girls held in forced labor or sexual servitude around the world” (5).

After noting the range of individuals who are trafficked in a variety of ways, Clinton framed the solution to human trafficking as one that required diverse responses. She argued: “Traffickers must be brought to justice. And we can’t just blame international organized crime and rely on law enforcement to pursue them. It is everyone’s responsibility. Businesses that knowingly profit or exhibit reckless disregard about their supply chains, governments that turn a blind eye or do not devote serious resources to addressing the problem, all of us have to speak out and act forcefully” (7). With that statement, Clinton expanded the discussion of human trafficking beyond a narrow law-and-order perspective. She also acknowledged the ways in which economic systems drive trafficking and argued that governments must pair prevention and prosecution with investment of public funds.

After describing trafficking as a complex, structural problem, Clinton created a rhetoric of collaboration by calling on multiple stakeholders to work together to find solutions. She urged, “All of us have a responsibility to bring this practice to an end. Survivors must be supported and their families aided and comforted, but we cannot turn our responsibility for doing that over to nongovernmental organizations or the faith community. Traffickers must be brought to justice” (7). She made the theme of collaboration an explicit policy change, noting that she wanted to expand the “paradigm of the three Ps—prevention, protection, and prosecution,” which had been a thematic cornerstone since the inception of the TIP Report. Clinton announced: “Now we call for the fourth P—partnership,” explaining that “thanks in part to the facts and focus provided by this annual report, governments, law enforcement agencies, international organizations, and families are working more closely together than ever” (10). The spirit of global partnership also was expressed in the “heroes” being honored at the event. Clinton pointed out that anti-trafficking heroes “hail from all over the world,” touting a “French Dominican friar who started working with the rural poor in northern Brazil and ended up leading a national campaign against slave labor.” She also mentioned a “woman from Burundi, one of the first to serve as an army officer in her native country, who searches the streets for enslaved children and recently broke up a major human trafficking ring” (14). Finally, Clinton praised the efforts of lawmakers and law enforcement officers in Argentina, Egypt, and Ghana, whose work was highlighted in the report as “models going forward” (15).

In her roll out of the 2010 TIP Report, then, Clinton invoked both the language of historical abolition and the human rights principles that should guide contemporary anti-trafficking efforts. Infusing the speech with an emphasis on gender equity and collaboration, Clinton crafted a progressive, feminist rhetoric consistent with the political philosophy she has espoused since the beginning of her political career. But Hillary Clinton is also a political pragmatist. As a presidential appointee and prospective future candidate for president herself, Clinton could not subordinate U.S. political and moral authority within her rhetoric of partnership. Consequently, this speech also functions ideologically to reinforce U.S. hegemony

and situate the United States as the arbiter of international social justice in the fight against “modern-day slavery.”

*Asserting National and Individual Authority*

Even though the 2010 Report identified the United States as a “source, transit, and destination” country for human trafficking, Clinton’s speech cast the United States as the ultimate authority, uniquely capable of assessing international anti-trafficking efforts. She stated that “[c]ountries come to us and ask very forcefully to be dropped in their category and we hear them out and we tell them . . . the kinds of things that we would look to that would demonstrate the commitment that we think would make a difference, to talk about best practices, to share stories. And some countries have listened and the results speak for themselves. Others have not” (12). With that statement, Clinton cast the United States as an international anti-trafficking arbiter. She also took credit for the success of policies in other countries, characterizing them as times in which “countries of have listened” to the United States. She expanded her case further by arguing that the U.S. stance is principled even in the face of diplomatic awkwardness:

Now, this is a process that is fraught with all kinds of feelings and I recognize that, but the easiest way to get out of the tier three and get off the watch list is to really act. And we had some real friends, friends—countries that are friends on so many important issues, and they were very upset when we told them that they were not going to progress and, in fact, were in danger of regressing. And they said, “Well, what can we do?” And we said, “Well, we’ve pointed this out, we point it out again, and we will stand ready to help you.” And I hope all of you will because our goal should not be to point fingers. Our goal should be extending a hand to help people improve and make a difference in how they address this problem (13).

That statement was likely meant as a rejoinder to critics who accuse the United States of letting politics guide the TIP Report ratings. By saying that “we had some real friends” who were “very upset when we told them that they were not going to progress,” Clinton directly challenged those who have accused the State Department of playing politics with the TIP Report. She also adopted a somewhat undiplomatic tone, characterizing the United States as an exasperated authority figure that must repeatedly point things out to the intransigent nation-states over which it exercises influence.

Clinton’s tonal shift illustrates the ways in which she ultimately subordinated her rhetoric of collaboration to her assertion of U.S. authority. Her posture in this portion of the speech illustrates the tensions that arise when U.S. leaders attempt to espouse an ideology of internationalism without relinquishing U.S. sovereignty and authority. Although her statement acknowledged the theme of partnership by urging, “we will stand ready to help you” (13), the power disparity between individual countries and the one remaining world superpower remained intact. As a member of the U.S. president’s cabinet, Clinton’s first responsibility was to her president and, by extension, the American people. This speech illustrates the difficulty of crafting a genuine rhetoric of collaboration when one is speaking on behalf of the executive branch of the U.S. government. Additionally, if, in 2010, Clinton wanted to leave the door open

for a second presidential bid, it was important for her to send the message that she would not relinquish U.S. sovereignty on any issue—even global human trafficking—to the United Nations or any other international governing body. Consequently, her rhetoric of global partnership needed to be tempered by an explicit articulation of U.S. authority.

Clinton's primary purpose in the speech certainly was not to showcase her capacity for presidential leadership. Yet, it is instructive to consider the ways in which politicians use rhetorical situations to bolster their own ethos. When she introduced Clinton at the release of the 2010 TIP Report, Under Secretary for Democracy and Global Affairs Maria Otero asserted that "under Secretary Clinton's leadership, the issue of human trafficking is elevated as never before."<sup>59</sup> According to the *Medill National Security Zone* report, the passage of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 was, in part, "a result of then First Lady Hillary Clinton shining a light onto the global issue during the 1990s, when the transnational crime is believed to have grown exponentially."<sup>60</sup> In her remarks, Clinton explicitly invoked this long history, stating, "I remember very well when we got the wheels in motion for this process because we wanted to document the persistent injustice of modern slavery" (5). When she reminded her audience of her long history with the issue of human trafficking, Clinton also attempted to turn her tenure as first lady into part of a broader political resume that credentialed her for her role as secretary of state. She said: "It's been 10 years since the United Nations Trafficking in Persons Protocol was negotiated and the U.S. Trafficking Victims Protection Act was enacted, and I was very proud to have worked on both of those in a prior life sometime back." (10) This statement strategically positioned Clinton as an experienced leader who had a history of productive foreign policy work. Not only does this impression lend gravitas to her image as secretary of state, but it also creates an impression that would be of use to Clinton as she positioned herself for a second presidential bid.

In sum, although Clinton's remarks were relatively brief, and the issue about which she spoke was not explicitly controversial, the rhetorical situation she faced was complex. She attempted to negotiate the sometimes competing neo-abolitionist and human rights perspectives on human trafficking, infuse the dialogue with a rhetoric of partnership, retain the international moral authority of the United States, and establish herself as a credible and effective leader.

### **The Speech's Impact and Legacy**

Although the United States used the 2010 TIP Report to take what National Public Radio (NPR) called the "unusual step of reporting on itself, pointing out that the United States is one source of the problem," critics were skeptical about the results.<sup>61</sup> Prior to the report's release, Nathan Wilson, the CEO of an organization that trains anti-trafficking professionals, said: "From what I've seen, [the United States] should be on the watch list. I'm not expecting the annual report to reflect the true situation."<sup>62</sup> Gallagher argues that the decision to include a self-assessment was "a move presumably intended to lend additional legitimacy to the reporting process while responding to the most obvious of all criticisms that had been leveled against it in the past."<sup>63</sup> Although it was too long in coming, some who reported on the event interpreted the move as a step in the right direction. NPR reported that Humanity United's David Abramowitz called the decision to include the United States in the report a "powerful

diplomatic tool for the Obama administration to encourage countries to work with the U.S. to stamp out modern slavery.”<sup>64</sup> Others attributed the administration’s voluntary self-reflection to Clinton’s long-standing commitment to opposing human trafficking. Writing for *Ms. Magazine*, Kate Noftsinger stated, “of course it’s a woman—Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—who has finally included the U.S. in its own anti-trafficking report. She has put the second-largest sex purchaser in the world on the road to recovery—because admitting you have a problem is the first step.”<sup>65</sup> *Politico* noted that the “feminization of trafficking was one notable trend in this year’s report, expanding beyond the conventional stereotype of sex trafficking,” suggesting that Clinton’s feminist human rights perspective resonated in media coverage of the event.<sup>66</sup> Activists also reacted positively to Clinton’s discussion of labor trafficking and economic exploitation. In CBS News’s coverage of the event, Greg Kaufmann noted that when Clinton discussed business practices and supply chains in her speech, “you could almost feel the chills traveling up the spines of the hundreds of activists from all over the world who packed the room. Some broke into grins, cameras flashed.”<sup>67</sup> Kaufmann quoted Laura Germino, one of the anti-trafficking “heroes” spotlighted in the 2010 report, who said, “Now you have Secretary of State Clinton saying we need to have corporate responsibility in the supply chain . . . That’s huge.”<sup>68</sup> Reflecting on the historical development of the TIP Report, scholars Erin O’Brien and Michael Wilson argue that the “changes in focus of the anti-trafficking agenda from the Bush to Obama administrations are promising, demonstrating a greater awareness of a wider range of factors that contribute to trafficking both as a crime, and a human rights abuse.”<sup>69</sup>

Reaction to Clinton’s remarks was not universally positive. Writing for the conservative magazine, *The Weekly Standard*, Janice Shaw Crouse criticized Clinton’s theme of partnership, saying that “Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton makes it clear that the United States, instead of being the leader in efforts to end human trafficking worldwide, is merely one of the partners in confronting the ‘global scourge.’”<sup>70</sup> Crouse interpreted references to the Palermo Protocol, the U.N.’s anti-trafficking policy document, as a ceding of U.S. authority and a “threat to America’s national sovereignty.”<sup>71</sup> Crouse, however, was in the minority. The *Washington Post*’s Dana Milbank noted that Clinton’s favorability ratings exceeded those of President Obama in June of 2010, noting that the “secretary of state was in Washington receiving plaudits for being a ‘passionate leader’ and for taking a ‘resolute and genuine’ stand against trafficking and slavery.”<sup>72</sup> Milbank’s analysis illustrates the ways in which Clinton succeeded in establishing her leadership *bona fides* in the speech and in her broader diplomatic career. He noted that during the speech, “Clinton was in her policy-expert element” and remarked that “[f]ew could have imagined . . . that the controversial and polarizing first lady would someday win the favor of two-thirds of her countrymen [sic].”<sup>73</sup>

Clinton’s efforts to affirm the State Department’s commitment to opposing human trafficking within and outside of its borders have had lasting impact. When he spoke at the Clinton Global Initiative in 2012, President Barack Obama made human trafficking the theme of his address; he credited Hillary Clinton for her leadership on the issue, stating:

Now, as president, I’ve made it clear that the United States will continue to be a leader in this global movement. We’ve got a comprehensive strategy. We’re shining a spotlight on the dark corners where it persists. Under Hillary’s leadership, we’re doing more than ever—with our annual trafficking report, with new outreach and partnerships—to give

countries incentives to meet their responsibilities and calling them out when they don't.<sup>74</sup>

In February of 2013, the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act was added as an amendment to the Violence Against Women Act and passed by the U.S. Congress. In June of the same year, Clinton's successor, Secretary of State John Kerry, released the 2013 TIP Report, saying that "as Secretary of State, I will continue to make the fight against modern-day slavery a priority for this Department and for the country."<sup>75</sup> Like Clinton, Kerry adopted a neo-abolitionist frame when he referred to human trafficking as "modern-day slavery." Kerry's 2013 speech also was similar to Clinton's 2010 speech insofar as he asserted U.S. authority, saying that the values of "justice, dignity, and the rights of all people" are "probably quintessentially American values."<sup>76</sup> Although Kerry noted that those values were also likely "universal values," Kerry asserted that "American leadership . . . is required so that we protect those values and advance them, not just here at home but all around the world."<sup>77</sup>

Although the 2010 TIP Report backed away from the American exceptionalism that characterized the nine reports that preceded it by including a U.S. rating, the rhetoric that accompanied the release of the report enshrined the United States not only as a model of anti-trafficking best practices but also as the arbiter of international social justice.<sup>78</sup> Nonetheless, the report continues to do some good. In her study of the effectiveness of TIP Reports, Gallagher notes that "[e]ven those who continue to grumble about political hubris and self-righteousness generally agree that individual country assessments are 'thorough and largely consistent with the facts as observed, reported by the media and examined in other comprehensive Reports on the same issue.'"<sup>79</sup>

Prioritizing human trafficking as a major focus of U.S. diplomatic policy was one outgrowth of what Valerie M. Hudson and Patricia Leidl have called "the Hillary Doctrine," which they define as the "proposition that the empowerment of women and girls is a stabilizing force for peace in the world, and should thus be a cornerstone of American foreign policy."<sup>80</sup> Dubbing this philosophy "Fempolitik," Hudson and Leidl assert that Fempolitik is "a pillar of Realpolitik"—a strategic maneuver that fosters the continued strength of the United States as it works to create a more productive and equitable balance of power worldwide.<sup>81</sup> Unfortunately, Hudson and Leidl conclude that after Clinton completed her tenure as U.S. Secretary of State, the Obama administration's emphasis on international gender justice declined. Even so, they remain optimistic that Clinton's efforts, along with a generational shift in attitudes about gender equity, have laid a "foundation . . . that could lead to the persistence of the Hillary Doctrine over time . . . ."<sup>82</sup>

When Hillary Clinton presented the 2010 TIP Report to the international community, she negotiated a complex rhetorical terrain. Although opposing human trafficking is a safe political position, the arguments political leaders employ as they discuss the problem have pragmatic, strategic, and ideological importance. Clinton's address increased the country's pragmatic commitment to opposing human trafficking both inside and outside its borders. It also reinforced the notion that those interested in partnering with the United States would need to defer to U.S. authority. And, finally, the speech presented Clinton as a principled and experienced leader. An analysis of Hillary Rodham Clinton's 2010 address reveals ways in which

even brief speeches on relatively uncontested political issues are complex rhetorical maneuvers that can be structured to serve diverse ideological objectives.

---

**Author's Note:** Karrin Vasby Anderson is Professor of Communication Studies at Colorado State University. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2013 National Communication Association Convention. The author wishes to thank Denise Bostdorff, Robert Terrill, and Shawn Parry-Giles for their constructive comments and suggestions.

---

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Omedi Ochieng, "A Ruthless Critique of Everything Existing: Frederick Douglass and the architectonic of African American Radicalism," *Western Journal of Communication* 75, no. 2 (2011): 168-184; Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Jacqueline Bacon, *The Humblest May Stand Forth: Rhetoric, Empowerment, and Abolition* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002); Robert E. Terrill, "Irony, Silence, and Time: Frederick Douglass on the Fifth of July," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89, no. 3 (2003): 216-234; and Stephen H. Browne, "Textual Style and Radical Critique in William Lloyd Garrison's *Thoughts on African Colonization*," *Communication Studies* 47, no. 3 (1996): 177-190.

<sup>2</sup> Gabriela Wasileski and Mark J. Miller, "Rethinking Gender Violence: Battered and Trafficked Women in Greece and the United States," in *From Human Trafficking to Human Rights: Reframing Contemporary Slavery*, eds. Alison Brysk and Austin Choi-Fitzpatrick (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 108.

<sup>3</sup> Anne T. Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking: A Vision for the Future of the U.S. Trafficking in Persons Reports," *Human Rights Review* 12, no. 3 (2011): 380.

<sup>4</sup> Amy Farrell and Stephanie Fahy, "The Problem of Human Trafficking in the U.S.: Public Frames and Policy Responses," *Journal of Criminal Justice* 37, no. 6 (2009): 620-621.

<sup>5</sup> Theresa Loar and Laura Ardito, "Women's Leadership in the Fight against Human Trafficking," in *Gender and Women's Leadership: A Reference Handbook*, ed. Karen O'Connor (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2010): 260-269. See, for example, Patrick T. Sullivan, "Hillary Clinton Urges Action against Human Trafficking," *USA Today*, April 26, 2014, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/04/26/hillary-clinton-methodist-women/8209073/> (accessed December 13, 2015); and Hillary Rodham Clinton, "Partnering Against Human Trafficking," *Washington Post*, June 17, 2009, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/06/16/AR2009061602628.html> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Department of State, *2010 Trafficking in Persons Report* (June 2010): 338, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/142979.pdf> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>7</sup> Anne Gallagher, "Human Rights and Human Trafficking: A Reflection on the Influence and Evolution of the U.S. Trafficking in Persons Reports," in *From Human Trafficking to Human Rights: Reframing Contemporary Slavery*, eds. Alison Brysk and Austin Choi-Fitzpatrick (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 172-194.

<sup>8</sup> Michael Kruse, "The Long, Hot Summer Hillary became a Politician," *Politico*, April 14, 2015, <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/04/hillary-clinton-2016-arkansas-116939> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>9</sup> Shawn J. Parry-Giles, *Hillary Clinton in the News: Gender and Authenticity in American Politics* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2014), see pp. 54-75; Karrin Vasby Anderson and Kristina Horn Sheeler, *Governing Codes: Gender, Metaphor and Political Identity* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005), see pp. 118-127; Anne F.

Mattina, "Hillary Rodham Clinton: Using Her Vital Voice," in *Inventing a Voice: The Rhetoric of American First Ladies of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Molly Meijer Wertheimer (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 417-433.

<sup>10</sup> "1969," Wellesley College Commencement Archives,

<http://www.wellesley.edu/events/commencement/archives/1969commencement> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>11</sup> Parry-Giles, *Hillary Clinton in the News*; and Shawn J. Parry-Giles, "Mediating Hillary Rodham Clinton: Television News Practices and Image-Making in the Postmodern Age," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17, no. 2 (2000): 205-226.

<sup>12</sup> Kristina Horn Sheeler and Karrin Vasby Anderson, *Woman President: Confronting Postfeminist Political Culture* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2013); Karrin Vasby Anderson, "'Rhymes with Blunt': Pornification and U.S. Political Culture," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 14, no. 2 (2011): 327-368; Karrin Vasby Anderson, "From Spouses to Candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the Gendered Office of U.S. President," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 1 (2002): 105-132; Anderson and Sheeler, *Governing Codes*; Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Discursive Performance of Femininity: Hating Hillary," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1, no. 1 (1998): 1-19; Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetorical Presidency: A Two-Person Career," in *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, ed. Martin J. Medhurst (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996), 179-195; and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

<sup>13</sup> Quoted in Jamieson, *Beyond the Double Bind*, 22.

<sup>14</sup> See Parry-Giles, *Hillary Clinton in the News*, pp. 104-107.

<sup>15</sup> Hillary Rodham Clinton, "Remarks to the UN Fourth World Conference on Women Plenary Session," September 5, 1995, <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/hillaryclintonbeijingspeech.htm> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>16</sup> Loar and Ardito, "Women's Leadership in the Fight against Human Trafficking," 262.

<sup>17</sup> Patrick Tyler, "Hillary Clinton in China, Details Abuse of Women," *New York Times*, September 6, 1995, *LexisNexis Academic*. See also Karrin Vasby Anderson, "Hillary Clinton as 'Madonna': The Role of Metaphor and Oxymoron in Image Restoration," *Women's Studies in Communication* 25 (2002): 1-24.

<sup>18</sup> Parry-Giles, *Hillary Clinton in the News*, 102. Also see Anderson and Sheeler, *Governing Codes*.

<sup>19</sup> Video of Barack Obama's remarks announcing his cabinet nominations is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PMTTK-Avoll> (accessed December 13, 2015). For a transcript of Obama's remarks, see "Obama's National Security Team Announcement," *New York Times*, December 1, 2008, [http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/01/us/politics/01text-obama.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/01/us/politics/01text-obama.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0) (accessed December 15, 2015).

<sup>20</sup> Quoted in Loar and Ardito, "Women's Leadership in the Fight against Human Trafficking," 267.

<sup>21</sup> Julie Harrelson-Stephens and Rhonda L. Callaway, "What are Human Rights? Definitions and Typologies of Today's Human Rights Discourse, in *Exploring International Human Rights: Essential Readings*, edited by Rhonda L. Callaway and Julie Harrelson-Stephens (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007), 4.

<sup>22</sup> United Nations, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, December 10, 1948, <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> (accessed December 15, 2015).

<sup>23</sup> *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

<sup>24</sup> United Nations, *Human Rights and Human Trafficking: Fact Sheet No. 36* (New York: Office of the High Commissioner, 2014).

<sup>25</sup> U.S. Department of State, "What is Modern Slavery?," <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/what/index.htm> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, Cameron Conaway, "There are Now More Slaves Than at Any Point in Human History," *AlterNet*, August 28, 2012, <http://www.alternet.org/investigations/there-are-now-more-slaves-any-point-human-history> (accessed December 13, 2015); "Modern-Day Slavery," *Not for Sale*, <https://notforsalecampaign.org/human-trafficking/> (accessed December 13, 2015); and Melissa Holman, "The Modern-Day Slave Trade: How the United States Should Alter the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act in Order to Combat International Sex Trafficking More Effectively," *Texas International Law Journal* 44 (2008): 99-121.

<sup>27</sup> U.S. Department of State, *2013 Trafficking in Persons Report* (June 2013): 7, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/210737.pdf> (accessed December 13, 2015).



<sup>28</sup> U.S. Department of State, *2014 Trafficking in Persons Report* (June 2014): 1, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/226844.pdf> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>29</sup> International Labour Organization, "Summary of the ILO 2012 Estimate of Forced Labour," June 1, 2012, [http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/WCMS\\_181953/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/WCMS_181953/lang--en/index.htm) (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>30</sup> Mark R. Kennedy, "Dump Realism. It's Time For a Conservative Internationalism," *Foreign Policy*, April 30, 2015, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/04/30/dump-realism-its-time-for-a-conservative-internationalism/> (accessed December 15, 2015). Also see David Coates, *The Oxford Companion to American Politics, volume 2* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 454.

<sup>31</sup> Coates, *The Oxford Companion to American Politics*, 454 and Kennedy, "Dump Realism."

<sup>32</sup> J. Michael Hogan, *Woodrow Wilson's Western Tour: Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and the League of Nations* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2006), 172. Also see Leroy G. Dorsey, "Woodrow Wilson's Fight for the League of Nations: A Reexamination," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2 (1, 1999): 107-135. In the post-9/11 era, even conservative realists have been casting themselves as internationalists. See Henry R. Nau, *Conservative Internationalism: Armed Diplomacy under Jefferson, Polk, Truman, and Reagan* (Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 2013).

<sup>33</sup> "History of the United Nations," *United Nations* (n.d.), <http://www.un.org/en/sections/history/history-united-nations/> (accessed December 15, 2015).

<sup>34</sup> Karen E. Bravo, "Exploring the Analogy between Modern Trafficking in Humans and the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade," *Boston University International Law Journal* 25 (2007): 224.

<sup>35</sup> Bravo, "Exploring the Analogy," 225. See also: "What is Human Trafficking?," *United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*, <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/human-trafficking/what-is-human-trafficking.html> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>36</sup> Kelly Hyland Heinrich, "Ten Years After the Palermo Protocol: Where are Protections for Human Trafficking?" *Human Rights Brief* 18, no. 1 (2010): 2.

<sup>37</sup> Heinrich, "Ten Years After the Palermo Protocol," 2.

<sup>38</sup> Heinrich, "Ten Years After the Palermo Protocol," 4. For additional assessment of the impact of the Palermo Protocol, see Carol S. Brusca, "Palermo Protocol: The First Ten Years after Adoption," *Global Security Studies* 2, no. 3 (2011): 8-20.

<sup>39</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 381.

<sup>40</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 382.

<sup>41</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 382.

<sup>42</sup> U.S. Department of State, *2015 Trafficking in Persons Report* (June 2015): 47, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/245365.pdf> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>43</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 382.

<sup>44</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 382.

<sup>45</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 379.

<sup>46</sup> Steven Lee Myers, "U.S. Accuses 3 Countries of Abetting Human Trafficking," *New York Times*, June 20, 2013, *LexisNexis Academic*.

<sup>47</sup> Myers, "U.S. Accuses 3 Countries of Abetting Human Trafficking."

<sup>48</sup> Although the original title of the legislation was the "Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000," it has subsequently come to be known as the "Trafficking Victims Protection Act." See "U.S. Laws on Trafficking in Persons," U.S. Department of State, (n.d.), <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/laws/> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>49</sup> Moshoula Capous Desyllas, "A Critique of Global Trafficking Discourse and U.S. Policy," *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 34, no. 4 (2003): 65.

<sup>50</sup> Bravo, "Exploring the Analogy," 240.

<sup>51</sup> Farrell and Fahy, "The Problem of Human Trafficking in the U.S.," 620.

<sup>52</sup> Girish J. Gulati, "News Frames and Story Triggers in the Media's Coverage of Human Trafficking," *Human Rights Review*, 12, no. 3 (2011): 365.

<sup>53</sup> Bravo, "Exploring the Analogy," 241.

<sup>54</sup> For a more detailed explication of the human rights framework, see: Austin Choi-Fitzpatrick, "Rethinking Trafficking: Contemporary Slavery," in *From Human Trafficking to Human Rights: Reframing Contemporary Slavery*, eds. Alison Brysk and Austin Choi-Fitzpatrick (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 13-24.

<sup>55</sup> U.S. Department of State, *2015 Trafficking in Persons Report* (June 2015): 3, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/245365.pdf> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>56</sup> Hillary Rodham Clinton, "Partnering Against Trafficking," *Washington Post*, June 17, 2009, [http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2009-06-17/opinions/36784296\\_1\\_sexual-exploitation-prostitution-human-rights](http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2009-06-17/opinions/36784296_1_sexual-exploitation-prostitution-human-rights) (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>57</sup> Hillary Rodham Clinton, "Remarks on the Release of the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Trafficking in Persons Report," *U.S. Department of State*, June 14, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2010/06/143113.htm> (accessed December 16, 2015). All of the remaining references to "Remarks on the Release of the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Trafficking in Persons Report" are cited with reference to paragraph numbers in the speech that accompanies this essay.

<sup>58</sup> See, for example, Stephen Howard Browne, *Angelina Grimke: Rhetoric, Identity, and the Radical Imagination* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999); Stephen Browne, "'Like Gory Spectres': Representing Evil in Theodore Weld's *American Slavery as It Is*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 277-292; and Gary S. Selby, "The Limits of Accommodation: Frederick Douglass and the Garrisonian Abolitionists," *Southern Communication Journal* 66, no. 1 (2000): 52-66.

<sup>59</sup> Maria Otero, "Remarks on the Release of the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Trafficking in Persons Report," June 14, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2010/06/143113.htm> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>60</sup> "Amidst Problems, U.S. Expected to Rank Well in Human Trafficking Report," *Medill National Security Zone*, (n.d.), <http://nationalsecurityzone.medill.northwestern.edu/blog/tag/slavery/> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>61</sup> Deborah Amos, "U.S. Included in Human Trafficking Report," *National Public Radio*, June 15, 2010, *LexisNexis Academic*.

<sup>62</sup> "Amidst Problems, U.S. Expected to Rank Well in Human Trafficking Report."

<sup>63</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 381.

<sup>64</sup> Amos, "U.S. Included in Human Trafficking Report."

<sup>65</sup> Kate Noftsinger, "U.S. Finally Includes Itself in Human Trafficking Report," *Ms. Blog*, June 22, 2010, <http://msmagazine.com/blog/2010/06/22/u-s-finally-includes-itself-in-human-trafficking-report/> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>66</sup> Becca Milfeld, "U.S. Ranks Itself in Trafficking," *Politico.com*, June 14, 2010, *LexisNexis Academic*.

<sup>67</sup> Greg Kauffman, "Human Trafficking: Not Someone Else's Problem," *CBS News*, June 15, 2010, <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/human-trafficking-not-someone-elses-problem/> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>68</sup> Kauffman, "Human Trafficking: Not Someone Else's Problem."

<sup>69</sup> Erin O'Brien and Michael Wilson, "Clinton, Bush, and Obama: Changing Policy and Rhetoric in the United States Annual Trafficking in Persons Report," in *Global Human Trafficking: Critical Issues and Contexts*, ed. Molly Dragiewicz (New York: Routledge, 2015), 135.

<sup>70</sup> Janice Shaw Crouse, "The Administration Picks Weak Path to Fight Sex Trade," *The Weekly Standard*, July 22, 2010, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/author/janice-shaw-crouse> (accessed September 21, 2015).

<sup>71</sup> Crouse, "The Administration Picks Weak Path to Fight Sex Trade."

<sup>72</sup> Dana Milbank, "Clinton vs. Obama, 2010: Polling Well is the Best Revenge," *Washington Post*, June 15, 2010, *LexisNexis Academic*.

<sup>73</sup> Milbank, "Clinton vs. Obama, 2010."

<sup>74</sup> Barack Obama, "Remarks by the President to the Clinton Global Initiative," September 25, 2012, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/09/25/remarks-president-clinton-global-initiative> <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/human-trafficking-not-someone-elses-problem/> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>75</sup> John Kerry, "Remarks at the Annual Trafficking in Persons Report (TIP) Release," June 19, 2013, <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2013/06/210911.htm> <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/human-trafficking-not-someone-elses-problem/> (accessed December 13, 2015).

<sup>76</sup> Kerry, "Remarks at the Annual Trafficking in Persons Report (TIP) Release."

<sup>77</sup> Kerry, "Remarks at the Annual Trafficking in Persons Report (TIP) Release."

<sup>78</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 387.

<sup>79</sup> Gallagher, "Improving the Effectiveness of the International Law of Human Trafficking," 389.

<sup>80</sup> Valerie M. Hudson and Patricia Leidl, *The Hillary Doctrine: Sex and American Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 4.

<sup>81</sup> Hudson and Leidl, *The Hillary Doctrine*, 281.

<sup>82</sup> Hudson and Leidl, *The Hillary Doctrine*, 287.