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Abstract

This dissertation offers an analysis of metaphor usage during the 2016 presidential election. More precisely, the campaign speeches of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton will be investigated. The aim is to investigate four types of metaphor that are frequently observed in research about metaphors of migration. More specifically, the ‘migration as water’, ‘migration as invasion’, ‘migrant as alien’ and ‘container’ metaphors (applied to the theme of migration) will be discussed. The research consists of an analysis of the occurrence of these four types of metaphor in Trump’s and Clinton’s discourse about migration. More specifically, the effects of their uses of these metaphors will be analysed. The investigation is based on the analysis of eleven speech events: four campaign speeches by Trump, four campaign speeches by Clinton and the three presidential debates. The report consists of five chapters. The first chapter contains background information about migration in the United States. The second briefly discuss the cognitive theory of metaphor. The third consists of a discussion of metaphors on migration. More specifically, it will discuss the four types of metaphor mentioned above. Fourthly, before investigating the data set, I will clarify the methodology that I will use to analyse Trump’s and Clinton’s speeches and debates. Fifthly, the usage of metaphors of migration in Trump’s and Clinton’s speech events will be analysed. Finally, there will a discussion of the outcomes of this research. The general conclusion of this project presents the case that, Trump uses the metaphors of migration in the conventional way, which is to represent a negative attitude towards migration. On the other hand, Clinton’s use of the metaphors of migration, on the contrary, is discussed as being innovative in the sense that she uses these types of metaphor to represent migration in a positive way, or to deny the negative associations which the migration metaphors implies.
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Introduction

Language use is a complex characteristic of human beings, as it allows people to express themselves in various ways. One of the many tools that form a valuable resource in linguistic expression is the concept of metaphor. Arguably, the best-known theory that has been developed about this concept can be found in George Lakoff’s and Mark Johnson’s (2008) work *Metaphors We Live By*. They argue that metaphor “is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action” and that “our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 3).

Thus, metaphor does not merely provide linguistic expressions for everyday reality; it also forms its foundation. What’s more, metaphor can create this reality because it enables the speaker to affect the receiver and his/her action in response to the metaphor. In other words, metaphor can be considered as “a guide for future action” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 156). Subsequently, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) elaborate this claim as follows:

> In all aspects of life, not just in politics or in love, we define our reality in terms of metaphors and then proceed to act on the basis of the metaphors. We draw inferences, set goals, make commitments, and execute plans, all on the basis of how we in part structure our experience, consciously and unconsciously, by means of metaphor.
> (p. 158)

This quote again emphasises the omnipresence of metaphor in human life. However, more interesting is the phrase “not just in politics or in love” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 3), as it implies that it is in these two fields that traditionally, one perceives the presence of metaphor as most directly observable. This dissertation will analyse the use of metaphor in one of these mentioned fields. More specifically, it will investigate the occurrence of metaphors in politics, in particular in election rhetoric.
The presence of metaphor in political rhetoric is a theme that has been studied before (see, e.g. Semino, 2008; Musolff, 2016). However, there is one important recent event that has not as yet received full attention in this field of research: the United States presidential elections of 2016 and, in particular, the campaign rhetoric of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, the two main candidates. This thesis will offer an investigation of their use of metaphor on the basis of an analysis of eleven selected speech events throughout the different stages of their campaigns. I will discuss the choice of particular speech events more specifically in a later chapter of this thesis.

For the present purposes of this introduction, it is important to consider the campaign topic that will serve in my analysis of metaphor in Trump’s and Clinton’s discourse. Since many different areas of politics apply metaphorical concepts, the focus of this thesis will be on one specific theme which was particularly relevant and salient during last election, namely the topic of migration.

It is significant to add that while this investigation mainly focuses on the use of metaphors of migration, it will become clear that most of the time, the metaphors in the rhetoric of Trump and Clinton are mostly about immigration in the United States. More specifically, the thesis will investigate the use of four commonly occurring metaphors of migration in the English language, namely the ‘migration as water’, ‘migration as invasion’, ‘migrant as alien’ and container metaphors.

The primary purpose of this dissertation is to formulate an answer to two research questions. First, I will investigate in what ways Trump and Clinton make use of the four types of metaphors mentioned above. Subsequently, I will consider how these specific methods of use contribute to Trump’s and Clinton’s efforts to persuade the audience of their view towards migration.

This dissertation consists of six parts. The first part offers some necessary information about migration in the United States in the context of the 2016 presidential election. The second part consists of a brief overview and explanation of the cognitive theory of metaphor and about one particular type of metaphor that will be relevant for this research.
The third part contains a synopsis of some frequently used metaphors of migration. It also provides a theoretical context for these types of metaphor, which will serve as a basis for the further investigation in this dissertation. The fourth part offers a clarification of the methodology used for the analysis of the metaphors of migration in the speeches of Trump and Clinton. In the fifth part, I present my findings. While doing so, I will consider the metaphorical instances in the light of the theoretical insights offered in the third part of the dissertation. The sixth and final part of the dissertation discusses the outcomes of the analysis and provides a final answer to the research questions.
Chapter 1: Migration in the United States during the 2016 presidential election

In their presidential campaign discourse, Trump and Clinton spent considerable time discussing immigration in the United States. This chapter provides some general information and data about migration in the United States at the time of Trump’s and Clinton’s presidential campaigns. The first subsection offers a definition and several statistical facts about recent immigration in the United States. The subsequent subsections will briefly discuss the three immigration groups which were discussed most prominently during the 2016 presidential elections: Mexican immigrants, refugees and unauthorised immigrants. The discussion will include statements from several articles that the website of the Migration Policy Institute (henceforth abbreviated as MPI) provides.  

1.1. The concept of immigration

To determine who belongs to the category of ‘immigrant’ in the United States, one must consider the definition of this term. In the online newspaper article “Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States” displayed by the MPI, Jie Zong and Jeanne Batalova (2017a) define the term ‘immigrant’ as follows:

“Foreign born” and “immigrant” are used interchangeably and refer to persons with no U.S. citizenship at birth. This population includes naturalized citizens, lawful permanent residents, refugees and asylees, persons on certain temporary visas, and the unauthorized. (point 4)

---

1 Since in one of the articles that I will refer to, the authors present the information in ‘bullet points’, for this article I will each time refer to the bullet point number (instead of referring to particular pages).
They also inform their readers that “according to the 2016 Current Population Survey (CPS), there are approximately 84.3 million immigrants in the United States, which is 27 percent of the total population. The majority of the immigrants arrive from India, followed by China – Mexico – the Philippines and Canada (Zong & Batalova, 2017a, bullet point 1). Although the latter statement indicates the current predominance of Indian and Asian immigrants in the United States, the presidential election discourses focused more on Mexican immigrants.

1.2 Mexican immigrants

The first immigration group that has frequently been discussed during the 2016 presidential elections is the group of Mexican immigrants. Zong and Batalova (2017a) report that according to the MPI, the number of Mexican immigrants in the United States in 2015 consisted of 11.6 million people, which is 27 percent of the total immigrant population. The majority of these immigrants reside in the West and Southwest of the United States. As one will observe later, Trump frequently describes Mexican immigrants as a population group that occupies jobs which belong to American citizens. In this respect, it is meaningful to consider some data about the workforce in relation to Mexican presence within in the United States. About this matter, Zong and Batalova (2017a) state that

About 69 percent of the 11.2 million immigrants from Mexico ages 16 and older were in the civilian labor force in 2015. This represents a slightly higher labor force participation than for the overall foreign-born population ages 16 and older (66 percent of 41.4 million) and the native-born population ages 16 and older (62 percent of 214.8 million). (point 4)

Although the number of Mexican immigrants that occupy jobs in the United States is higher than the number of that of other immigrant population groups, there is a difference of maximum seven percent.
1.3 Unauthorised immigrants

Apart from Mexican immigrants, the topic of unauthorised immigration has been frequently addressed by Trump and Clinton, too. Regarding the number of unauthorised immigrants in the United States, Zong and Batalova (2017a) observe that “the Migration Policy Institute estimated 11 million unauthorized immigrants resided in the United States in 2014”. Amongst this population group, “Mexico and Central America accounted for most unauthorized immigrants in the United States as of 2010-14, with MPI estimating their totals at about 7.9 million (71 percent of the overall unauthorized population)” (Zong & Batalova, 2017a, point 11). This high number of unauthorised Mexican immigrants is remarkable because Mexican immigration is only estimated around 11.6 million people in 2015, as mentioned in section 1.2.

In another article on the website of the MPI, Marc R. Rosenblum and Ariel G. Ruiz Soto discuss the significant difference between the total number of Mexican immigrants and the number of unauthorised Mexican immigrants. In the description of their report “An analysis of Unauthorized immigrants in the United States by Country and Region of Birth”, they claim as follows:

    Mexican and Central American immigrants, who have long histories of migration to the United States, represent 37 percent of the U.S. foreign-born population, yet are disproportionately represented (71 percent) among the total unauthorized immigrant population. Mexico alone accounts for more than half of the estimated 11 million unauthorized immigrants in the United States, with another 15 percent and 14 percent from Central America and Asia, respectively. (Rosenblum & Ruiz Soto, 2015, 3rd paragraph)

Observing these figures, it can be noted that the focus on Mexican immigration in the United States during the 2016 presidential election is rather due to the high percentage of unauthorised Mexican immigrants in the United States, rather than to the total number of Mexican immigrants in general.
1.4 Refugees

Another frequently discussed group of immigrants during the presidential elections are refugees, in particular refugees from Syrian origin. In another article of the MPI, titled as “Syrian Refugees in the United States”, Zong and Batalova (2017b) claim that from 2015 onwards, there was a remarkably higher increase in the acceptance of Syrian refugees, which was due to the emergence of the Syrian civil war in 2011. Consequently, more than 11 million Syrians were displaced both nationally and internationally. Furthermore, between 2011 and 2016, there was a total number of 18,007 Syrian refugees in the United States, in comparison to the maximum number of 10,000 permitted at that time (Zong & Batalova, 2017b). Thus, Syrian refugees also form a significant category of recent immigrants in the United States.
Chapter 2: Types of metaphor

This chapter will discuss one of the best-known theories of metaphor, which is the cognitive theory offered by Lakoff and Johnson in their work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). Their insights will serve as a basis for the analysis of the metaphors of migration in the political rhetoric of Trump and Clinton. In this chapter, I will also elaborate on Lakoff and Johnson’s concept of ‘ontological’ metaphor, as it is a central concept within their theoretical framework.

2.1 The cognitive theory of metaphor

In the introduction, I have already explained Lakoff’s and Johnson’s (1980) main idea about the concept of metaphor, which is its omnipresence in everyday life. However, I did not discuss what metaphors are. In Lakoff & Johnson’s (1980) words, “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (p. 5). They illustrate this argument, among other things, with a specific metaphorical usage; the use of the conceptual metaphor “ARGUMENT IS WAR”. They observe how in everyday language use, people include metaphor in their speech to express themselves in many different ways, for example with an expression like “your claims are indefensible” or “he shot down all of my arguments”.

The concept of war partially structures many of the things we do in arguing. For this reason, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) conclude that “it is in this sense that the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is one that we live by in this culture”, as “it structures the actions we perform in arguing” (p. 4). They also argue that the metaphorical concept ARGUMENT IS WAR allows “to structure (at least in part) what we do and how we understand what we are doing when we argue”. This statement leads to the following conclusion: “the concept is metaphorically structured, the activity is metaphorically structured, and, consequently, the language is metaphorically structured” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 5). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) refer to these types of metaphor as “structural
metaphors”, that is, “cases where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another” (p. 14).

In his work *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction (second edition)*, Zoltán Kövecses (2010) elaborates Lakoff’s and Johnson’s (1980) concept of the conceptual metaphor. He explains this term as follows: “CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN A IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN B, which is what is called a conceptual metaphor” (Kövecses, 2010, p. 4). In this view, “a conceptual domain is any coherent organization of experience”. Hence, the author concludes, “we thus need to distinguish conceptual metaphor from metaphorical linguistic expressions”, since they are “words or other linguistic expressions that come from the language terminology of the more concrete conceptual domain” (Kövecses, 2010, p. 4). Kövecses (2010) explains the functions of “domain A” and “domain B” as follows:

The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is called source domain, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way is the target domain. Thus, LIFE, ARGUMENTS, LOVE, THEORY, IDEAS, SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS, PLANTS, and others are source domains. The target domain is the domain that we try to understand through the use of the source domain. (p. 4)

Later on in this dissertation, I will discuss the source domains which describe the target domain of migration more thoroughly. Moreover, the findings from earlier research in this area will be compared with the source domains which Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton use in their public speeches and debates. However, first, I will discuss another important type of metaphor that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have elaborated and which will be useful for the further analysis in this paper, namely the ontological metaphor.

### 2.2 Ontological metaphors

The ontological metaphor is one of the most essential types of metaphor in cognitive metaphor theory. It is also one of the subcategories of conceptual metaphors. By considering the purpose of conceptual metaphors, Kövecses (2010) claims that they “can be classified according to the cognitive functions that they perform” (p. 37).
He distinguishes three types of conceptual metaphor: structural, ontological and orientational (Kövecses, 2010, p. 37).

The concept of structural metaphor has already been discussed in chapter 2.1. Kövecses (2010) describes the cognitive function of this metaphor as “to enable speakers to understand target A by means of the structure of source B”, which occurs through “conceptual mappings between elements of A and elements of B” (p. 37).

The cognitive function of orientational metaphors is “to make a set of target concepts coherent in our conceptual system”. Therefore, Kövecses argues that “it would perhaps be more appropriate to call this type of conceptual metaphor ‘coherence metaphor’. In this case, the term coherence refers to the fact that “certain target concepts tend to be conceptualized in a uniform manner” (Kövecses, 2010, p. 40). In this section, I will only elaborate on the concept of ontological metaphor, as it will be the most relevant subcategory of conceptual metaphor for this investigation.

Kövecses (2010) describes the function of ontological metaphors as to give “a new ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts and to bring about new abstract entities”. More specifically, “we conceive of our experiences in terms of objects, substances, and containers, in general, without specifying exactly what kind of object, substance, or container is meant” (Kövecses, 2010, p. 38). Furthermore, there are four important subcategories of ontological metaphor which will occur several times in Trump’s and Clinton’s campaign speech events. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have named these categories as follows: entity and substance metaphors, container metaphors, personification and metonymy. The following subsections will offer a brief discussion of each category.

### 2.2.1 Entity and Substance Metaphors

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), entity and substance metaphors provide “ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances”. Moreover, they claim that “once we can identify our experiences as entities or substances, we can refer to them, categorize them, group them, and quantify them – and, by this means, reason about them” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 25). In particular, these metaphors fulfil different types of purposes like

2.2.2 Container Metaphors

Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) work offers a consistent basis for the discussion of container metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) claim that the most fundamental characteristic of container metaphors is the fact that they have an in-out orientation. More specifically, people are “physical beings” who are separated from everything by the surface of the skin. Thus, they perceive everything else in the world as being outside of them. Therefore, every person can be considered as being a container, “with a bounding surface and an in-out orientation”. (p. 29). Subsequently, they argue that “we project our own in-out orientation onto other physical objects” and therefore perceive them as “containers with an inside and an outside” as well. In this respect, “rooms and houses” are a clear illustration of containers because “moving from room to room is moving from one container to another, that is, moving out of one room and into another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 29). The authors also claim that:

even where there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries – marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface – whether a wall, a fence or an abstract line or plane (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 30)

However, the most important aspect about container metaphors is that they imply “an act of quantification”. More precisely, “bounded objects, whether human beings, rocks, or land areas, have sizes”, and this “allows them to be quantified in terms of the amount of substance they contain”. They illustrate this statement as follows: “Kansas, for example, is a bounded area – a CONTAINER – which is why we can say, “There’s a lot of land in Kansas” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 30).

Lastly, it is also important to bear in mind that “substances can themselves be viewed as containers”, “but of different sorts” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 30).
demonstrate this argument with their example of “a tub of water”. In particular, they argue that “when you get into the tub, you get into the water”. Therefore, “the tub is a CONTAINER OBJECT, while the water is a CONTAINER SUBSTANCE” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 30).

2.2.3 Personification

Another subcategory of ontological metaphors is personification, although Lakoff and Johnson (1980) describe this concept as an extension of the category of the ‘ontological metaphor’ (p. 34). The main idea of personification is that it consists of metaphors “where the physical object is further specified as being a person”, which “allows us to comprehend a wide variety of experiences with nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics, and activities”. Examples include: “This fact argues against the standard theories”, “Life has cheated me” and “Inflation is eating up our profits” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, p. 33-34).

However, “personification is not a single unified general process”, because “each personification differs in terms of the aspects of people that are picked out”. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) exemplify this claim with a comparison between sentences like “inflation has pinned us to the wall” and “inflation has robbed me of my savings”. In these examples, “inflation is personified, but the metaphor is not merely INFLATION IS A PERSON” but more specifically, “INFLATION IS AN ADVERSARY”. Therefore, this example of personification “not only gives us a particular way of thinking about inflation but also a way of acting toward it”.

In this dissertation, it will also be essential to consider the effect of persuasion that personification implies in a political context. Therefore, it is interesting to consider Charteris – Black’s work (2011) Politicians and rhetoric: the persuasive power of metaphor, as he offers a useful explanation of the reasons why personification is persuasive in politics. More precisely, he argues that personification “evokes our attitudes, feelings and beliefs about people and applies them to our attitudes, feelings and beliefs about abstract political entities and is therefore a way of heightening the emotional appeal” (Charteris-Black, 2008, p. 61).

In other words, it enables to transmit emotions from recognisable human characteristics to abstract political ideas.
Charteris-Black (2008) elaborates his description of personification by discussing “the ideological basis for using personification”. More precisely, this ideological basis is “either to arouse empathy for a social group, ideology or belief evaluated as heroic, or to arouse opposition towards a social group, ideology or belief that is evaluated as villainous” (p. 61). Thus, personification can be used to express both positive and negative attitudes towards specific ideas or population groups. Furthermore, Charteris-Black (2008) describes the way in which transmission of ideologies or beliefs can be realised as follows:

This is done by associating social groups, ideologies and beliefs that are positively evaluated with heroic human attributes – such as courage and determination – and by associating negatively evaluated social groups, ideas, etc. with villainous attributes – such as cowardice and treachery. (p. 61)

The analysis of Trump’s and Clinton’s discourse about migration in chapter 5 will demonstrate that they imply personification in their discourse about migration differently.

2.2.4 Metonymy

The last subcategory partly resembles personification but differs in the sense that it serves to refer to a person specifically. In particular, instead of “imputing human qualities” to the metaphor (as personification does), metonymy uses “one entity to refer to another that is related to it” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 35). Therefore, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that metonymy has a “referential” function (p. 36).

Another function of metonymy is “providing understanding” because “it allows us to focus more specifically on certain aspects of what is being referred to” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 36 - 37). Interestingly, these “metonymic concepts are also systematic”. Therefore, they can be divided into different categories: “the part for the whole”, “producer for product”, “object used for user”, “controller for controlled”, “institution for people responsible”, “the place for the institution” and “the place for the event” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 37-39). Examples of metonymy include:

- “We don’t hire longhairs” (“part for the whole”)
- “He bought a Ford” (“producer for product”)
- “The buses are on strike” (“object used for user”)
- “Watergate has changed our politics” (“the place for the event”) (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 38-39).

Briefly, the function of ontological metaphors is the provision of a new ontological status to the target domain that they represent, which can be realised by the four different subcategories to which the specific uses of the ontological metaphor belong.
Chapter 3: Metaphors of migration

This chapter will offer an overview of some of the most frequently discussed metaphors of migration. In particular, I will discuss insights from recent research on the use of metaphors of migration in English. The work of the following academics will be discussed: Elena Semino, Otto Santa Ana, Inga Dervinyte, Keith Cunningham-Parmeter and Jonathan Charteris-Black. In particular, I will discuss their views on four metaphorical concepts of migration: the ‘migration as water’ metaphor, the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor, the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor, as well as the application of the container metaphor on the theme of migration.

One must also consider the most remarkable conclusion about the use of these migration metaphors, namely the fact that they function mainly to provide a negative representation of the migration phenomena. Therefore, the main purpose of this part is to offer a basis for comparison for the investigation on migration metaphor in the campaign discourses of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. More specifically, by the theoretical and empirical work covered in this chapter, I will attempt to offer an answer to two specific questions. Firstly, in what ways are Trump’s and Clinton’s uses of these four types different from or similar to these tendencies. Secondly, what are the effects and uses of these differences and how does this contribute to Trump’s and Clinton’s goals of persuading an electorate.

3.1 The ‘migration as water’ metaphor

The first commonly occurring metaphor of migration represents the target domain ‘migration’ by the source domain ‘water’. In the following four subsections, I will elaborate on the ‘migration as water metaphor’ by offering the insights of three scholars: Elena Semino (2008), Otto Santa Ana (1997), Inga Dervinyte (2009) and Cunningham – Parmeter (2011).
3.1.1 Elena Semino’s (2008) ‘migration as a flood’ metaphor

In her work *Metaphor in Discourse*, Elena Semino (2008) discusses the use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor in British discourse:

> a conventional metaphorical use of expressions relating to the movement of water, and ‘flood’ in particular, is part of the discourse of immigration and asylum generally, i.e. it is part of the dominant way of talking about immigrants and asylum seekers in, minimally, contemporary British English. (p. 88)

Semino is especially concerned with “the metaphorical use of the noun ‘flood’ to refer to the alleged imminent arrival in Britain of larger-than-usual numbers of asylum seekers”. She describes floods as “natural disasters whereby large amounts of water invade inhabited or cultivated areas causing damage and, potentially, death”. Thus, according to Semino (2008), the notion ‘flood’ in discourse about immigration is used especially to express an anti-immigration attitude (p. 88).

Interestingly, afterwards, she creates a relationship between the ‘migration as water’ metaphor and the container metaphor (see part 2.2.2 above). On the function of this metaphorical combination, she notes how “groups, institutions, and particularly nation states, are conventionally constructed as containers, so that belonging (to a group, institution, nation, etc.) corresponds to being ‘inside’ and not belonging to being ‘outside’”. Thus, in such cases, there is a “metaphorical ‘in-out’ opposition” (Semino, 2008, p. 95).

Consequently, “the application of the CONTAINER image schema may emphasize the difference between what is ‘inside’ and what is ‘outside’, and may also involve the notion of resistance and protection against pressure from entities outside the container” (Semino, 2008, p. 95-96). This implies the emergence of a feeling of threat, which can be constructed as “the possibility of others entering the container that is associated with one’s group, country, etc., causing problems that one can describe as ‘bursting’ or ‘overflowing’” (Semino, 2008, p. 96). In other words, “the FLOOD metaphor, and other water-related metaphors more generally, often present the arrival of immigrants and refugees in terms of the entrance of (excessive amounts of) liquid into a container”.

It is significant to observe that these types of immigration metaphors “do not just dehumanize the people involved, but also present large areas such as towns or countries as bounded containers with a limited capacity, that can be filled until no more space is available”. This strikingly “simplifies the relationship between people and inhabited areas, and contributes to the ‘common-sense’ view that some areas cannot accommodate any more newcomers because they are (becoming) ‘full’” (Semino, 2008, p. 96).

Therefore, the most crucial aspect of the association of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor with the container metaphor is the fact it allows language users to represent migration (immigration in particular) in the sense of being an excessive amount of liquid that causes damage to the country. This representation enables the creation of a clear opposition between citizens and migrants, an opposition so notable that it arguably includes the dehumanisation of the latter. Moreover, the combination with the container metaphor also implies the idea that one needs to be protected against the pressures of the migration ‘flood’.

3.1.2 Otto Santa Ana’s representation of migration as dangerous waters

In his article “Empirical analysis of anti-immigrant metaphor in political discourse”, Otto Santa Ana (1997) also touches on the negativity implied by the ‘migrant as water’ metaphor. He observes how the ‘migration as water’ metaphor frequently serves to describe immigration in the United States as “dangerous waters”.

Santa Ana (1997) also warns about a specific risk that the use of this metaphor implies by claiming that “the negative connotation associated with immigration, in particular, has very clear social implications, and political consequences” (p. 321). More specifically, he describes the way in which the use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor impacts politics and society: “by treating immigration as dangerous waters, the individuality of the immigrants and their humanity are backgrounded”.

He also claims that “floods are a perfect metaphor to inspire dread and fear” (Santa Ana, 1997, p. 323). Thus, the ‘migration as water’ metaphor again tends to dehumanise immigrants in society. Moreover, a new insight is the fact that metaphor is frequently used in the political sphere to create a feeling of anxiety towards immigrants amongst the audience.
Santa Ana (1997) offers three subcategories that explain the causes of these implications of dehumanisation and anxiety. He names these categories “volume, movement and control” (Santa Ana 1997, p. 321). More precisely, “volume” describes “the relative number of immigrants”. Furthermore, “movement” focuses on “the direction of waters, primarily northward as from Mexico to the United States”. Finally, “control” refers to “the efforts to reduce the immigration of undocumented workers”, “by describing means by which the waters can be held back or stemmed” (Santa Ana, 1997, p. 321-322).

Santa Ana (1997) concludes his discussion of the ‘migrant as water’ metaphor by arguing that:

The hard-working, family-oriented immigrant who believes in the American dream is hidden with the use of this metaphor. His or her human quality is diminished as volume and movement are emphasized. (p. 323)

This statement is important for my investigation, as it partly explains the negative view towards migration in the context of a nation that is built up by migrants.

3.1.3 Inga Dervinyte’s representation of migration as a natural force

Another researcher who has discussed the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is Inga Dervinyte 2009). In her article “Conceptual EMIGRATION and IMMIGRATION Metaphors in the Language of the Press: a Contrastive Analysis”, she observes the use of metaphorical expressions about migration as water using the “migration is a natural force” metaphor.

During her research on migration metaphors in the British press, she discovered a frequent occurrence of the conceptual metaphor “immigration is inflow”. More particular, she states that “the metaphorical expressions having the image schema of a NATURAL FORCE refer to the concept of the flow of water as the source domain”. Also, the most occurring metaphorical expressions she encountered in her investigation were “influx, wave, surge, flood” and “curbs” (Dervinyte 2009, p. 52).

By considering the purpose of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor, Dervinyte (2009) makes a relevant observation. She notes how “the flow of water can change the complexion of a country, create alarm or change its course”. Therefore, “we conceive migration in terms of an active doer
or entity” (p. 52). This ability of migration to affect the country by its association with “imminence and force”, thus creates the perception of immigrants being a threat, or even as enemies of the country. Therefore, the state is obliged to go in defence against that threat.

Ultimately, this metaphor also focuses on the perception of migrants as “some undifferentiated mass” (Dervinute 2009, p. 53). In short, Dervinute considers the ‘migration as water’ metaphor in the British press as being a natural force or flow of water that can change the country.

In sum, similar to Semino (2009) and Santa Ana (1997), Dervinute (2009) emphasises the ability of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor to depict migrants as a threat against which the country needs defending. One can mostly achieve this effect through the perception of migrants as “active doers” (Dervinute, 2009, p. 52) who are capable of changing the state of the country.

3.1.4 Cunningham-Parmeter’ representation of migration as a flood

The fourth and final instance of research concentrating on the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is “Alien Language: Immigration Metaphors and the Jurisprudence of Otherness”, written by Keith Cunningham-Parmeter (2011). In this article, the author analyses the use of migration metaphors by the U.S. Supreme Court and observes the frequent occurrence of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor regarding the perception of immigration in the United States as a flood.

Consequently, he claims that this flood is considered as “the movement of people across borders as an uncontrollable body of water that harms the nation” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1580).

Similar to Santa Ana’s (1997) distinction of three subcategories of the flood metaphor: “volume, movement and control” (p. 321), Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) allocates “three distinct characteristics” of this metaphor: direction, size and force (p. 1580).

More specifically, Otto Santa Ana’s (1997) description of “volume” (p. 321) is similar to Cunningham-Parmeter's (2011) description of “size” as the description of immigrants as “a monolithic group of border-crossers that overwhelmingly approaches from Mexico (p. 1581).

Santa Ana’s (1997) subcategory of “movement” refers to “the direction of waters, primarily northward as from Mexico to the United States” (p. 321). Therefore, it is comparable with the characteristic “direction”, which refers to the depiction of “a northward immigrant stream” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1580).
Finally, one can compare Ana’s (1997) notion of “control” as representing “the efforts to reduce the immigration of undocumented workers” (p. 322) to the characteristic of “force”. This concept represents the border as “a fragile dike that might burst at any moment, given the pressure coming from the alien flood”, and thus emphasises the need to control this situation (Cunningham – Parmeter, 2011, p. 1581).

Briefly the descriptions of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor by Semino, Santa Ana, Dervinyte and Cunningham-Parmeter promote several similarities. As mentioned before, their clearest resemblance is their description of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor as a means to express a negative attitude towards migration. More specifically, all claim that this metaphor represents migration as a threat that enters the nation at a rapid speed and needs to be defended against before the situation will be out of control. Arguably, this way of representing migration as a threat frequently implies a dehumanising description of migrants.

Subsequently, it is interesting to consider the purpose of dehumanisation in political discourse about migration. The article “Justice, Morality, and the Dehumanization of Refugees”, written by Esses, Veenvliet, Hodson and Mihic (2008) offers some relevant insights about this matter. Amongst other things, the authors examine the function and consequences of dehumanisation of refugees in Canada. Their investigation of the function of dehumanisation led to the observation that “the dehumanization of low status groups in society may serve to justify the status quo and defend against threats to the ingroup position” (Esses et al., 2008, p. 22). More precisely;

by perceiving low status group members as not completely part of the human ingroup, one can more easily believe that they deserve their negative outcomes and that members of more well-off groups do not have to work to increase social equality. (Esses et al., 2008, p. 22)

They conclude that “in doing so, existing systems and the societal status quo are maintained and perpetuated” (Esses et al., 2008, p. 22). Another interesting observation that they make is that “by dehumanizing low status groups, ingroup–outgroup boundaries may be strengthened so that the boundaries between groups are less penetrable” (Esses et al., 2008, p. 23). The presence or absence of a boundary between immigrants and American citizens is an essential aspect of Trump’s and Clinton’s analysed rhetoric about migration.
Regarding the consequences of dehumanisation, the authors observe how in every conducted study, “dehumanization led to contempt and lack of admiration for refugees” (Esses et al., 2008, p. 23). They associate this observation with Fiske’s argument that “perceived injustice and illegitimate behavior on the part of an outgroup may result in contempt and other negative emotions toward the group” (Fiske, 2002, qtd. in Esses et al., 2008, p. 23). The authors elaborate this argument as follows:

In turn, these negative emotions promoted overall negative attitudes toward refugees and negative attitudes toward the country’s current refugee policy. Thus, dehumanization seems to promote negative consequences for the group in question through the emotions that it engenders. (Esses et al., 2008, p. 23)

Briefly, according to Esses et al., the dehumanisation of immigrants serves to justify the lack of action that a nation undertakes to help them. This justification is based on the reason that by dehumanising immigrants, they are represented as being responsible for their fate. Furthermore, dehumanisation also leads to the creation of boundaries between immigrants and the nation. However, arguably the most important conclusion is the fact that dehumanisation evokes negative emotions amongst citizens towards immigrants, which leads to negative attitudes towards them.

3.2 The ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor

3.2.1 Representation of ‘migration as invasion’ using the war metaphor

The description of immigrants as a threat to the country or nation is not only expressed using the ‘migration as water’ metaphor; another way of expressing this idea is the use of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor. In his work Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse, written by Otto Santa Ana (2002). I have consulted the electronic version of this work using the web application Kindle Cloud Reader. As electronic copies of a publication do not contain any page numbers (the number of pages varies depending on the type size used in the display), I will refer to ‘page locations’ (which do not correspond with the actual page numbers of the work). Hence, I will refer to the book by referring to its page locations, relative to the total number of locations (e.g. ‘location 1590 of 9671’).
American Public Discourse, Otto Santa Ana (2002) describes the concept ‘invasion’ as “an organized attack by armed forces with the objective of taking over a region or country”. Therefore, he considers “the semantic domain of invasion” as being “a subset of the domain of WAR” (Santa Ana, 2002, location 1590 of 9671).

Dervinyte (2009) also argues that the conceptual metaphor “MIGRATION IS WAR” is often used to represent immigrants as a threat. She makes an observation that resembles Lakoff’s and Jonhson’s (1980) description of the characteristics of the “ARGUMENT IS WAR” metaphor. Specifically, Dervinyte (2009) argues that the conceptual domain of war implies “putting up a fight, setting targets, using weapons as well as the participants of war, i.e. a victim and an enemy” (p. 53).

Moreover, Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) also explains the use of the war metaphor for its function to describe migration as an invasion, by arguing as follows:

Human beings instinctively fear outside physical threats. Throughout recorded history, nations have built walls and raised armies in response to real and perceived enemies. There are few, if any, aspects of our embodied experience more central than self-defense. (p. 1582)

Due to this “social, historical, and cultural knowledge, we often explain foreign concepts in terms of battle”. Applying this claim in his research on migration metaphors used by the Supreme Court of the United States, Cunningham – Parmeter (2011) observes how “reflecting the centrality of war metaphors in human thought, the Supreme Court often describes immigration in terms of invasion” (p. 1582).

Thus, the metaphorical concept of war implies the idea that “America is under assault by a different kind of enemy” and that “through metaphor, Supreme Court Justices become protectors of a nation besieged by an ominous alien attack” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1584). I will discuss the depiction of immigrants as aliens in the following section of this chapter, but first I will elaborate on the idea of the notion of protection that the ‘migrant as invasion’ metaphors imply.

Regarding the topic threat and the need of protection that the war metaphor implies, Dervinyte (2009) states that “whenever the lexical item specifies military action against the enemy is used, it is most often the target country that is personified and acts as a victim” (p. 53). Therefore, “it
seems that the WAR metaphor is used as justification for political sanctions against migrants” and that thus, “the metaphorical language of war justifies the strict control on immigrants entering the country, and moulds the public opinion about migrants as potential criminals” (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 54). In other words, the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor in political discourse functions as a justification to represent migrants negatively and to take measures to their presence.

3.2.2 Representation of ‘migration as invasion’ using the NATION AS HOUSE metaphor

The idea that the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor implies can be understood more specifically by another categorisation. Santa Ana (2002) categorises the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor as being an “umbrella” metaphor of the “NATION AS HOUSE” metaphor (as observed in the work of Paul Chilton). This observation involves the description of so-called “umbrella” metaphors as “providing the semantic source domains for a wide range of political metaphorization” (Santa Ana, 2002, location 5866 – 5881 of 9671). It is worth underlining how the NATION AS HOUSE metaphor aligns with the CONTAINER metaphor:

America’s everyday understanding of HOUSE is culture-specific, but its presumed cross-cultural central concept is a three-dimensional material container for habitation by people. Thus HOUSE, a higher-level metaphor, builds on the more foundational CONTAINER metaphor, with its center/periphery schema, interior/exterior schema, and bounding structures. (Santa Ana, 2002, location 5611 – 5628 of 9671)

Subsequently, Santa Ana (2002) offers some specific characteristics that the source domain “house” contains. Namely, the fact that it is “a manufactured structure, which implies a builder, an architect and design; materials such as roofs, doors, and windows” and that “it also presumes an owner” (location 5612-5630 of 9671). Also, this proprietor “is sovereign in his or her residence rather than one occupant among others and, within this dominion, enjoys paramount rights over others”. Therefore, “social claims are also made by way of this metaphor”, one example of which is: “the United States constitutes itself, defining legitimate residency, namely citizenship” (Santa Ana, 2002, location 5653 of 9671).
In other words, the idea of the HOUSE AS NATION metaphor regarding the attitude towards immigrants is its depiction of citizens as having the right to inhabit the house that represents the United States, while immigrants do not have this right. Therefore, immigrants need permission from the owners of the house to reside in it. This metaphor thus has the effect of excluding immigrants from the country.

Furthermore, in his article “Empirical analysis of anti-immigrant metaphor in political discourse”, Santa Ana (1997) also discusses the effects that the use of the “NATION AS HOUSE” metaphor implies. More particular, he makes the following statement about the pattern of thought that emerges by using this metaphor by citizens of the United States: “whether cultural, linguistic or material territories, we normally will resort any means necessary to protect them. We feel we own these territories because they partly define who we are”. (Santa Ana, 1997, p. 325)

Briefly, the NATION AS HOUSE metaphor represents migration as an invasion of the house that refers to the nation. The adjacent assumption then is the inhabitants being justified to protect their house against these invaders. This metaphorical concept again clearly serves to attribute negative connotations to migrants.

In sum, it is clear that the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor represents immigrants as a threat to the country. It is implied that the victimised country needs protection against immigrants who invade it. The comparison of the nation with a house depicts immigrants as invaders who are trying to break into this house.

### 3.3 The ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor

The fact that migrants are excluded using the “NATION AS HOUSE” metaphor signifies that they are depicted as strangers. Therefore, they are often described by the term ‘alien’. In fact, Keith Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) even claims that the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor is “the most dominant metaphor” in legal discourse because “it relies on a wide body of experiential knowledge – social, cultural, and historical – to create meaning” (p. 1569). He attributes three characteristics to the term “alien”, namely: otherness, illegality and ethnicity.
Regarding the first feature, he argues that “the repeated use of ‘alien’ in legal texts unavoidable triggers readers’ inclinations to associate aliens with extraterrestrials”, which has a dehumanising effect (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1569 - 1570).

It is also interesting to consider his claim that the combination of the “IMMIGRANTS AS ALIENS” metaphor with the “ALIENS ARE INVADERS” metaphor creates “multiple, overlapping correspondences”. More specifically, this metaphorical combination presents “immigrants not only as invaders from foreign countries but also as nonhuman aggressors from foreign worlds” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1570-1571).

Subsequently, Cunningham – Parmeter (2011) argues that the characteristic “otherness” has the following effect on the perception of immigrants:

[…] the metaphor IMMIGRANTS ARE ALIENS conceals immigrant’s personhood and potential for social contribution. The metaphor brings focus to images of foreignness and otherness, producing a narrowly focused picture of nonhumans who can never belong. (p. 1573)

In other words, the aspect “otherness” that is attributed to migrants through the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor thus marginalises them and denies their possibility of integration into society.

The second concept that Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) attributes to the term ‘alien’ is “illegality”. Interestingly, after his analysis of the connotations of both “illegal” and “aliens”, he obtains the following outcome:

If “illegal” means “criminal” and “alien” means “stranger”, then through the illegal alien metaphor, immigrants become criminal strangers. As such, the illegal alien metaphor presents immigrants as more than mere border-crossers; like murderers, robbers and drug dealers, they threaten the social order. (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1576)

Thus, the use of the adjective “illegal” implies the association of immigrants with criminality. Consequently, this metaphor “fuels a growing public distrust of both authorized and unauthorized immigrants”, which “fosters the misunderstandings about the scope of illegal immigration and the appropriate responses to the perceived problem”. As such, immigrants are perceived as a “monolithic group of criminal strangers who must be captured, convicted, and expelled”
(Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1576 - 1577). In other words, it is important to consider the contrast between the justification of describing immigrants in criminal terms and the actual accuracy of the demographic data.

The last characteristic of the term ‘alien’ that Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) elaborates is the concept of “ethnicity”. During his research on the use of metaphors by the Supreme Court, he observes that “although ‘illegal alien’ could theoretically refer to any group of immigrants, the term has a much tighter racial focus”, since it “focuses on Mexicans in particular” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1577). However, the problem with this association is the fact that “the illegal alien metaphor has never been concerned with conveying a true picture of the real demographics”. More specifically, the main problem of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor is that it “merges all Latino residents into one group of unauthorized outsiders”, who are “unable to contribute to a common social endeavor” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1578 - 1579).

In sum, Cunningham-Parmeter’s clarification of the different characteristics implied by the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor demonstrates how the use of this metaphor in the United States allows not only the description of migrants as being entirely different from American citizens; it also justifies their depiction as criminals. Furthermore, this metaphor is often applied to refer to the whole Mexican population.
Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Used material

In the investigation of Donald Trump’s and Hillary Clinton’s use of metaphors of migration, several of their speeches and debates. Instead of focusing on one particular stage of their campaigns, I have chosen speech events from several stages. This approach allowed for a wider scope of metaphorical variation. Is there a particular evolution in the use of metaphors of migration by Trump and Clinton? Moreover, I have chosen both individual public speeches as well as data from debates. The individual speeches seemed a good choice to explore the points of view that the candidates emphasise in their rhetoric. The analysis of the presidential debates, on the other hand, enables to observe how the candidates react to the opponent’s argument, for example by countering it or challenging the opponent. For each candidate, I choose four individual speeches. Additionaly I have analysed the three presidential debates. The eleven speech events are listed below, together with a link to the web page where the video recording can be found.

1) Hillary Clinton’s presidential announcement speech (April 12, 2015)
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZgGPMrLHRy0

2) Donald Trump’s presidential announcement speech (June 16, 2015)
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=apjNfkysjbM

3) Hillary Clinton’s Super Tuesday Speech (March 1, 2016)
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AyvaflqusdQ

4) Donald Trump’s Super Tuesday speech (March 1, 2016)
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qzEAYM0LK2U
5) Clinton’s Nomination Acceptance Speech at the Democratic National Convention (July 28, 2016)  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ToS5Hn9CV-E

6) Trump’s Nomination Acceptance Speech at the Republic National Convention (July 21, 2016)  
Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=34Svt3kfqlc

7) The first Presidential Debate between Trump and Clinton (September 26, 2016)  
Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BF2h_1OdroU

8) The second presidential debate between Trump and Clinton (October 9, 2016)  
Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rfq0Yw2sMq0

9) The third presidential debate between Trump and Clinton (October 19, 2016)  
Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=smkyorC5qwc

10) Clinton’s concession speech (November 8, 2016)  
Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cv4hsnfGRnI

11) Trump’s victory speech (November 8, 2016)  
Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=owuq_An4cnk

4.2 process of investigation

Before starting the analysis, I first had to take several steps in selecting and preparing the recorded data for analysis. The first step was to decide which speech events to concentrate on, and the selection of six similar speech events for both Trump and Clinton: their presidential announcement speech, their Super Tuesday Speech, their nomination acceptance speech, the first presidential debate, Trump’s Victory speech and Clinton’s Concession Speech. Although these speech events
contained several metaphors of migration, they did not contain as many metaphorical instances as needed for this investigation. This insufficient number of metaphors was mostly due to factors such as the length of the speech or debate. For example, Trump’s Victory Speech and Clinton’s concession speech turned out to be rather short.

However, the length of the speech events was not the only factor. Even in longer speech events such as the first presidential debate, there was another obstacle. More specifically, in this debate (and in other speech events), the theme of migration was not widely discussed, as in this debate they rather discussed aspects such as economy and warfare. Even though they also widely addressed the issue on race diversity, this did not apply to their view on migration explicitly, although it also has led to significant outcomes in the investigation.

Since I did not find sufficient data in the beginning, I have added two more speech events to the analysis later on: the second and third presidential debate. In each of these debates, I have encountered more metaphors of migration than in the first presidential debate. After collecting the needed data for my research, I have transcribed the fragments in the speech events that were related to the theme of migration.

In my transcripts, I have also included the discussion about race. More specifically, I have added the fragments in which they discuss their attitude towards the African-American population. Even though this population group is not a migration group, they nevertheless do form a minority group. Consequently, since the concepts of ‘migrant’ and ‘minority’ are often conflated in the United States because minorities are often of immigrant descent, I have also included the discussion of African-Americans in my analysis.

The second step was to select all metaphors of migration in the transcribed fragments. I again encountered some obstacles, since sometimes it was hard to make a distinction between concrete metaphorical utterances and utterances that could be considered as containing metaphors of migration. The problems which I experienced are similar to the ones discussed by Charteris-Black (2011) in his work regarding individual opinion on what can be perceived as a metaphor and what not. His view is that “metaphor arises from our expectations about meaning that are based on how words have previously been used” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 31). Consequently, this also means that
expectations of the common senses of words may vary between individuals according to their differing experiences of language and what for one speaker is novel may be familiar for another because experience of language is unique and personal. (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 31)

On the basis of these arguments, he concludes that “this is why people vary in how many instances of metaphor they find in a particular text”. He adds:

At any one instance in time a word may be more or less metaphoric for an individual speaker because judgements of what is normal, or conventional, depend on language users’ unique experience of discourse. (Charteris-Black 2011, p. 32)

Thus, according to Charteris-Black (2011), the encountering of metaphors is partly dependent on the experience of the researcher with the language in which the metaphors can be found. In this respect, I also experienced some difficulties with identifying the metaphorical uses, because I was at times unsure whether the utterance that I perceived to be metaphorical, actually implied metaphors.

An example of this is Clinton’s frequent description of immigrants in the United States as “undocumented” (which I will elaborate on in the analysis in the next chapter). This description can either be seen as merely a neutral adjective. However, it can also be considered as an alternative for more negatively loaded descriptions that imply a metaphorical use. Therefore, even though it is possibly not an explicit metaphorical use, it is still interesting to consider in the analysis of metaphors of migration.

Another complication that I encountered during my analysis was the fact that the utilisation of some metaphors could be ambiguous, as one can place it into different metaphorical categories. This is, for example, notable in the following utterance of Trump: “Drugs are pouring in through the border”. As I will discuss later, this metaphorical use belongs to two different categories, namely the category of ‘migration as water’ metaphors and the category of container metaphors. Such cases complicated the research because it made it difficult to make specific categories. Furthermore, I also encountered the complication that sometimes, metaphors belong to a combination of categories. Consequently, this combination might imply the creation of new effects of the use of the metaphors in question.
Because of the reasons mentioned above, namely the fact that it sometimes was hard to find out which expressions can be considered as metaphorical uses precisely and which phrases were not entirely metaphorical, I have chosen to conduct a rather qualitative instead of a quantitative approach in my investigation. My aim has not been to provide exact figures for each category. Instead, I have focused on some specific categories of metaphor which appeared to be most representative of Trump’s and Clinton’s uses of metaphors of migration and engaged first of all with their semantics in context.

Another important reason for the preference of a qualitative approach was the fact that the context of the utterances and the combination of various metaphorical uses into one utterance often turned out to be more relevant than the exact number of metaphorical use. As my corpus only contains eleven speech events, I thought this would not be representative enough to draw a firm conclusion regarding the strength of a particular category.

This approach also allowed me to focus more on the exact reason for the choice of a particular metaphor either by Trump or Clinton to persuade the audience. In other words, my methodological approach does not imply a clear overview of the exact frequency of a particular (type of) metaphor. Nevertheless, it did help me to focus more on other aspects of my analysis, for example, the context of the metaphorical use and the meaning which is being promoted more locally.

Therefore, I have also chosen to include the context in the appendix (and partly in the analysis instead of only displaying the exact utterances in which a metaphor can be found. One should take into account some aspects of this appendix:

- I did not imply the speech events in it entirely because, as I have mentioned before, in many instances Trump and Clinton also discussed other themes than the subject of migration.
- I have put all metaphorical utterances I encountered in bold font.
- Not all instances put in bold font are included in my analysis.
- In order to have a clearer focus in my research, I have only concentrated on four specific categories of metaphors of migration: the ‘migration as water’, ‘migration as invasion’, ‘migrant as alien’ and the container metaphors.
In order to display an approximate estimation of the occurrence of metaphorical use, I have marked other instances of metaphor in my appendix as well.

4.3 The codes used to refer to the data

All cases of the displayed metaphors can be found back in the appendix of this thesis. In the text, I will refer to the utterances in this appendix as follows:

so we should offer hardworking, law-abiding immigrant families

a path to citizenship (Clinton, 2015, 1.2, lines 1-2)

In this reference, I refer to Clinton’s presidential announcement speech on April 12, 2015. Regarding the numbering, the first number (in this example number 1) refers to the speech or debate, which in this case is Clinton’s presidential announcement speech. The second number (which is here number 2) refers to the specific location within the speech event, which is also enumerated in the appendix. Additionally, I also refer to the exact lines in Trump’s and Clinton’s speeches, and turns in their debates.
Chapter 5: Metaphors on migration in the speeches of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton

In each section of my analysis, I will discuss a particular type of metaphor. I will each time examine the instances of Trump and Clinton separately and clarify and elaborate these cases of metaphorical use. In the third presidential debate, the presenter Chris Wallace highlighted how the theme of migration marked the contrast between the two candidates: “All right, let's move on to the subject of immigration uh - and there is almost no issue that separates the two of you more than the issue of immigration” (Wallace, 2016, 9.1).

Therefore, it is essential to explore how Trump and Clinton provoke such opposition. Additionally, in order to make convincing arguments to defend their view, it is insufficient for candidates to base their strategies on already existing uses of metaphor merely. To stand out, Trump and Clinton undoubtedly also needed to develop “unique” strategies to secure the vote of their audience. It was to be expected that they would either extend the basic use metaphors on immigration or create and develop new metaphorical uses or strategies. A similar point is made by Semino, in a paraphrase of an argument made by Charteris-Black (2005):

In the political sphere, it has been shown that the speeches given by individual politicians can display salient and distinctive rhetorical strategies, including distinctive patterns in the choice and combination of source domains and the use of particular sets of metaphorical expressions. (Charteris-Black, 2005, qtd. in Semino, 2008, p. 107)

An illustration of this statement in my data is the observation that Trump’s and Clinton’s uses of metaphor on immigration not only often fit with the insights of previous studies about metaphor on migration. Sometimes, it is the combination of several orientations of metaphor that makes a particular metaphorical expression remarkable in their speech.

In this chapter, I will dwell on these particular uses of metaphor in more detail.
5.1 The ‘migration as water’ metaphor

As mentioned in chapter 3.1, the ‘migration as water’ metaphor presents and describes migrants as a significant amount of fast-flowing water, which often is a negatively connoted representation. Although this metaphor is often represented as a “flood” (see, e.g. Semino, 2008; Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011), I did not encounter any specific use of this noun in Trump’s and Clinton’s speech data. However, it is remarkable that Trump frequently uses the verb *pour* to describe migration in the United States and that, in contrast with this, Clinton’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is sporadic.

5.1.1 Trump’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor

In my data set, several instances of Trump’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor have been encountered. Each of the following phrases contains an instance of the ‘migration’ as water metaphor:

1) the heroin is **pouring in** (Trump, 2016, 4.5, turn 40)

2) A 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top of the existing **massive refugee flows coming into our country** already (Trump, 2016, 6.3, lines 7-8)

3) the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence **spilling across** our borders (Trump, 2016, 6.3, lines 27-28)

4) to stop the drugs from **pouring into** our communities. (Trump, 2016, 6.3, line 46)

5) people are **pouring into** our country (Trump, 2016, 7.12, turn 3)

6) we’re also letting drugs **pour through** our southern border at a record clip (Trump, 2016, 8.11, turn 14)

7) Drugs are **pouring in through** the border (Trump, 2016, 9.1 turn 20)
8) the single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern borders, just pouring and destroying their youth (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turns 31-32)

Firstly, it is interesting to observe Trump’s frequent use of metonymy in these utterances. As argued before in chapter 2.2.4, metonymy implies the use of “one entity to refer to another that is related to it” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 35). The words “violence”, “heroin” and “drugs” in the utterances mentioned above are all instances of metonymy. More precisely, these examples of metonymy belong to the category “object used for user”, because they refer to the persons who – according to Trump – cause violence and utilise or deal drugs.

This use of metonymy also dehumanises immigrants because it compares them to an inanimate abstract concept. Furthermore, these comparisons of immigrants with “violence” and “drugs” also demonstrate Trump’s depiction of Mexican immigrants as violent people and drug dealers, which contributes to the creation of a feeling of threat.

In addition, Trump’s description of immigrants as ‘pouring in/into/through/across and spilling across the border/country/community’ accurately reflects Semino’s (2008) observation that the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is connected with the CONTAINER metaphor, as well as the ‘in-out’ opposition that this CONTAINER metaphor implies (p. 95). Namely, Trump represents the United States as a container that is rapidly getting filled with liquid (which represents immigrants, and with them, illegal substances).

As Semino (2008) argues that the entering of others in the container of the nation might cause problems as “bursting” or “overflowing” of the container (p. 96), Trump’s expression of “pouring “ also implies the risk of the United States getting overflowed by immigrants. In other words, Trump perceives immigration as a threat to the United States because an excessive number of immigrants will eventually become problematic.

Trump’s use of the verb ‘pour’ can also be considered as an illustration of the three categories which Santa Ana (1997) attributes to the ‘migration as water’ metaphor: “volume, movement and control” (p. 321). Similarly, also Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) composed categories “direction, size and force” (p. 1580) can be applied to the analysis of Trump’s expressions that include the act
of ‘pouring’. More specifically, Trump’s uses of this metaphorical concept express “movement” and “direction” in various ways. In the phrase the “heroin is pouring in”, the direction is expressed rather implicitly, but it is clear that the heroin is pouring into the United States.

The utterance “we’re also letting drugs pour through our southern borders at a record clip” is more specific. Here, it is clear that the movement includes a northward direction, as the southern borders refer to the Mexico-United States border. Besides, this northward direction thus is also implied in Santa Ana’s (1997) concept of “movement” and Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) concept of “direction”.

The description of “massive refugee flows” in the second example is comparable with Inga Dervinyte’s notion of the “NATURAL FORCE domain”, referring to “the concept of the flow of water as the source domain” (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 52). As mentioned before in section 3.1.3, Dervinyte claims that “the flow of water can change the complexion of a country, create alarm or change its course”. Consequently, “we conceive migration in terms of an active doer or entity” (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 52). Besides, the depiction of immigrants as being a flow represents them as “some undifferentiated mass” (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 53).

These two statements already demonstrate two points of view that Trump expresses towards immigrants; firstly, immigrants being as a flow that can affect the condition of the United States and secondly, immigrants being one liquid mass rather than human beings. Interestingly, Trump emphasises this metaphor even more by adding the adjective “massive” to it. This emphasis enables him to strengthen the negative connotation of his use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor.

In the sixth example, Trump also explicitly emphasises the rapidity of the migration with the expression “at a record clip”. This emphasis on rapidity is an illustration of Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) category “force”. Trump’s notion of the rapidity of migration also evokes Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) reference to “a fragile dike that might burst at any moment, given the pressure coming from the alien flood” (p. 1581). In other words, Trump implies that the velocity of the pouring in of drugs through the southern borders might lead to damage in the country at any moment soon.
5.1.2 Clinton’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor

As mentioned before, in contrast with Trump, Clinton’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is much more sporadic. In my data, I have only encountered the following two instances of this metaphorical concept:

1) You know, America’s diversity, our openness, our devotion to human rights and freedom is what’s drawn so many to our shores (Clinton, 2015, 1.3, lines 1-2)

2) […] Not only to help protect the Syrians and prevent the constant outflow of refugees […] (Clinton, 2016, 9.4, line 10)

In the first utterance, Clinton uses the verb “draw”, which according to the Cambridge Dictionary (in this context) means “to attract attention or interest” (Cambridge Dictionary online, 2017). Therefore, there is an observable coherence between the choice of this verb and Clinton’s depiction of the United States. More specifically, she depicts migration to the United States as an inevitable consequence of all the positive qualities that are only ascribable to the United States. Besides, later on in her campaign, Clinton again emphasises the uniqueness of the United States in her nomination speech, by stating as follows: “our country’s motto is E pluribus unum: out of many, we are one” (Clinton, 2016, 5.1, line 6). In short, she describes migration as an unavoidable consequence of the uniqueness of the nation and therefore, in opposition to Trump’s negative depiction of migration, Clinton uses the ‘migration as water’ metaphor to justify migration by considering it as a confirmation of all positive aspects of the United States.

In the second example, Clinton uses the concept “outflow” to describe the emigration of refugees from Syria. This term is the opposite of the comparison of migration as an ‘inflow’. As mentioned before, Dervinyte (2009) states that source domains of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor like “influx, wave, surge, flood” and “curbs” imply that “the flow of water can change the complexion of a country, create alarm or change its course”. Therefore, “we conceive migration in terms of an active doer or entity” (p. 52).

Furthermore, Dervinyte (2009) has also analysed the occurrence of ‘migration as water’ metaphors in Lithuanian press, for which she offers the following example of such metaphorical concept:
“There are almost no measures today to cope with the problem of people’s ‘outflow’” (p. 53). Moreover, she states that this metaphor “implies flow outwards” and that “the focus is on the problem of people leaving the source country, i.e. emigration”. Consequently, she offers the following argument about ‘migration as water’ metaphors: “it is by focusing on different directions of the flow of water that different aspects of the complex metaphor MIGRATION IS A NATURAL FORCE are highlighted” (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 53).

Clinton’s use of the term ‘outflow’ also implies that this emigration is a problem. However, she depicts it as a problematic situation for refugees, and thus less uniquely so for the United States. Thus, instead of citizens of the United States, she, on the contrary, represents migrants as victims. Moreover, she also uses this description to express the necessity of providing help for Syrian refugees with the creation of non-fly zones, which she claims will contribute to the prevention of their “outflow”. Therefore, it is clear that she does not express her wish to prevent migration to protect the United States because she opts for the protection of migrants instead.

Altogether, the use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor demonstrates Trump’s and Clinton’s opposing views on migration. Trump namely clearly demonstrates a negative attitude towards migration, as he frequently addresses migrants using the metonymical concepts “heroin” and “drugs”. Furthermore, also his representation of migration as a liquid pouring into the United States implies negative connotations such as damage and threat.

Clinton, on the contrary, focuses on the positive motivation behind migration, since she considers it as a confirmation of the positive qualities that the United States depict. In doing so, she attempts to evoke a feeling of pride amongst Americans. Moreover, Clinton uses the metaphorical concept “outflow”, which is frequently negatively connoted. However, her use of this metaphor is arguably in part more positive because of the emphasis on the problems which Syrian refugees experience. At the same time, she stresses a possible solution for this problem: the creation of non-fly zones. Finally, it is interesting that Clinton does not use the ‘migration as water’ metaphor frequently, especially compared with Trump. In this way, she creates a big contrast between her view on migration and Trump’s perception of it.
5.2 The ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor

In section 3.2, I have discussed how the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor frequently serves to represent migration as a threat to the nation. This section will investigate whether examples of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor can be found in Trump’s and Clinton’s discourse about migration, and for which purpose they use this metaphorical category. Firstly, their use of the subcategory of the war metaphor will be analysed. Subsequently, I will discuss their other uses of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor.

5.2.1 the war metaphor

As mentioned before in section 3.2.1, some scholars observe a relationship between the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor and the WAR metaphor (see, e.g. Santa Ana, 2002). In the speech data of Trump and Clinton, I have encountered some explicit war metaphors which the candidates use in their discussions’ of the theme of migration. In this section, I will offer an overview and analysis of these uses.

5.2.1.1 Trump’s use of the war metaphor

In the analysed speeches and debates, I have observed the following utterances that represent Trump’s use of the metaphorical concept of war:

1) When do we beat Mexico at the border? (Trump, 2016, 2.1, line 1)
   [...] and now they are beating us economically, they are not our friend – believe me – but they’re killing us economically. (Trump, 2016, 2.1, lines 1-3)

2) Hillary Clinton wanted the wall. Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts. (Trump, 2016, 9.2, turns 40-41)
3) You look at countries like Mexico where they’re killing us on the border. Absolutely destroying us on the border. They’re destroying us in terms of economic development (Trump, 2016, 4.1, lines 1-3)

4) I am a unifier, I would love to see the Republican Party and everybody get together and unify. And when we unify, there’s nobody, nobody that’s going to beat us. (Trump, 2016, 4.9, lines 1-3)

Firstly, it is noticeable that Trump frequently uses verbs that express either aggression, fighting or damage. Trump uses the verbs ‘killing’, ‘beating’ and ‘destroying’ to describe the intention of Mexicans. Whether it concerns the economy or the border of the United States, Trump often depicts Mexico as a nation that evokes a fight. Although in this case, he does not mention anything about migration, it is important to reflect upon Trump’s view on Mexico on an economic level as well because it shows that Trump does not only creates a negative depiction of Mexican immigrants but that he also creates an enemy image of Mexican economy.

In this respect, he might have intended to create an association between these two aspects on some level. In the first example, Trump expresses the necessity to “beat Mexico at the border”, which thus involves the act of fighting against Mexicans. Furthermore, with the expression “they are not our friends”, he also implies a division between Mexicans and Americans because this description represents Mexicans as enemies of the nation. Thus, this description illustrates Dervinyte’s (2009) argument that the war domain implies the notion of “victim and enemy” (p. 53).

In the second example, Trump uses the metaphorical expression of ‘fighting’ to prove Hillary Clinton’s approval to build a border between Mexico and the United States back in 2006. The metaphorical expression fighting for namely expresses the fact that Clinton is not merely in favour of having a border, but that she also strongly desires the realisation of this project.

Even though the third example also refers to economics rather than the theme of migration, it still demonstrates Trump’s attempt to create an enemy image of Mexico. Christopher Schubert (2017) also discusses this utterance in his article “Constructing Mexican Stereotypes: Telecinematic Discourse and Donald Trump’s Campaign Rhetoric”. More precisely, he claims that this utterance
“contains the harshest metaphors in the form of the verbs ‘killing’ and ‘destroying’, portraying Mexico as a ruthless and murderous enemy” (Schubert, 2017, p. 52).

Thus, all of the examples of Trump’s expressions of the war metaphor mentioned above illustrate Dervinyte’s (2009) argument about the conceptual domain of war. More specifically, she claims that it implies “putting up a fight, setting targets, using weapons as well as the participants of war, i.e. a victim and an enemy” (p. 53). Trump frequently refers to the act of “putting up a fight”, too. His creation of an enemy image of the Mexican economy arguably facilitates his association of Mexican immigrants as being enemies of the nation, too.

There is also another aspect of Trump’s use of the ‘migrant as invasion’ metaphor which warrants detailed attention. He uses a metaphorical expression which Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) considers as “an entailment of the invasion metaphor”: “because the invasion metaphor describes immigration as an especially dangerous threat, however, citizens are reluctant to overlook the past offenses of aliens through amnesty”.

Subsequently, one can observe that “although the law of war allows governments to grant amnesty, public attitudes have become so shaped by the image of battle against aliens that such acts of forgiveness appear treasonous” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1587). In Trump’s discourse, I have observed four examples of his use of the “amnesty component” as an argument that he uses against his opponent:

1) Communities want relief, yet Hillary Clinton is proposing **mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness**. (Trump, 2016, 6.3, lines 68-69)

2) […] **she wants amnesty for everybody**. Come right in, come right over. It’s a horrible thing she’s doing. (Trump, 2016, 8.11, turns 19-20)

3) [about Clinton] Well, first of all, **she wants to give amnesty**, which is a disaster and very unfair to all of the people waiting in line for many, many years. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turns 12-13)

4) We have no country if we have no border. **Hillary wants to give amnesty**; she wants to have open borders. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turns 21-22)
5) We need strong borders; we need absolute - we cannot give amnesty. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turn 36)

Trump refers to Clinton as approving of migration. He criticises her for this approval, as he associates every immigrant with the past offences that some immigrants have committed. Therefore, Trump also generalises the idea that all immigrants have committed a crime. Consequently, he concludes that immigrants do not deserve amnesty. He criticises Clinton with the following statements: “it’s a horrible thing she’s doing”, “which is a disaster and very unfair”. He also claims that Clinton wants to have open borders, while Trump argues that it is impossible to have a country without borders. In the first example, he emphasises the effect of his statement by repeating the adjective “mass” three times in the same utterance. This repetition enables him to emphasise the seriousness of the situation.

Finally, in the last utterance, Trump also uses the term “amnesty” to depict immigrants as offenders and rejects the possibility of offering them amnesty.

5.2.1.2 Clinton’s use of the war metaphor

After having analysed Trump’s use of the war metaphor in his discourse about migration, I will now discuss Clinton’s use of this metaphorical category. In my data set, I have found the following examples of her use of this subcategory of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor:

1) [about Trump] he has also targeted immigrants (Clinton, 2016, 8.6, turn 3)

2) Because – unfortunately – there’s been a lot of very divisive, dark things said about Muslims. And even someone like Captain Khan, the young man who sacrificed himself defending our country in the United States Army, has been subject to attack by Donald. (Clinton, 2016, 8.9, turns 34-37)

3) We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lines. (Clinton, 2016, 8.9, turn 48)
4) he started his campaign bashing immigrants (Clinton, 2016, 9.3, turn 6)

5) That does not solve our internal challenges with ISIS and our need to stop radicalisation to work with American Muslim communities, who are on the front lines to identify and prevent attacks. (Clinton, 2016, 9.6, turns 8-10)

6) [...] that is why I believe deeply that if we resist the forces trying to drive us apart, we can come together to make this country work for everyone (Clinton, 2016, 3.4, lines 6-7)

Firstly, it is interesting to consider Clinton’s frequent use of the war metaphor to depict Trump’s negative attitude towards immigrants. This frequent use is notable in her metaphorical expressions “targeted” (example 1), “subject to attack” (example 2) and “bashing” (example 4). Thus, in contrary to Ana’s, Dervinyte’s (2009) and Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) assumption that the war metaphor in the description of immigrants serves as a threat caused by immigrants, in this case, Clinton applies the war metaphor to describe Trump’s behaviour. More specifically, it is Trump who acts in terms of the war metaphor, instead of the immigrants doing so. Instead of using the war metaphor to depict migration in a negative way, she applies these metaphorical concepts to criticise Trump.

Therefore, Clinton again represents migrants as victims instead of enemies. In this case, she relies on a strategy which Semino (2008) describes as the idea of “the possibility of ‘against the grain’ interpretations of metaphorical expressions and the strategic extension or evocation of other’s metaphors” (p. 85). Specifically, Clinton strategically extends the war metaphor that is often used for describing migration negatively. Therefore, Clinton’s metaphorical expression is a possible ‘against the grain’ interpretation of a war metaphor, applied to the context of migration.

Another example of such an ‘against the grain’ interpretation of a metaphor is observable in the third example. Here, Clinton depicts herself as someone who includes immigrants in America’s fight against terrorism. Instead of negatively describing migration with a metaphorical concept of battle, she uses this metaphor to express her eagerness to include migrants in America’s fight. The idea of the ‘against the grain interpretation’ of a metaphor is also notable in the fifth example. Here, she refers to the Muslim Captain Khan and describes him as someone who “sacrificed
himself defending our country”, which is also an expression of the fact that migrants should be included instead of excluded in defending of the United States.

Ultimately, in the sixth utterance, Clinton uses the war metaphor to describe the fight of the nation against some forces, although she does not mention which forces she refers to exactly. However, the fact that she wishes to make the country work for everyone also implies the inclusion of migrants in the United States.

**5.2.2 Representation of ‘Migration as a threat’**

In section 5.2.1, I have discussed the idea of considering migrants as a threat in political discourse that the country and people need to be protected against. As argued in section 5.2.1, this assumption is often expressed through the war metaphor, which implies the use of conceptual metaphors of battle. However, another way to express this idea of threat is by literally referring to it as being a threat in need of protection against. In this section, I will elaborate on these expressions of threat.

**5.2.2.1 Representation of ‘Migration as a threat’ in Trump’s speech events**

Formulations of threat and protection can be observed several times in the speech data of Donald Trump:

1) [...] But we don’t - 'cause we have no protection, and we have no competence - we don’t know what’s happening. (Trump, 2015, 2.1, lines 16-17)

2) Nearly 180 000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, order deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens. (Trump, 2016, 6.1, lines 1-2)

3) They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities, with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources. (Trump, 2016, 6.1, lines 5-6)
4) My plan will begin with safety at home, which means safe neighbourhoods, secure borders and protection from terrorism. (Trump, 2016, 6.2, lines 1-2)

5) We have gangs roaming the street, and in many cases, they’re illegally here, illegal immigrants. And they’ve guns, and they shoot people. And we have to be very strong. And we have to be very vigilant. We have to be – we have to know what we’re doing. (Trump, 2016, 7.3, turns 1-4)

6) […] and I will tell you that I’m gonna make our country safe, we’re gonna have borders in our country which we don’t have now. People are pouring into our country, and they’re coming in from the Middle East and other places. Uh – we’re gonna make America safe again, we’re gonna make America great again, but we’re gonna make America safe again, and we’re gonna make America wealthy again. (Trump, 2016, 8.5, turns 2-8)

7) We're going to secure the border, and once the border is secured - at a later date - we’ll make a determination as to the rest. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turns 42-44)

A literal expression of the domain of ‘threat’ is observable in the second example. Here, Trump describes the behaviour of migrants as “roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens”. It is important to observe the opposition that he creates between immigrants as illegal criminals and peaceful citizens, whom he represents as innocent victims. Thus, the notion of ‘threat’ is not only explicitly expressed with the verb “to threat”, but also through this opposition. In the sixth example, Trump also describes all refugees as a threat because he associates them with some terrorists who have a Middle-East nationality. In other words, Trump generalises all refugees as possibly being terrorists who enter the United States.

The concept of ‘protection’ is also literally expressed in the first and fourth utterance. In the first utterance, Trump criticises the lack of protection against the migration of Mexicans and other Hispanic nationalities in the United States. Therefore, he again considers their migration as a threat to the nation. In the fourth utterance, Trump promises to bring “safety at home”, which is a clear illustration of the use of the “nation as house” metaphor (Santa Ana, 2002).
Interestingly, in the third utterance, Trump depicts migrants as being “released by the tens of thousands into our communities”. This use of the verb ‘release’ might have a negative connotation, as it possibly attributes the behaviour of animals or prisoners to migrants. In his article “‘Like an animal I was treated’: anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse”, Otto Santa Ana (1999) describes the suggestion of the animal metaphor by paraphrasing Lovejoy (1936) as follows:

In the west a purported ‘natural’ hierarchy has been articulated since the time of Aquinas to justify social inequity. In its full extension it subordinates other living creatures to human beings, and ranks the inherent quality of humans from more base to more noble. In its elaborated form, it has been called the ‘Great Chain of Being’. (Lovejoy 1936, qtd. in Santa Ana, 1999, p. 201)

Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) has also observed the use of the same metaphorical expression in his research of contemporary discourse of the Supreme Court. In his investigation, he encountered the following utterance: “[T]he Government may continue to detain an alien who still remains here or release that alien under supervision”. Additionally, he claims that “the Supreme Court employs dehumanizing metaphors to describe aliens as animals that are caught and released” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1571). Here, h also perceives the choice of the verb ‘release’ as a characteristic that belongs to an animal and that therefore serves to represent the inhumaness of migrants. (I will discuss the depiction of migrants as aliens in the following section of this thesis).

Thus, Trump’s use of the domain ‘animal’ arguably serves to dehumanise immigrants and to depict them as being subordinate to American citizens. Furthermore, the choice of the verb “release” also indicates that Trump considers immigrants as being a threat, which, as I have mentioned before, implies the need for protection. Furthermore, Trump also claims the necessity of protection by arguing that immigrants affect public safety.

In the fourth, sixth and seventh utterances, Trump uses the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor to prove the need for more borders in the United States. In combination with the word “secure” (“secure borders”, “to secure the border”), Trump’s message of the need to build borders is expressed even more strongly, since it involves a justification, that is, the building of borders to
obtain security. This concept of justification was already discussed before with Dervinyte’s (2009) statement that “the WAR metaphor is used as justification for political sanctions against migrants”.

Thus, “the metaphorical language of war justifies the strict control on immigrants entering the country, and molds the public opinion about migrants as potential criminals” (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 54). As the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor is part of the WAR metaphor, it can be applied to this example as well. Furthermore, in the fifth utterance, Trump more explicitly expresses the need for protection against the threat of migration. The claim here is that migrants are threatening because “they’ve guns” and because they “shoot people”. Therefore, the country needs to be “very strong” and “vigilant” to prevent any tragedy from happening.

Shortly, the reference to borders and the security they provide serves to compare migrants with invaders whom the nation needs to protected against by the building of a border that separates them and keeps them on a safe distance. The statement “we’re gonna make America great again, but we’re gonna make America safe again” also implies that although it is necessary to make America great again, it is even more urgent to make it safe again.

5.2.2.2 Clinton’s use of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor

In the previous subsection, I have demonstrated that Trump’s discourse quite frequently contains the use of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor to represent the idea of a threat. In the speech data of Clinton, some expressions which revolve around the concept of threat have been observed, too:

1) Now – now America is once again at a moment of reckoning: powerful forces are threatening to pull us apart. (Clinton, 2016, 5.1, lines 1-2)

2) There’s too much inequality, too little social mobility, too much paralysis in Washington, too many threats at home and abroad. (Clinton, 2016, 5.1, lines 27-28).

3) […] In fact, the killer...of the...dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando, the Pulse Night Club, was born in Queens; the same place Donald was born. So let’s be clear about what the threat is and how we are best going to be able to meet it. (Clinton, 2016, 9.6,
In the first example, Clinton states that “powerful forces are threatening the United States apart”. However, as mentioned before, she does not specify what exactly these powerful forces imply. Thus, in opposition to Trump’s explicit claim that it is migration that threatens the United States, Clinton does not seem to blame migrants in her utterances.

In the second example, it is not clear which threats Clinton refers to either. As one can observe, Clinton also uses the NATION as HOUSE metaphor (see Santa Ana 2002), but interestingly, she does not use it to create a division between citizens of the United States and migrants. This idea is in contrast with Trump’s purpose of the use of the “nation as house” metaphor which I have discussed before (“safety at home”).

However, in the third example, Clinton describes the threat more specifically. She refers to the shooting in a nightclub in Orlando on June 12, 2016. An online article of the BBC, titled “Orlando nightclub shooting: How the attack unfolded”, informs us that on that day, “a gunman opened fire at a gay nightclub in Orlando, Florida, killing at least 49 people and injuring dozens before being shot dead by police”. According to Barack Obama, “this was an act of terror and an act of hate, but authorities were investigating whether there were links to extremist groups (BBC online, 2016).

Subsequently, the BBC reported that Trump “called on the president to resign for not using the words ‘Islamic terrorism’ and once again called for a ban on all Muslims coming to the United States” (BBC online, 2016). In her reference to this event, Clinton gives a counter-argument against a similar claim that was previously pronounced by Trump during the third presidential debate. More particularly, she states:

But I wanna respond to what Donald said about refugees, he’s made these claims repeatedly: I am not going to let anyone into this country who is not vetted, whom we do not have confidence in. (Clinton, 2016, 9.6, turns 1-3)

Thus, according to her, Trump assumed that all forms of violence and terrorism are to blame on immigrants. Regarding this matter, Clinton acknowledges the need for vetting, but she also emphasises the inaccuracy of Trump’s statement. Clinton demonstrates her point of view by
equating the place of birth of the perpetrator of the Orlando shooting with Trump’s place of birth. She contradicts Trump by countering his inaccurate generalisations of migration as a threat.

Moreover, Clinton also mentions the concept of safety in her discourse. During the first presidential debate, Trump and Clinton discuss the “stop and frisk” system. The Legal Information Institute defines this concept as follows:

A brief, non-intrusive, police stop of a suspect. The Fourth Amendment requires that the police have a reasonable suspicion that a crime has been, is being, or is about to be committed before stopping a suspect. If the police reasonably suspect the person is armed and dangerous, they may conduct a frisk, a quick pat-down of the person’s outer clothing (Legal Information Institute, 2017)

During the debate, the presenter Lester Holt stated as follows: “stop-and-frisk was ruled unconstitutional in New York because it - it largely singled out black and Hispanic young men”(Holt, 2016, 7.3, turns 13-14). In her discussion about this system during the debate, Clinton states as follows:

You know, the vibrancy of the black church, the black businesses that employ so many people – uh - the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids – uh -there's a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up. But we do always have to make sure we keep people safe. There are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective. Stop-and-frisk was found to be unconstitutional and - in part - because it was ineffective. It did not do what it needed to do. (Clinton, 2016, 7.5, turns 5-12)

Here, it is interesting that Clinton acknowledges that there is a possible presence of threat in the country, more specifically the danger of gun violence. Besides, it is also clear that in this case, the gun violence is associated with African-Americans. By arguing that it is important to “keep people safe”, she implies the need for protection against gun violence. However, in her attempt to gain the African-American vote, she avoids a negative description about the African-American community in general. Instead, she initiates her argument with an enumeration of several good qualities which she ascribes to the African-American population. Only then, she offers the argument that the United
States needs protection against gun violence, which is performed by some members of the African-American community.

Therefore, this example also demonstrates that Clinton is in a difficult position in the debate about the stop-and-frisk system. On the one hand, she realises that many incidents of gun violence are associated with the African-American population. Therefore, she cannot deny that African-Americans do represent the feeling of threat to a certain extent. On the other hand, Clinton also attempts to convince African-Americans to vote for her. Therefore, she does not exclude the fact that the citizens of the United States do need protection against the threat that some African-Americans are associated with. However, with the utterance “there are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective”, she already frames her disagreement regarding the use of the stop-and-frisk system.

Another expression of safety is the following:

I’ve worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America. I’ve met with a lot of them, and I’ve heard how important it is for them to feel that they are wanted and included and part of our country, part of our homeland security. And that’s what I wanna see. (Clinton, 2016, 8.9, turns 49-52)

Here, Clinton again uses the “nation as house” metaphor (Santa Ana, 2002), which usually functions to create a division between US citizens and foreigners, since the latter do not belong to this home and therefore are considered as invaders against whom the country needs to be protected.

However, Clinton, on the contrary, uses this metaphor to include immigrants instead of creating a division. Her claim that Muslim groups should be part of the “homeland security” of the United States invites Muslims to become part of the house that represents the United States and to support the United States in their protection against dangerous situations. This is again an example of Semino’s (2008) concept of an ‘against the grain’ interpretation of a metaphorical expression and of “the strategic extension or evocation of other’s metaphors” (p. 85).

When applying our analysis to Clinton’s use of the “nation as house” metaphor, one must consider the previously mentioned observation that this metaphor usually serves to depict immigrants as persons who attempt to break into the house that refers to the nation, which excludes them from
entitlement to enter the house. Therefore, Clinton’s use of this metaphor to include immigrants instead of excluding them is an illustration of an ‘against the grain’ interpretation of the “nation as house” metaphor.

5.3 The ‘Migrant as alien’ metaphor

As discussed before in section 2.3, Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) attributes three qualities to the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor: otherness, illegality and ethnicity” (p. 1569). In this section, I will offer the analysis of the use of this metaphorical concept in the speech data of Trump and Clinton by – amongst other things – examining the application of these three characteristics to the metaphorical concepts used by Trump and Clinton.

5.3.1 Trump’s use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor

In the data analysis of Trump’s discourse about migration, I have encountered the following instances that represent his use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor:

1) Nearly 180 000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, order deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens. The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year, already exceeds the entire total from 2015. They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities, with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources. (Trump, 2016, 6.1, lines 1-6)

2) People are coming into our country like - we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is and she wants 550 percent more. This is gonna be the great Trojan horse of all time. (Trump, 2016, 8.10, turns 5-8)

3) Hillary Clinton, in terms of having people come into our country; we have many criminal illegal aliens. (Trump, 2016, 8.11, turns 1-2)
4) hundreds of thousands of people come in from Syria when we know nothing about them. (Trump, 2016, 8.10, turns 15-16)

5) [...] whose children have been killed, brutally killed, by people that came into the country illegally. You have thousands of mothers, and fathers and relatives all over the country. They’re coming in illegally. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turns 17-20)

6) We take care of illegal immigrants, people that come into the country illegally, better than we take care of our vets; that can’t happen. (Trump, 2016, 9.7, turns 6-8)

In the first example, it is remarkable that Trump uses the term “illegal” twice to describe immigrants. Regarding this function of repetition in political speeches, Charteris-Black (2011) states that “repetition communicates a sense of conviction” (p. 9). Furthermore, as mentioned before in the discussion about ‘migration as invasion’ metaphors in Trump’s speech, the contrast that he introduces between immigrants as illegal criminals and American citizens as peaceful persons and therefore innocent victims, highlights the association of migrants with a threat.

This argument is also observable in Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) statement that “the illegal alien metaphor represents immigrants as more than mere border – crossers”, because “like murderers, robbers and drug dealers, they threaten the social order” (p. 1576). Moreover, the notion of these immigrants as being “released” into the United States, possibly demonstrates their inhuman association, as I have already discussed in section 3.2.1.

The second, fourth and sixth utterances do not contain a ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. However, they do imply the idea of “otherness” that is part of the meaning of this metaphor (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011). Specifically, Trump describes immigrants with the utterances “we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is, we know nothing about them, and they have no idea where they come from”. Therefore, in a way, Trump does not even acknowledge the migrant status of these people because he partly attempts to deny their background and identity.

In a way, this strategy is comparable with a strategy observed by Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) in his research of the discourse that the Supreme Court maintains about migration. Specifically,
Cunningham-Parmeter argues that “dehumanization occurs by describing aliens as creatures from outer space”, since “extraterrestrials are the ultimate nonhumans” (p. 1571). He describes aliens with the following characteristics: “born in a foreign galaxy, space creatures do not eat our food or breathe our air; they possess fewer human qualities than even animals on Earth” (p. 1571).

Furthermore, Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) describes the purpose of the use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor by using these characteristics in legal discourse. He claims that “because metaphors connect listeners to deeply embedded cultural knowledge, the repeated use of ‘alien’ in legal texts unavoidably triggers readers’ inclinations to associate aliens with extraterrestrials” (p. 1571). He explains the effect of this metaphor as follows: “according to popular science fiction narratives, extraterrestrials seek to dominate the universe”. Therefore, this metaphor relates to the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor, which “relates simultaneously to popular images of space creatures attempting to overtake the galaxy, as well as more conventional notions of warfare” (Cunningham- Parmeter, 2011, p. 1571).

In conclusion, “by connecting readers to this cultural imagery, the Court’s alien metaphors present immigrants not only as invaders from foreign countries, but also as nonhuman aggressors from foreign worlds” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1571-1572).

By applying these statements to Trump’s second, fourth and sixth examples, one can observe several aspects. His formulations do not explicitly include an expression of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. Nevertheless, they may imply a partial comparison of immigrants with extraterrestrials. This is possible because Trump conceals the background of immigrants in his utterances. Moreover, the potential slippage of the representation of migrants as extraterrestrials adds to their association with the concept of threat to the extent that a comparison is invited with creatures who “seek to dominate the universe”.

Another interesting aspect is the addition of another metaphor in the second utterance, namely the expression “this is gonna be the great Trojan horse of all time”. The Merriam-Webster dictionary online (2017) explains the expression “Trojan horse” by offering its background story:

After besieging the walls of Troy for ten years, the Greeks built a huge, hollow wooden horse, secretly filled it with armed warriors, and presented it to the Trojans as a gift for the
goddess Athena, and the Trojans took the horse inside the city's walls. That night, the armed Greeks swarmed out and captured and burned the city. A Trojan horse is thus anything that looks innocent but, once accepted, has power to harm or destroy (Merriam-Webster dictionary online, 2017)

In this explanation, especially the last sentence is interesting, as it is similar to Trump’s intended representation of immigrants. Furthermore, this dictionary also offers the following definition of the expression: “someone or something intended to defeat or subvert from within usually by deceptive means” (Merriam-Webster dictionary online, 2017). The application of these two descriptions of Trump’s depiction of immigrants signifies that here, the expression “ Trojan horse” describes immigrants as being invaders who appear to be innocent at first sight. This leads to their acceptance in the United States by people like Clinton who assume that these immigrants are innocent. However, once the immigrants enter the country, they will reveal their dangerous identity and cause damage to the nation.

Therefore, this metaphor belongs to the category of ‘migration as invasion’ metaphors. However, in combination with the description “we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is”, which belongs to the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor, this metaphorical expression furthermore emphasises the threatening identity of migrants. Therefore, one can argue that there is a connection between ‘migrant as alien’ metaphors and ‘migration as invasion metaphors’ because they complete one another.

Trump also uses this metaphor during the third presidential debate. This use implies the same attitude towards migration:

[…] And wait till you see – and this is gonna be the great Trojan horse - and wait till you see what happens in the coming years. (Trump, 2016, 9.5, turns 7-8)

Here, Trump generalises immigrants as being all aligned to ISIS, which depicts them as being a threat to the United States, since there is a clear association with terrorism.

Furthermore, the third example of Trump’s use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor is also remarkable, because it depicts Trump’s perception of immigrants as “criminal illegal aliens”. In

---

3 See appendix 9.5 for the entire fragment
this case, it is interesting to consider Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) analysis of the “illegal alien” metaphor: “If ‘illegal’ means criminal and ‘alien’ means ‘stranger’, then through the illegal alien metaphor, immigrants become criminal strangers (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1576).

In other words, if “illegal alien” means “criminal stranger”, then Trump’s expression “criminal illegal aliens” in this respect signifies ‘criminal criminal strangers’. In this case, there is a repetition of the same element, which, as discussed before, contributes to the conviction of the perception of immigrants as criminals. In this respect, Trump’s combination of three different elements that are frequently used in the creation of a ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor, strengthens his argument. Therefore, it also increases his influence on the pattern of thought of the audience.

The fifth example mentioned above also contains an example of a ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. Firstly, it is noteworthy that Trump repeats the fact that immigrants come into the country illegally: “people that came into the country illegally” and “they’re coming in illegally”. This repetition thus emphasises his claim. There is also another remarkable element in this utterance, namely the fact that Trump uses these ‘migrant as alien’ metaphors in a real-life story.

In his article “Contaminated Communities: the Metaphor of “Immigrant as Pollutant” in Media Representations of Immigration”, J. David Cisneros (2008) discusses the purpose of this strategy. He states that in news media discourse about immigration, “the dangers of immigration” are sometimes expressed “through concrete stories and emotional appeals”. In his case study investigated, he observes that “centering coverage on the stories of individuals helped to establish a connection with the victims” and to “convey the human impact of the crisis” (Cisneros, 2008, p. 585).

Trump mentions this story to create a connection between the audience and the victims of the assassination which is committed by immigrants. To gain more credibility, Trump mentions the fact that he has known the victims for some years. By describing them as “unbelievable people”, he creates a contrast between the positive human characteristics which they represent and the negatively loaded characteristics that he attributes to immigrants, namely the fact that they can

---

4 See appendix 9.1, turns 15-20 for the story
“brutally” kill innocent people. Furthermore, the double association of this negative description with the adverb “illegally”, creates a connection between the crimes that the immigrants committed and their identity of being illegal immigrants.

Finally, the last utterance also clearly contains metaphorical expressions of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. Trump initiates his utterance by referring to immigrants as being “illegal”. However, more interesting is the fact that immediately after this description, he provides a clarification of the concept of “illegal immigrants”. It is clear that the purpose of his explanation is not actually to explain the meaning of his first utterance but to emphasise the fact that immigrants are illegal. By doing this, he expresses even more wonder about the fact that Americans take more care of immigrants than they do for veterans, which is a way to emphasise the – in his opinion – illogicality of that situation.

5.3.2 Clinton’s use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor

In the previous subsection, the examples of Trump’s use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor have demonstrated that he often relies on the use of this type of metaphor in his discourse about migration. Remarkably, by analysing Clinton’s use of the same metaphorical concept, I have found only one example in the data set. More precisely, during the first presidential debate, Clinton states as follows:

[...] They need to have close working cooperation with law enforcement in these communities, not be alienated and pushed away – uh – as some of Donald’s rhetoric, unfortunately, has – uh - led to. (Clinton, 2016, 7.10, turns 10-12)

With this phrase, Clinton expresses her disagreement with the exclusion of Muslims. In this case, he chooses to use the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor to associate it with Trump’s point of view. She implies that his rhetoric partly causes the alienation of immigrants. Again, she uses the negatively associated metaphor to blame Trump for the frequent use of this metaphor in general and to emphasise that she does not compare migrants with aliens. Therefore, it is arguable that Clinton uses the strategy of “against the grain” interpretations, which is discussed by Semino (2008). She

5 See appendix 7.10 for the context of this example
namely uses Trump’s application of the “migrant as alien” metaphor to express her refusal of the use of this metaphor.

I have also observed how, instead of describing unauthorised immigrants as aliens, Clinton frequently applies the adjective “undocumented”. Another remarkable aspect is that I have only encountered her use of this adjective in the third presidential debate:

1) We have eleven million **undocumented** people (Clinton, 2016, 9.2, turn 8)
2) every **undocumented** person (9.2, turn 11)
3) people who are **undocumented** (9.2, turn 15)
4) **undocumented** immigrants (9.3, turn 9)
5) **undocumented** labour (9.3, turn 13)
6) **undocumented** workers (9.3, turn 14 & 17)

These uses are interesting because they imply the fact that Clinton avoids the use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. Arguably, this demonstrates her intention to represent the concept of migration positively.

### 5.4 The container metaphor (applied to the theme of migration)

As mentioned in section 2.2.2, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that the container metaphor has an in-out orientation and that it implies the idea of comparing persons and objects to containers. They also state as follows:

> even where there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries – marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface – whether a wall, a fence or an abstract line or plane. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 29-30)

Another aspect of the container metaphor is that it is a subcategory of the ontological metaphor. The function of the latter is to give “a new ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts and to bring about new abstract entities” (Kövecses, 2010, p. 38). In the data set, several instances of the application of the container metaphor by Trump and Clinton have been
found. In this section, the focus will be both on the in- as the out-orientation of this metaphorical concept, and, in separate subsections, on the association of the container metaphor with the “nation as house” metaphor (Santa Ana, 2002).

5.4.1 Container metaphors with an in – orientation

This subsection will offer an analysis of the instances of the presidential candidates’ use of the container metaphor in which the in-orientation of this type of metaphor is expressed.

5.4.1.1 The in-orientation of the container metaphor in Trump’s speeches

In the data set, the in-orientation of the container metaphor appears several times in Trump’s discourse. His most frequent use of this metaphorical concept consists of the verb ‘come in/into’ and represents the entering of immigrants into the container that refers to the United States:

1) We’re gonna stop drugs from coming into New Hampshire. (Trump, 2016, 4.5, turn 35)

2) people are gonna come in, and they’re gonna come into this country, but they’re going to come in legally, O.K.? (Trump, 2016, 4.5, turns 44-46)

3) People are coming into our country like - we have no idea, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is (Trump, 2016, 8.10, turns 5-7)

4) [...] hundreds of thousands of people come in from Syria when we know nothing about them. (Trump, 2016, 8.10, turns 15-16)

5) [about Clinton] She doesn’t; she wants amnesty for everybody. Come right in, come right over. It’s a horrible thing she’s doing. (Trump, 2016, 8.11, turns 19-20)

6) Now, you can come back in, and you can become a citizen, but it’s very unfair. (Trump, 2016, 9.3, turn 28)

7) People are gonna pour into our country; people are gonna come in from Syria. (Trump, 2016, 9.3, turn 91)
8) We take care of illegal immigrants, people that come into the country illegally, better than we take care of our vets (Trump, 2016, 9.7, turns 6-8)

It is observable that Trump’s description of immigrants as coming into the United States depicts the phenomenon of migration in a negative way. In the first example, Trump compares immigrants with drugs. As discussed in chapter 5.1.1, on the occurrence of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor in Trump’s speeches, this comparison is an instance of metonymy and has the purpose of dehumanising immigrants. In the second example, Trump also represents immigrants negatively, as he blames them for their unauthorised arrival in the United States.

In the third and fourth example, Trump combines the use of the container metaphor and the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. More specifically, as discussed in chapter 5.3.1, his description of immigrants as people whom no one knows anything about implies the concealment of their identity and humanity. Therefore, it can be argued that the combination of the in-orientation of the container metaphor and the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor emphasises Trump’s negative view towards migration more strongly.

In the final example, Trump also uses both the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor and the container metaphor in one sentence. The application of the ‘migrant as alien’ in this sentence has already been discussed in chapter 5.3.1. More specifically, I have argued that here, Trump offers clarification of the phrase “illegal immigrants” to emphasise it in a stronger way. By combining the in-orientation of the container metaphor with this use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor, Trump accentuates the - in his opinion - illogicality of the assumption that immigrants are often perceived as being more important than military veterans of the United States.

In the fifth example, Trump uses the in-orientation of the container metaphor to accentuate the – according to him – absurd immigration plan that Clinton wishes to realize. By adding his opinion that “it’s a horrible thing she’s doing”, he represents the application of the in-orientation of the container metaphor on the theme of migration as a negative idea. Similarly, in the sixth example, he emphasises his negative opinion by claiming that allowing unauthorised migration is an “unfair idea”.

Interestingly, in the following illustration, Trump combines the use of the in-orientation of the container metaphor with the ‘migration as water’ metaphor. More precisely, he describes migrants
as pouring into the United States. As discussed in chapter 5.5.1., the use of this metaphorical expression illustrates Semino’s (2008) argument that the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is connected with the CONTAINER metaphor, as well as the ‘in-out’ opposition that this CONTAINER metaphor implies (Semino, 2008, p. 95). She also argues that the entering of people into the container that represents the nation is considered a dangerous act, since it can lead to the “bursting” or “overflowing” of that container (p. 96).

Thus, by using this combination of the container metaphor and the ‘migration as water’ metaphor, Trump is able to emphasise the threat that migration implies strongly. In this way, he arguably attempts to create a feeling of fear amongst American citizens. Another remarkable aspect of this example is that here, Trump uses the container metaphor twice, as he also uses the verb “come in”. It can be argued that Trump has created this repetition deliberately, with the aim of putting even more emphasis on his message.

In brief, Trump’s use of the in-orientation of the container metaphor serves to describe the arrival of immigrants in the country as a problematic situation. Therefore, according to Trump, this situation needs to be halted by creating a boundary between the territory of the United States and the immigrants who try to come into this territory. This idea is in accordance with Lakoff’s and Johnson’s (1980) statement that

even where there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries – marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface – whether a wall, a fence or an abstract line or plane. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 29)

5.4.1.2 The in-orientation of the container metaphor in Clinton’s speech events

In contrast to Trump’s use of the in-orientation of the container metaphor applied to the theme of migration, I have found only two instances of Clinton’s application of the in-orientation within the speech events. More precisely, these examples occur during the second presidential debate:

1) Well, first of all, I will **not let anyone into** our country that I think poses a risk to us, but there are a lot of refugees, women and children (Clinton, 2016, 8.10, turns 23-26)
2) Are we going to have religious tests when people fly into our country? (Clinton, 2016, 8.10, turns 37-38)

The first example contains Clinton’s answer to a question asked by the presenter Martha Raddatz:

And –uh- Secretary Clinton, let me ask you about that because you have asked for an increase from 10 to 65 000 Syrian refugees. We know you want tougher vetting. That’s not a perfect system, so why take the risk of having those refugees come into the country? (Raddatz, 2016, 8.10, turns 19-22)

Thus, in opposition to Trump, in the first example, Clinton makes a separation between immigrants who might be dangerous (anyone that she think poses a risk to the United States) and immigrants who are certainly innocent (refugees, women and children). By making this distinction, she emphasises the fact that one cannot perceive all immigrants as being dangerous persons.

In the second example, Clinton does not express any negative feelings towards immigration either. More specifically, her application of the in-orientation of the container metaphor does not imply any negative connotation. This absence of negative connotations contrasts with Trump’s use of the in-orientation to describe immigration, for example, his use of the verb pouring in.

Additionally, Clinton also expresses the in-orientation using a reference to the content or surface of the container:

1) Because this country belongs to all of us, not just those at the top. Not just the people who look one way, worship one way or even think one way. […] we have to make America whole, we have to fill in – fill in what’s been hollowed out. (Clinton, 2016, 3.2, turns 1-7)

2) […] I’ve heard how important it is for them to feel that they are wanted and included (Clinton, 2016, 8.9, turns 50-51)

3) […] to making sure that every American feels like he or she has a place in our country. And I think when you look at the letters that I get, a lot of people are worried that maybe they wouldn’t have a place in Donald Trump’s America (Clinton, 2016, 8.13, turns 8-11)
4) Now, what I am also arguing is that bringing undocumented immigrants out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy, would be good (Clinton, 2016, 9.3, turns 9-10)

These examples demonstrate Clinton’s representation of the United States container as a container that has enough space available for immigrants. This idea contradicts Trump’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor to represent the United States as having no space available for immigration⁶.

Even more, in the first illustration, Clinton implies that the container is too empty at present, as she claims that it still needs to be made whole. The latter is achievable by including every inhabitant of America, which also includes immigrants (this can be seen in the statement “not just the people who look one way, worship one way”, which implies the inclusion of people from all races and every religion). In other words, in the past, the container has been hollowed out because it did not include everyone. Therefore, one needs to refill the container by including everyone in it again.

In the second example, Clinton emphasises how necessary it is to include Muslims in the container that represents America. Subsequently, in the third illustration, she expresses her wish to offer the Hispanic population a place in the United States. Another aspect that is interesting to consider in this example is Clinton’s emphasis on her opposition to Trump, who does not seem to offer any place for immigrants in the container that depicts the United States. In the fourth example, Clinton compares the economy of the United States to a container. Thus, in this case, Clinton attempts to include immigrants in the economy of the United States.

Briefly, Trump’s and Clinton’s application of the in-orientation of the container metaphor to discuss immigration implies a different purpose. On the one hand, Trump applies the in-orientation to represent migration as harmful in general. Therefore, he opts for the exclusion of immigrants from the container that represents North America. On the other hand, Clinton seems to be in favour of including immigrants in the container. Therefore, she describes this inclusion of immigrants as genuine act.

⁶ See section 5.1.1
5.4.2 Container metaphors with an out – orientation

The previous subsection has addressed the use of the in-orientation of the container metaphor in Trump’s and Clinton’s discourse about migration. In this subsection, I will discuss their use of the other category of the container metaphor, which implies the use of the out-orientation of this type of metaphor.

5.4.2.1 The out-orientation of the container metaphor in Trump’s speech events

Apart from the metaphorical domains that express the in-orientation of the container metaphor regarding the theme of migration, I have also found several instances of Trump’s use of the out-orientation of the container metaphor. Within my data set, occurrences of Trump’s application of the out-orientation in his presidential campaign speech events is limited to the third Presidential debate:

1) we have **to keep the drugs out** of our country (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turn 34)

2) One of my first acts will be to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones - we have some bad, bad people in this country that **have to go out**. We're gonna **get them out**. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turns 40-42)

3) But we have some bad **hombres** here and we're gonna **get them out**. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turn 45)

4) President Obama has **moved millions of people out**. Nobody knows about it, nobody talks about it, but under Obama, millions of people **have been moved out** of this country, they've been deported. (Trump, 2016, 9.3, turns 20-22)

Trump’s application of the out-orientation of the container metaphor in the examples above, clearly demonstrates his negative attitude towards immigrants. The first example represents immigrants as drugs. This instance of metonymy creates a very negative representation of Mexican immigrants because of the negative comparison of immigrants to an aspect that is inanimate and negatively connotated. In the second example, Trump again focuses on Mexican drug
dealing, and the out-orientation of the phrases *have to go out* and *get them out* describes Trump’s view of Mexicans as not belonging to the container.

In the third instance, Trump also uses the same phrase as he did in the previous example: “we’re gonna get them out”. This example is interesting because it demonstrates the use of repetition by politicians. In particular, Charteris-Black (2011) discusses the different methods that politicians apply to persuade their audience, and he claims that repetition “communicates a sense of conviction” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 9). Thus, Trump’s repetition of the phrase “we’re gonna get them out” serves to convince the audience of the fact that immigrants cannot stay in the container. Therefore, Trump is in favour of eliminating immigrants from this container.

Moreover, he describes immigrants (more specifically, the Mexican population) here as being “bad *hombres*”, which, again, is a negative description. The fact that he uses the Spanish translation of the noun ‘men’ indicates that with this description, he is referring to the Hispanic population only.

This use of a foreign term can also be considered a direct association to the different identity of Mexicans. The reference to their identity separates Mexican immigrants from Americans even more than the phrase “bad men” does, since “bad *hombres*” implies the characteristics of immigrants are both “bad” and foreign. The phrase “bad *hombres*” can also be considered an example of a ‘soundbite’. Charteris-Black (2011) describes a soundbite as follows:

> Short, memorable and quotable phrases have become known in media communication as ‘sound bites’. They are effective because they encapsulate arguments by compressing a large idea into a small number of words, thereby taking up less media time. They can be used in headlines and gain the ‘viral’ effect of being constantly recycled through various media including of course the Internet. In communicative terms they are therefore highly efficient (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 9).

In this respect, Trump’s quote is a soundbite because it also compresses “a large idea into a small number of words”. In other words, this idea implies that there is an association of Mexicans with criminality, drug dealing, et cetera. This description also gained much media attention and went viral on the Internet, mainly through the use of social media. Therefore, the widespread attention
has the effect of making this quote memorable and has possibly contributed to the establishment of Trump’s message towards Mexican immigrants by American citizens.

Interestingly, in the last example, Trump associates the use of the out-orientation of the container metaphor with the presidency of Barack Obama. He describes Obama as someone who is against the inclusion of immigrants in the United States, without American citizens being aware of it. By associating the out-orientation with the presidency of Obama, Trump can arguably achieve two purposes.

Firstly, this association possibly serves to justify his critical view of migration. Secondly, Trump can implicitly attribute the adverse effects that are characteristic for the out-orientation of the container metaphor (such as the representation of immigrants as a threat) to Obama’s identity. Since Clinton’s immigration policy is quite similar to Obama’s immigration policy, he might imply the message that Clinton should not be trusted. More specifically, similar to Obama, she can also conceal her real intentions.

What’s more, since “repetition communicates a sense of conviction” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 9), Trump’s repeated use of the same phrase with an out-orientation arguably serves to emphasise the credibility of his statement.

5.4.2.2 The out-orientation of the container metaphor in Clinton’s speech events

Having discussed Trump’s use of the out-orientation of the container metaphor, this section turns to Clinton’s use of the same metaphor. As with Trump, Clinton’s use of the out-orientation is rather limited – in my data set, three instances could be found:

1) An America where – if you do your part – you reap the rewards. Where we don’t leave anyone out or anyone behind. (Clinton, 2015, 1.4, lines 2-3)

2) I believe that when we have millions of hard-working immigrants contributing to our economy, it would be self-defeating and inhumane to try to kick them out. (Clinton, 2016, 5.3, lines 1-3)
3) (about Trump) He said as recently as a few weeks ago in Phoenix that every undocumented person would be subject to deportation and here's what that means; […] And we would then to have put them on trains, on buses to get them out of our country. (Clinton, 2016, 9.2, turns 10-17)

In the first example, Clinton expresses her refusal of applying the out-orientation to exclude immigrants from the United States. On the contrary: she wants to include everyone in the container and not leave anyone out of it. The container metaphor in the second example is used with a more specific domain than its use in the first example. Here, Clinton uses the expression “kicking out” instead of “leaving out”. The strong emphasis that is expressed by this metaphorical use is in harmony with the message Clinton wishes to convey: that attempting to kick immigrants out of the United States is an act that is “self-defeating” and “inhumane”. Therefore, this metaphorical use of an out-orientation of the container metaphor can be considered a more relevant choice in that example than the metaphorical expression in the first example.

Ultimately, the third example also expresses Clinton’s disapproval of the use of a container metaphor with an out-orientation. She describes the act of getting immigrants out of the country as an unrealistic task to achieve since one would have to carry out significant efforts such as putting a large number of immigrants on trains and buses.

In conclusion, there is a clear difference between the use of the out-orientation in the speech events of Trump and Clinton. Trump uses the container metaphor with an out-orientation to express his anti-immigrant attitude and thus to exclude immigrants. Clinton, on the contrary, protests against sending immigrants away. Therefore, she uses the out-orientation of the container metaphor only to demonstrate that it is wrong to send immigrants away.

5.4.3 the ‘nation as house’ metaphor

As mentioned in chapter 3.2.2, Santa Ana (2002) discusses the relationship between the “nation as house” metaphor and the container metaphor. More specifically, he argues that “HOUSE, a higher-level metaphor, builds on the more foundational CONTAINER metaphor, with its center/periphery schema, interior/exterior schema, and bounding structures” (Santa Ana, 2002,
location 5611 – 5628 of 9671). Subsequently, the ‘house’ domain also contains “a manufactured structure, which implies a builder, an architect and design; materials such as roofs, doors, and windows”. Moreover, “it also presumes an owner” (Santa Ana, 2002, location 5612-5630 of 9671). In my data set of Trump’s and Clinton’s speech events, there are many examples of the nation – or aspects of it – that are considered as an element that needs to be built.

5.4.3.1 Trump’s use of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor

In the data set, I have encountered some examples of Trump’s claim for building the nation (and aspects which are associated with it). The following examples contain the ‘nation as house’ metaphor:

1) But I wanna do things that haven’t been done, including fixing an making our inner cities better for the African-American citizens that are so great and for the Latinos, Hispanics, and – uh – I look forward to doing it, it’s called “make America great again”. (Trump, 2016, 8.4, turns 1-4)

2) [...] it sounds harsh to say, but we have to build up the wealth of our nation. (Trump, 2016, 8.5, turn 10)

3) We stop the drugs, we-we shore up the border. (Trump, 2016, 9.1, turn 39)

4) It’s a movement comprised of Americans from all races, religions, backgrounds and beliefs who want and expect our government to serve the people and serve the people it will. Working together, we will begin the urgent task of rebuilding our nation and renewing the American dream. (Trump, 2016, 11.2, lines 5-9)

The most interesting observation about these examples is the fact that Trump includes various population groups in his use of the ‘nation as house metaphor’. In the first example, Trump seems to acknowledge the coexistence of American citizens with the African-American and Hispanic community. He uses the source domain “house” to demonstrate his ability to improve the living environment (the inner-cities) of these communities.
However, there is a noticeable difference in his approach to the African-American and the Spanish American community. Namely, he describes African-Americans as being “so great”, while, after mentioning Spanish Americans, he hesitates and eventually does not offer any description of them. However, shortly after having done that, he offers a negative description of immigrants by using the ‘migration as water’ metaphor and considering migration as a threat\(^7\). In the second example, he hesitates again and attempts to make his message to seem less offending by admitting that “it sounds harsh to say”. But eventually, he implies that immigrants do not belong to the “nation as house” metaphor because they deprive the nation of one of its fundamental building materials, which is the wealth of the nation.

In the third example, Trump claims that one needs to create a supporting element for the border between Mexico and the United States. Thus, the border needs to be made stronger to protect the nation from outside threat. He combines this use of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor with the use of metonymy, which is his comparison of immigrants with drugs. As discussed in chapter 5.1.1, this use of metonymy serves to emphasise the threatening identity of immigrants. Therefore, it can be argued that Trump’s combination of using both metonymy and the house metaphor in this example functions to justify his plan to build a border, as he augments the feeling of threat.

Interestingly, in the final example, Trump claims that the “task of rebuilding our nation”, which is an application of the “nation as house metaphor”, does not only imply the participation of American citizens but also of “Americans from all races, religions, backgrounds and beliefs”. However, even though he implies people from all races, he still only mentions “Americans”, which implies that they are persons from different backgrounds who already are present in the house/container that represents the United States. Therefore, he still excludes immigrants who have not entered the United States yet. Shortly, the “nation as house” metaphor represents Trump’s view as more dynamic than how it was discussed in this dissertation before, but it still clearly implies a negative view towards immigrants.

\(^7\) See appendix 8.5, turn 4
5.4.3.2 Clinton’s use of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor

In the previous section, several examples of Trump’s use of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor have been discussed. In the data, I have also found some instances of Clinton’s depiction of immigrants through the use of the “nation as house” metaphor:

1) (about her mother) I wish she could have seen the America we are going to build together. […] (Clinton, 2015, 1.4, lines 1-2)

2) Instead of building walls we’re going to break down barriers and build [applause] build ladders of opportunity and empowerment […] (Clinton, 2016, 3.2, lines 14-15)

3) We can break down barriers for hard-working immigrants everywhere, who are often too exploited and intimidated. (Clinton, 2016, 3.3, lines 1-2)

4) […] if we all do our part, we can restore our common faith in our common future (Clinton, 2016, 3.4, line 9)

5) We will not build a wall. Instead we will build an economy where everyone who wants a good job can get one. And we’ll build a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants who are already contributing to our economy. (Clinton, 2016, 5.1, lines 19-22)

6) It’s a guiding principle for the country we’ve always been and the future we’re going to build. (Clinton, 2016, 5.2, lines 3-4)

7) our campaign was never about one person or even one election; it was about the country we love and about building an America that’s hopeful, inclusive and big-hearted. (Clinton, 2016, 10.1, lines 5-7)

8) […] the American dream is big enough for everyone: for people of all races and religions, for men and women, for immigrants, for LGBT people, and people with disabilities; for everyone. So now, our responsibility as citizens is to keep doing our
part to build that better, stronger, fairer America we seek. (Clinton 2016, 10.2, lines 3-7)

9) But I am not gonna slam the door on women and children. I -- that picture of that little four-year-old boy in Aleppo with the blood coming down his face while he sat in an ambulance is haunting, and so we are going to do very careful thorough vetting (Clinton, 2016, 9.6, turns 4-6)

In the first example, the “nation as house” metaphor implies a collaboration, whereby nobody is left out or behind. Thus, immigrants do form part of this act of building as well. The second instance is particularly interesting because here, Clinton refers to Trump’s policy. More specifically, she refers to his plan to build a wall between Mexico and the United States. Clinton’s strategy of referring to Trump can be associated with a statement made by Mio and paraphrased by Semino: “Interestingly, empirical studies have shown that, in political debates, metaphorical expressions that extend an opponent’s metaphor have a particularly high persuasive power” (Semino, 2008, p. 84). Moreover, later on in her work, Semino also argues that “once a particular metaphor occupies a prominent position in the public domain, it can be alluded to and exploited in different ways by different participants in political debates” (Semino, 2008, p. 117).

Therefore, Clinton’s example illustrates these arguments. More specifically, although one can consider Trump’s frequent claim that he will build walls in a literal way, it is also possible to regard it as a metaphorical expression that belongs to the container metaphor. This statement can be demonstrated with Lakoff and Johnson (1980) claim about container metaphors:

> even where there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries – marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface – whether a wall, a fence or an abstract line or plane. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 29)

Thus, the wall that Trump refers to can be considered as a “bounding surface” that is used to mark off the territory of the container. Therefore, Clinton’s claim to build “ladders of opportunity and empowerment” instead of walls is an extension of Trump’s metaphorical expression “to build a wall”. Thus, Clinton’s utterance is a strategic method of persuasion because it serves to respond to Trump’s metaphorical use.
Interestingly, Clinton does not only refer to the action of ‘building’ in her use of the “nation as house” metaphor, but to its reversed version as well. More specifically, in the second example, she mentions the action of ‘breaking something down’, as she claims to “break down barriers” for immigrants. Interestingly, she also refers to the fact that Trump is in favour of building walls to accentuate her wish of doing the opposite: “instead of building walls we’re going to break down barriers”.

In his article “Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign rhetoric: Making America whole again”, Samuel Gunawan (2017) also discusses this example. He makes the following statement: “contrary to Trump's political stand to build walls, Clinton points out her determination to break down existing barriers that divide the lives of the people and the nation and to break down barriers that cause injustice and inequality” (Gunawan, 2017, p. 54).

Thus, Clinton opts for the opposition of building walls because she is against the unjust and unequal treatment of immigrants. Therefore, in this example, the source domain “walls” can be considered as a design or material in the building that needs to be eliminated and replaced by the source domain “ladders”.

What’s more, this metaphorical instance also has a strong persuasive power because Clinton pronounces it twice in a rather short period (example 3). More specifically, as discussed several times before in this dissertation, according to Charteris-Black (2011), repetition in political speeches “communicates a sense of conviction” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 9).

Therefore, Clinton’s repeated use of the utterance “break down barriers” arguably also has the purpose of conviction. The fifth example also implies the extension of Trump’s metaphorical expression of building a wall, but in this example, Clinton opts for building an economy instead of a wall (“we will not build a wall. Instead we will build an economy”). Therefore, this utterance arguably has the same function of extending Trump’s metaphor of building walls.

In the fourth example, Clinton uses the “nation as house” metaphor to express that the faith in the future needs to be restored. Importantly, both the faith and the future that she refers to are common, which implies that she includes everyone in it. Therefore, it can be argued that Clinton
includes immigrants as well and also considers them as owners of the house that represents the nation.

Interestingly, in the fifth example, Clinton expresses her wish to “build a path to citizenship” for immigrants. This utterance is an example of the journey metaphor. Semino (2008) explains this concept as follows:

JOURNEY metaphors can be traced back to the PATH image schema, which is based in our physical experience of motion in space. Its component elements are a starting point, a destination, a path connecting the two, and a direction of movement. This image schema provides a way of metaphorically constructing goals as destinations, ways of reaching goals as movement forwards, problems as obstacles to movement, and success or failure as reaching, or failing to reach, a destination. (Semino, 2008, p. 92)

Clinton’s utterances also imply these elements of having “a starting point, a destination, a path connecting the two, and a direction of movement” (Semino, 2008, p. 92). More precisely; “the starting point” of this path to citizenship is the permission for immigrants to enter the United States, “the path” as the asylum procedure and “the destination” as the obtaining of citizenship. Thus, by using the journey metaphor, Clinton establishes the purpose of helping immigrants to become citizens of the United States. The association of this journey metaphor with the “nation as house” metaphor can be demonstrated by the fact that the path needs to be built can be considered as being part of a house.

Subsequently, in the sixth example, Clinton links the source domain house with the target domain future, because she is in favour of the idea of everyone building a future together. Although she does not explicitly mention migration in her statement, she arguably implies the immigrant population in the word “together” as well. It can also be argued that she emphasises the importance of establishing the “nation as house” metaphor together and that everyone can be considered as the owner of the house that represents the future of the nation.

In the following example, Clinton expresses her desire of “building an America that’s hopeful, inclusive and big-hearted”. Interestingly, this use of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor also illustrates

---

* The utterance “offering a path to citizenship” also occurs in other instances in Clinton’s analysed speeches and debates; see (Clinton, 2015, 1.2, lines 1-3) and (Clinton, 2016, 9.2, turns 32-33)
the concept of ‘personification’. As discussed in chapter 2.2.3, the main purpose of personification is to “allow us to make sense of phenomena in the world in human terms – terms that we can understand on the basis of our own motivations, goals, actions and characteristics” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 34). Therefore, Clinton’s use of personification serves to ascribe human characteristics to the country by comparing it to a human being. Consequently, this use of personification creates a more recognisable description for the audience. Arguably, the fact that America is inclusive and big-hearted implies the tolerance towards immigrants.

Remarkably, the eighth example consists of two instances of the container metaphor. The first one is the representation of the American dream as being a container that has sufficiently place left for; i.e., immigrants. The other metaphorical use in this example can be considered as belonging to the ‘nation as house’ metaphor, as it represents the act of building a “better, stronger” and “fairer America”. Therefore, this phrase also contains an instance of personification again, since America implies human characteristics such as the ability to become better, stronger and fairer than it was before.

The fact that this example consists of a combination of two instances of a container metaphor (among which one can be considered as belonging to the category of the ‘nation as house metaphor’) and one instance of the concept of personification, arguably leads to more persuasion of the audience. More precisely, the use of the first container metaphor implies the inclusion of immigrants in the American dream. The following metaphorical expression encourages the people to take action, as she gives them the responsibility to build a better, fairer and stronger America by, amongst other things, being tolerant toward immigrants.

The final example is a particular case of the “nation as house” metaphor, as it contains a description of a part of the materials of which the house consists. By arguing that she will not slam the door on women and children, Clinton expresses her opinion that it is wrong to not allow immigrants, in particular women and children, to enter the United States. Therefore, this metaphorical use expresses Clinton’s welcoming attitude towards immigrants.

In conclusion, Trump’s use of the “nation as house” metaphor is different from Clinton’s use of this metaphor. Trump sometimes attempts to be careful of who exactly should be included by using this metaphor. However, eventually, one can conclude that for Trump, immigrants are not
part of the source domain ‘house’, and he even perceives them as outsiders that try to threat this house. On the opposite, Clinton’s phrases demonstrate the inclusion of immigrants with this metaphor. Moreover, Clinton uses the “nation as house” metaphor in a more elaborated way than Trump does, because she combines its use with various other strategies. More specifically, she also either applies metaphorical extension, repetition and the use of the journey metaphor, or personification. Arguably, all of these strategies improve Clinton’s persuasion of the audience.
Chapter 6: Discussion and conclusion

The previous chapter has provided the observations that I made by analysing the data set about Trump’s and Clinton’s metaphorical usage in their rhetorics about the theme of migration. In this chapter, I will offer a comparison of Trump’s and Clinton’s uses of metaphors of migration that have been analysed in the previous chapter. More precisely, I will compare their application of these types of metaphor to the theoretical insights that are offered in the literature review of this dissertation. Ultimately, I will also offer a general conclusion.

6.1 Brief overview of the general results of the data analysis

This dissertation aimed to offer an answer to two central questions. Firstly, I have attempted to analyse the ways in which Trump and Clinton make use of the ‘migration as water’, ‘migration as invasion’, ‘migrant as alien’ and container metaphor. Secondly, I have tried to discover how those specific methods of use contribute to Trump’s and Clinton’s efforts to persuade the audience of their view towards migration.

In general, the data analysis demonstrates that both Trump and Clinton make use of the four metaphorical categories mentioned above. However, they use different methods in their application of these metaphorical concepts, which allows them to express opposing views towards the theme of migration in the United States. In the following subsections, the main outcomes of the data analysis in this dissertation will be summarised. More precisely, for each type of metaphor, I will recapitulate Trump’s and Clinton’s usage of these metaphors and the potential persuasive effects of their uses.
6.1.1 The ‘migration as water’ metaphor

Both candidates use the ‘migration as water’ metaphor. However, the application of this metaphor in Trump’s discourse has the function of representing migration negatively. To express this negative representation, he uses the ‘migration as water’ in different ways. Firstly, he applies metonymy and personification to represent migration as a threat. He also combines the use of the ‘water’ metaphor and the container metaphor. In this way, he depicts the nation as a container that is getting filled with water very quickly. Consequently, this depiction has the function of emphasising the urgency of stopping immigration in the United States.

Trump also uses the ‘migration as water’ metaphor to depict the direction and rapidity of migration. Furthermore, he uses this type of metaphor to represent migration as a flow that might affect the United States and immigrants as a liquid rather than human beings. Thus, his use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor also serves to dehumanise immigrants.

Clinton, on the contrary, does not use any methods to represent migration negatively. Instead, she uses the ‘migration as water’ metaphor to justify the presence of immigrants in the United States. Another remarkable outcome was the fact that, in the data set, only one instance of Clinton’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor could be found, which arguably implies her conscious avoidance of using this type of metaphor. In this way, the avoidance of using the ‘migration as water’ metaphor implies her tolerant view towards migration.

6.1.2 The ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor

Trump’s and Clinton’s use of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor differs as well. By analysing Trump’s discourse, I have encountered many instances of the ‘war metaphor’, which is a subcategory of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor. More precisely, Trump’s speeches frequently contain examples of verbs that express aggression fighting and damage. In this way, Trump again represents migration as a threat and immigrants as criminals. Even though Clinton frequently uses the same metaphorical concept as well, she, on the contrary, implies it in her speeches to criticise Trump’s use of this metaphorical concept and to represent migrants as victims instead of criminals.
The metaphorical subcategory ‘migration as a threat’ also demonstrates Trump’s and Clinton’s opposite uses of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor. In this case, Trump again creates an opposition between immigrants as criminals and citizens as victims. He also addresses the issue of insufficient protection against migration, an argument that he uses to justify his idea of building borders. More specifically, he represents immigrants as invaders whom the nation needs to be protected against.

Clinton’s speeches do not contain any explicit reference to immigrants as being a source of threat. Instead of creating a division between migrants and citizens, she, on the contrary, stresses the inclusion of immigrants. Moreover, she criticises Trump’s divisive migration policy by using an against the grain interpretation (Semino 2008) of his metaphors. Even during the debate about the “stop and frisk” policy, in which she acknowledges the presence of threat, she manages to address this matter cautiously and attempts not to blame African-Americans for it.

**6.1.3 The ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor**

In the data set, I have also encountered differences between Trump’s and Clinton’s use of the “migrant as alien” metaphor. Trump’s speeches contain many instances of repetition. More precisely, he repeats the words “illegal”, “criminal illegal aliens” and “illegally” several times. Furthermore, similar to Cisnero’s observation that discourse about migration often includes the use of true stories and emotional evocations to indicate the danger that migration implies, Trump also tells such concrete stories to the audience. Lastly, he also compares migration with a Trojan horse and offers a negatively loaded definition of the term “illegal immigrants”.

Interestingly, Clinton uses the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor only once and does so to criticise Trump’s use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. In other cases, she often uses the word “undocumented” instead of “illegal”.
6.1.4 The container metaphor

Finally, I have also investigated Trump’s and Clinton’s use of the container metaphor, which can be divided into three categories: the use of the in-orientation towards the container, the out-orientation and the ‘nation as house’ metaphor. As for the in-orientation, Trump frequently uses the verbs “come in” and “come into” to offer a negative description of migration. Interestingly, he often combines the use of this container metaphor with the ‘migration as water’ metaphor and the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor.

In opposition to Trump’s frequent application of the in-orientation of the container metaphor, in my data set, Clinton applies it only twice to refer to the container that represents the nation and does not use it to create a negative association of migration. On the contrary, she uses it to demonstrate her willingness to include migrants in the United States. Contrary to Trump, Clinton does not put every immigrant in the category of dangerous persons. Instead, she makes a distinction between innocent and possibly dangerous immigrants. Her second use of the in-orientation of the container metaphor does not show any negative attitude towards migration either.

Apart from her use of the in-orientation to represent the container, she sometimes also uses the in-orientation to refer to the content or surface of this container. In this way, she represents the nation as a container that has still enough space available for immigrants. The container needs to be refilled by the act of including everyone in it again. In one instance, she also emphasises the fact that in Trump’s point of view, the container does not have any space left for immigrants. Lastly, she also compares the container with the economy of the United States. Therefore, she opts to include immigrants in the economy of the country as well.

Regarding the out-orientation, Trump again uses it to represent migration negatively by the exclusion of immigrants. Interestingly, in this case, he does not only compare migration with Mexican drug dealing while at the same time using verbs that express an out-orientation, but he also uses repetition, a soundbite and even a comparison to Barack Obama’s migration policy to communicate his negative view towards migrants.

This comparison to Obama may serve to either justify Trump’s negative view of migration or to attribute the adverse implied effects of the out-orientation of the container metaphor to Obama’s
identity. Since Obama’s migration policy resembles Clinton’s migration policy, Trump arguably associates a feeling of distrust towards Clinton for concealing her real intentions.

In the analysed speeches, I found only three instances of Clinton’s use of the out-orientation. I have discovered that she uses it to show her acceptance of migration and to emphasise the self-defeating and inhumane aspect of Trump’s anti-migration policy. She also uses the out-orientation to emphasise the fact that it would be a complicated process to deport immigrants.

Regarding the ‘nation as house’ metaphor, the data analysis has shown a slight difference in Trump’s attitude towards migration, compared with his metaphorical usage before. Here, Trump acknowledges the coexistence of the African-American and the Hispanic population and even includes American citizens from all races into the ‘nation as house’ metaphor. However, he still negatively describes the Hispanic population and excludes new immigrants. Therefore, Trump’s use of this metaphorical concept may well offer a more dynamic, nuanced view of migration but is still mostly negatively loaded.

Clinton’s use of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor again serves to emphasise her eagerness to include immigrants in the United States. Interestingly, in this case, Clinton uses more different strategies of persuasion than Trump does. She makes use of a metaphorical extension of Trump’s metaphorical uses, repetition, personification and the journey metaphor. All of these methods allow her to represent migration positively.

6.2 Comparison with earlier research

By comparing my results with previous research on the topic of metaphors of migration, I have found both similarities and differences with the arguments of the other scholars. In the following subsections, for each type of metaphor, I will compare the observation made by the academics who are discussed in this dissertation with Trump’s and Clinton’s uses of these types of metaphor.
6.2.1 The “migration as water” metaphor

The first scholar whose observations about the ‘migration as water’ metaphor have been discussed is Elena Semino. In her work *Metaphor in Discourse*, she mainly examines the metaphorical use of the noun ‘flood’ (2008, p. 88) and the relation between the ‘migration as water’ metaphor and the ‘in-out’ opposition of the container metaphor (Semino, 2008, p. 95-96).

By comparing Semino’s insights with the speeches of Trump and Clinton, I have discovered that Trump’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor corroborates Semino’s arguments. As mentioned in section 5.1.1, his description of immigrants as ‘pouring in/into/through/across and spilling across the border/country/community can be considered as an illustration of Semino’s discussed concept of the ‘in-out’ opposition between the ‘migration as water’ metaphor and the container metaphor. More precisely, Trump’s use of these descriptions depicts immigrants as a threat and the United States as a container that is overflowing because of a large number of immigrants in the United States. Additionally, there is also the dehumanising aspect of Trump’s use of this ‘in-out’ opposition, as he compares immigrants to a liquid.

Interestingly, however, in Trump’s speech events, this ‘in-out’ opposition is mostly used in combination with metonymy (more specifically, Trump uses the words “violence”, “heroin” and “drugs”). This combination of metonymy and the ‘in-out’ opposition creates an even stronger feeling of overwhelm and threat. Therefore, it arguably also creates a stronger feeling of fear amongst the voters. In Clinton’s speech events, no examples matching Semino’s analysis could be found.

Another academic whose work has been mentioned in this investigation is Otto Santa Ana. He discusses the ‘migration as water’ metaphor as a metaphor that serves to represent migration as dangerous waters, in the sense that this representation creates dread and fear. Furthermore, he divides the description of migration as dangerous waters into three categories: volume, movement and control (Santa Ana, 1997, p. 321-323).

As discussed before, Trump makes a similar subdivision in his application of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor by inserting the verb ‘pour’ in his utterances. More specifically, his subdivision resembles Santa Ana’s description of “volume” as “the relative number of immigrants”,
“movement” as “the direction of waters, primarily northward as from Mexico to the United States” and “control” as “the efforts to reduce the immigration of undocumented workers”.

In Trump’s speeches, “volume” does not represent a specific number of immigrants, but by using the ‘migration as water’ metaphor, it becomes clear that he is referring to a large number of immigrants. Again, in Trump’s cases, this subdivision of “volume” is not only noticeable in the explicit reference to immigrants but also in reference to the large amount of drug dealing that they bring with them. Hence, this activity of drug dealing is implicitly associated with a large number of immigrants. Thus, by explicitly describing the threat caused by immigrants, Trump creates a more transparent image of the danger and menace that is present in the country.

Trump’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor also represents the subcategory of “movement”, as he sometimes explicitly mentions the direction of the water stream (“spilling across our borders”, “pouring through our southern border”, “pouring in through the border” and “pours across our southern borders”). The combination of this subcategory with metonymy allows Trump to make his reference to Mexican immigrants even more specific.

The subcategory of “control” can also be found in Trump’s discourse, as Trump describes Mexican immigration in the United States as a situation that urgently needs to be stopped because it has already influenced the country in many dramatic ways.

Especially the combination of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor and the words “at a record clip” emphasises the urgency of changing the situation because immigration is represented as a situation that is getting out of control very rapidly. As discussed in section 5.1.1, in a similar way Cunningham-Parmeter’s subdivision of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor into “direction, size and force” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011) can be applied on Trump’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor.

To summarise, the subcategories described by Santa Ana and Cunningham-Parmeter are used similarly by Trump, but sometimes Trump creates an even stronger image of fear and threat by combining these categories with metonymy or expressions like “at a record clip”. Again, in Clinton’s case, there were no examples of the application of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor found in the way of developing it along three subcategories. Since her use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is sporadic, Clinton arguably does not intend to represent migration as a threat.
Lastly, Inga Dervinyte’s metaphorical concept of migration as a natural force has also been discussed in this dissertation. More specifically, she considers expressions like “influx, wave, surge, flood” and “curbs” as metaphorical concepts that represent migration “in terms of an active doer or entity. Therefore, immigrants are being represented as a threat to the country and as “some undifferentiated mass” (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 52).

I have mentioned several times that Trump frequently represents immigrants by using the ‘migration as water’ metaphor. On the contrary, Clinton’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor occurred rather sporadic in the data set. One of her uses is comparable with Dervinyte’s noted concept of migration as a natural force. More specifically, Clinton’s use of the noun “outflow” has been compared with Dervinyte’s description of this term, namely the observation that this metaphorical expression “implies flow outwards” and that “the focus is on the problem of people leaving the source country, i.e. emigration”.

Interestingly, whereas Dervinyte, in this case, most likely refers to the use of this metaphor to express a negatively loaded argument towards migrants, Clinton, on the opposites, uses it to represent immigrants as victims and to emphasise the need of offering them help. Therefore, this example can be considered as an “against the grain” interpretation of Dervinyte’s observation of the ‘migration as a natural force’ metaphor.

Shortly, one can conclude that Trump’s use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor is quite similar to the theories about this metaphor offered by the scholars which have been discussed in this thesis, although Trump adds more emphasis by frequently combining them with the use of metonymy. Since Clinton does not use the ‘migration as water’ metaphor as often as Trump does, one can conclude that she is aware of its negative connotations and therefore avoids using it. She does not want to represent immigrants negatively. In the example that can associated with Dervinyte’s observations about the ‘migration as water’ metaphor, one can observe that Clinton does use the same metaphorical concept, but to represent migrants as victims rather than the cause of problems.

6.2.2 The ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor

The second type of metaphor that has been discussed in this dissertation is the ‘migration as invasion metaphor’. In section 3.2.1, I have discussed the ‘war metaphor’, which is the first
subcategory of this type of metaphor. I have consulted Dervinyte’s insights about the war metaphor. More precisely, Dervinyte compares the concept of this metaphor as “putting up a fight, setting targets, using weapons as well as the participants of war, i.e. a victim and an enemy”. Therefore, she considers the aim of this metaphor to be the representation of immigrants as a threat (Dervinyte, 2009, p. 53).

I have demonstrated that Trump’s speeches do contain some illustrations of these observations. Trump’s use of the war metaphor differs from Dervinyte’s description in the sense that he applies it to depict Mexican economy rather than Mexican immigrants in a negative way. However, it can be argued that in this case, Trump attempts to subtly link the voter’s perception of Mexican economy with their feelings about Mexican immigrants.

Another remarkable aspect of Trump’s application of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor is his use of the word “amnesty”. More specifically, it confirms Cunningham-Parmeter’s observation of the use of this word as “an entailment of the invasion metaphor”. As mentioned in section 5.2.1.1, Cunningham-Parmeter (2011) argues as follows: “because the invasion metaphor describes immigration as an especially dangerous threat, however, citizens are reluctant to overlook the past offenses of aliens through amnesty” (p. 1587). Moreover, he observes that “although the law of war allows governments to grant amnesty, public attitudes have become so shaped by the image of battle against aliens that such acts of forgiveness appear treasonous” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1587).

This metaphorical concept occurs several times in Trump’s discourse about migration. Interestingly, Cunningham-Parmeter’s observation about amnesty that “such acts of forgiveness appear treasonous” can also be found in Trump’s speeches. More specifically, he refers to this concept to emphasise the wrongdoing of his opponent. In Trump’s point of view, the fact that Clinton wants to offer amnesty to immigrants in the United States can be considered as a treasonous act as well. Therefore, Trump’s use of the amnesty component of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor illustrates that Cunningham-Parmeter’s observation can also be encountered in a political context, as Trump uses it to criticise Clinton’s politics.

By comparing Clinton’s use of the war metaphor with Dervinyte’s arguments and with Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) observation that the war metaphor represents the United States as
being “under assault by a different kind of enemy” (p. 1584), I have noted that Clinton’s intentions of the use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor differ from these observations. That is, she does not use the war metaphor to criticise immigrants, but to denounce Trump’s opposition towards migration instead.

While Dervinyte and Cunningham-Parmeter claim that the war metaphor usually serves to represent migrants as enemies, Clinton uses this metaphorical subcategory to represent migrants as victims instead. Moreover, her use of the war metaphor can be considered in the light of Semino’s observed strategy of the “against the grain” interpretation (2008, p. 85) because she strategically extends a metaphorical concept that is frequently used to describe immigration negatively.

Briefly, Clinton’s use of the war metaphor conflicts with Dervinyte’s and Cunningham-Parmeter’s observations, as she does not use this metaphorical concept to represent migrants as enemies. On the contrary, she depicts them as victims and only uses the war metaphor to comment on Trump’s ideas about migration. Therefore, it can also be argued that Clinton extends the use of the ‘migration as water’ metaphor by also giving it the function of criticising the ideas of her opponent.

The second subcategory of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor discussed in this dissertation is the literal representation of migration as a threat. As discussed in section 5.2.1.1, Trump frequently compares migrants with a threat to create an opposition between their dangerous identity and the identity of peaceful citizens.

By comparing Trump’s representations of immigrants as a threat with the arguments of the scholars discussed before, I have discovered that some arguments made by Santa Ana and Cunningham-Parmeter can also be observed in Trump’s metaphorical usage. More precisely, Santa Ana’s noted concept of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor (Santa Ana 2002) and Santa Ana’s (1999) and Cunningham-Parmeter’s (2011) discussion of the application of the verb “release” in discourse about migration.

Trump possibly also uses the verb “release” to dehumanise immigrants and to emphasise their subordinate position towards citizens of the United States. However, it is most likely the case that Trump does not mean to express it in such a harsh way and that instead, he uses this verb in the context of prisoners. Finally, Trump also applies Dervinyte’s (2009) noted concept of justification,
as he justifies the need of building borders to provide security against the threat of migration.

Shortly, Trump’s comparison of migration with a threat corroborates with the arguments about this concept made by Dervinyte, Santa Ana and Cunningham-Parmeter, except for the use of the verb “release”, which might also merely apply to the context of prisoners.

One of the main observations in the analysis of Clinton’s use of expressions of threat is that she frequently develops Semino’s concept of the “against the grain” interpretation (Semino, 2008). To clarify, Clinton counteracts Trump’s representation of migration as a threat by either countering his inaccurate representation of immigrants as a threat (in her discussion of the shooting in a nightclub in Orlando) or by using the ‘nation as house’ metaphor. The purpose of using the latter is to express her willingness to include immigrants in the protection of the country against other sources of threat.

Moreover, when comparing Clinton’s use of the nation as house metaphor with Santa Ana’s description of its function, many differences can be observed. While Santa Ana argues that this metaphorical concept usually serves to create an exclusion of migrants and to represent them as a threat (Santa Ana, 1997 and 2002), Clinton, on the contrary, includes immigrants and does not represent them as a threat. Even when she needs to acknowledge that there is a certain degree of threat in the form of gun violence associated with the African-American population, she does not agree to support the stop-and-frisk system to eliminate the risk of gun violence.

Altogether, it can be concluded that Trump’s use of the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor is more comparable to the theories and strategies of the scholars discussed in this thesis. Even though Clinton also applies some of their observed concepts in her speeches, her main aim of these uses conflicts with the noted occurrences of using of these concepts, as she often uses them in the opposite way than other people do. More precisely, she represents migrants as victims instead of enemies, includes immigrants in the protection of the United States, and criticises Trump’s negative view on migration by making “against the grain” interpretations of his instances of using the ‘migration as invasion’ metaphor.
6.2.3 The ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor

The next metaphor that has been analysed in this dissertation is the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. The analysis of the use of this metaphor by Trump and Clinton was based on Cunningham-Parmeter’s discussion of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. Three main characteristics are noted: otherness, illegality and ethnicity (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011).

The investigation of Trump’s speech events has demonstrated that he frequently applies the first two characteristics in his discussion about immigration. Similarly to Cunningham-Parmeter’s observation that this metaphor represents immigrants as people who “threaten the social order” (Cunningham Parmeter 2011, p. 1576), Trump attempts to create a contrast between the peaceful citizens of the United States and immigrants whom he considers as being illegal criminals who threaten the peace in the country. He expresses this idea by using different strategies, which will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Firstly, his speeches contain instances of the concept of “otherness”, which is one of the characteristics of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor that is observed by Cunningham-Parmeter (2011). In Trump’s speech events, I have discovered that this idea of otherness can be found in many of his utterances.

Apart from the occurrence of the idea of otherness by using a specific metaphor, Trump also often explicitly describes immigrants as people whose background, identity and intentions are unknown to citizens of the United States. In this way, not only does Trump create a sense of fear and distrust towards immigrants amongst the audience, but his aim also matches to a certain degree with Cunningham-Parmeter’s observation about the real intention of the use of the “migrant as alien” metaphor. Specifically, this intention implies the representation of immigrants as “not only as invaders from foreign countries, but also as nonhuman aggressors from foreign worlds” (Cunningham-Parmeter, 2011, p. 1571-1572).

However, as discussed before in section 5.3.1, one can only observe a potential slippage of the representation of migrants as extraterrestrials in Trump’s analysed discourse about migration. Therefore, while Cunningham-Parmeter’s insights have been useful in the analysis of Trump’s speeches, they are only partially observable in his speeches and arguably do not entirely represent his intentions and point of view. Cunningham-Parmeter’s theory about the ‘migrant as alien’
metaphor can be extended with a metaphorical expression that Trump uses several times in his speech events, which is the comparison of migration with a “Trojan horse”. This comparison namely also expresses an association of immigrants with a hidden threat.

In my data analysis of Trump’s discourse, I have observed an example of another of Cunningham-Parmeter’s arguments. More specifically, Cunningham-Parmeter’s dissection of the meaning of the words “illegal alien” can be found in Trump’s utterance “criminal illegal aliens”. While Cunningham-Parmeter argues that the literal meaning of “illegal aliens” is “criminal strangers” (2011, p. 1576), from this point of view, it can be concluded that Trump’s utterance is tautologous, i.e. “criminal criminal strangers”. In other words, Trump’s example can be considered as an extension of Cunningham-Parmeter’s noted use, because Trump adds the strategy of repetition to it. In this way, he puts more emphasis on the threatening identity of immigrants and creates a stronger feeling of fear.

Lastly, the analysis of Trump’s use of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor also contains an instance that is similar to a concept noted by David Cisneros. More specifically, he observes how “the dangers of immigration” are sometimes expressed “through concrete stories and emotional appeals”. Subsequently, Cisneros argues that “centering coverage on the stories of individuals helped to establish a connection with the victims” and to “convey the human impact of the crisis” (Cisneros, 2008, p. 585). Trump uses this technique by telling a real-life story about some of his acquaintances whose children have been killed by immigrants. In this way, Trump also attempts to gain credibility and to create a connection between the audience and the victims.

In Clinton’s analysed speeches, I did not find any application of Cunningham-Parmeter’s three characteristics of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor. This absence of metaphorical usage demonstrates that Clinton does not intend to represent immigrants as a threat or as people with an unknown identity and intentions.

Interestingly, Clinton seldom uses the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor, as I found only one application of it in her speeches. However, in this one instance, she did not attempt to represent immigrants negatively either. She applies Semino’s (2008) observed concept of the “against the grain” interpretation to denounce Trump’s use of the “migrant as alien” metaphor. Instead of using the
‘migrant as alien’ metaphor and describing immigrants as being illegal, Clinton frequently describes them by the neutral term “undocumented”.

### 6.2.4 The container metaphor

The final part of the analysis of Trump’s and Clinton’s speeches about immigration consisted of the discussion of the container metaphor. As mentioned before, three subcategories (the in-orientation, the out-orientation and the nation as house metaphor) have been analysed. The subcategories of the in- and –out orientation of the container metaphor belong to Lakoff’s and Johnson’s (2008) theory of the container metaphor. More specifically, they argue that the main characteristic of the container metaphor is the fact that it has an in-out orientation. In this dissertation, instances of the in-orientation and of the out-orientation have been categorised separately.

Regarding the in-orientation, I have observed that Trump often applies it in combination with the ‘migration as water’ or ‘migration as alien’ metaphor. In this way, he extends the application of Lakoff’s and Johnson’s original understanding of the container metaphor to emphasise his negative attitude towards immigration in the United States.

Clinton does not use the in-orientation of the container metaphor to criticise migration. On the contrary, she is willing to include immigrants in the United States and uses the in-orientation to express this idea.

Regarding the out-orientation of the container metaphor in Trump’s speeches, one can observe similar results. Trump again uses it to represent immigrants negatively. However, this time he combines it with metonymy and repetition, which extends the creation of a feeling of threat and fear that this container metaphor creates.

Furthermore, by using metonymy in the form of the words ‘drugs’ and the soundbite ‘bad hombres’, he also refines the source of threat, as he specifically refers to Mexican immigrants. Both the strategy of repetition and soundbite are discussed by Charteris-Black (2011), and Trump’s uses of these strategies can be considered as an example of Charteris-Black’s description of the function of these concepts. In short, he extends the use of the container metaphor by
combining it with metonymy, repetition and a soundbite and he narrows down the use by referring to Mexican immigrants.

In Clinton’s speeches, I have only encountered three examples of the out-orientation of the container metaphor and, similarly to her application of the in-orientation, Clinton again uses it to express her willingness to include immigrants in the United States. This time, she expresses this desire by denouncing the exclusion of immigrants. She also refers to Trump’s support of their exclusion and counters it by disapproving his use of the out-orientation of the container metaphor.

The last subcategory of the container metaphor that has been analysed is Santa Ana’s concept of the “nation as house” metaphor. As mentioned before, Santa Ana claims that this metaphor “builds on the more foundational CONTAINER metaphor, with its center/periphery schema, interior/exterior schema, and bounding structures”. Moreover, he argues that the domain “house” also consists of “a manufactured structure, which implies a builder, an architect and design; materials such as roofs, doors, and windows”. Finally, he observes that “it also presumes an owner” (Santa Ana, 2002, location 5611 – 5630 of 9671).

After having compared these observations with the instances of the ‘nation as house’ in Trump’s speeches, I have observed that he uses certain aspects of this concept to persuade the audience of his view towards migration. More specifically, he uses the idea that the nation consists of different building materials by arguing that migration deprives the United States of wealth, which he describes as an essential building material of the nation. In this way, he creates the sense of fear of losing such a valuable material because of immigration.

Furthermore, he also uses the nation as house metaphor as a justification for the need of building a border between Mexico and the United States, which can be compared with a wall in a house. Trump also uses the verbs ‘to fix’ and ‘to rebuild’. These utterances can be considered as an extension of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor, in the sense that they are not used to describe the building or manufacturing of a new house or building but to describe the restoration of a building that already exists. In this way, Trump probably implies that he is the right person to address for the restoration of the house so that it will not collapse in the future. Therefore, this idea also implies a sense of urgency.
In the analysis, I have argued that Trump does not seem to exclude American citizens from the act of building the nation, and he even includes the Latin American population in it, but he still does not include immigrants. The analysis also demonstrates that Clinton uses the ‘nation as house metaphor’ more frequently than Trump does. Furthermore, it is remarkable that in Clinton’s speeches, the instances of using the ‘nation as house’ metaphor are often combined with other strategies, which I will discuss in the next two paragraphs.

The comparison of Clinton’s use of the nation has house metaphor has demonstrated that it does not support Santa Ana’s observations of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor as being used to represent certain persons as a threat and excluding them. On the contrary, Clinton uses this metaphor to include immigrants into the house that represents the United States. Another strategy that Clinton combines the use of the ‘nation as house’ metaphor with is the extension of the metaphorical usage of her opponent, for example when she extends Trump’s metaphor of building walls by saying that she wishes to build ladders of opportunity and empowerment for immigrants instead. She also shows an instance of repetition (breaking down barriers), which according to Charteris-Black (2011) is a method of persuasion in political discourse.

Furthermore, she also develops the journey metaphor by emphasising the need to build “a path to citizenship” for immigrants. Her texts also show some instances of personification to represent America as a person that is tolerant, positive and inclusive towards immigrants. Moreover, similar to Trump, Clinton also extends the ‘nation as house’ metaphor by speaking about restoration. However, in contrast with Trump, she includes everyone in this process of restoration. Lastly, she uses the ‘nation as house’ metaphor by specifically describing a part of the material that a house consists of, by claiming that she will not slam the door on immigrants.
6.3 General conclusion

Several points about this investigation can be concluded. Firstly, I have attempted to discover how Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton, the two presidential candidates in the 2016 US elections, made use of the ‘migration as water’, ‘migration as invasion’, ‘immigrants as alien’ and the ‘container’ metaphors in their political rhetoric as presidential candidates. In what follows, I will provide a general conclusion to my linguistic investigation and list the most important findings.

In the case of the Republican candidate, Donald Trump, the noted uses confirm existing descriptions in the literature. More precisely, by using the four types of metaphors of migration, Trump represents immigrants either as a threat, as criminals or as outsiders who should be excluded from the United States.

At the same time, I have also noted some novel dimensions in Trump’s uses of these metaphors which were not noted in earlier research. Some examples include a combination of different types of metaphor, metonymy, repetition and a soundbite. Some other noteworthy aspects about his metaphorical usage are his representation of immigrants as a hidden threat (“Trojan horse), the use of the tautologous utterance “criminal illegal aliens” and his use of the concept of ‘amnesty’ in a political context.

In the case of the candidate for the Democratic party, Hilary Clinton, it can be concluded that her uses of metaphors of migration often rely on “against the grain” interpretations and extensions of the metaphors as a part of developing a discourse which seeks to oppose Trump’s views. Instead of representing immigrants as a threat and excluding them, the purpose of her metaphorical usage is to include immigrants and to represent them as victims.

Apart from using the strategies of “against the grain” interpretations and metaphorical extensions, Clinton also relies on other approaches. That is, in her discourse about migration, she includes strategies such as using the journey metaphor (to establish the purpose of helping immigrants to become citizens of the United States), repetition (to radiate more conviction) and personification (to create a more recognisable description of her ideas).
Another notable aspect is that Clinton often avoids using metaphors of migration that are stereotypically negatively loaded. For example, she seldom uses the ‘migration as water’ metaphor, and instead of using the term “illegal” - which is an example of the ‘migrant as alien’ metaphor to describe the status of immigrants, she uses the term “undocumented”. This avoidance is arguably conscious and demonstrates Clinton’s attempt to express a more positive attitude towards migration.

Also interesting to consider are the two candidates’ perceptions of which population group should be perceived as victims. On the one hand, Trump describes immigrants as enemies or criminals. American citizens, on the contrary, are perceived as victims of the criminality of immigrants. On the other hand, Clinton represents immigrants as victims.

An example of this reverse representation is the instance in which Trump tells a real-life story about American citizens whose children have been victimised by immigrants, while Clinton refers to the story of a Syrian child who has been the victim of bombings in his country. Therefore, with this reference, she represents the terrors that immigrants experience if they cannot immigrate to another country. Consequently, it is interesting that by using the same types of metaphor, Trump and Clinton can express such opposite views on this matter.

The second question that I have attempted to answer is how these specific methods of use contribute to Trump’s and Clinton’s efforts to persuade the audience of their views towards migration. Generally, it can be argued that they both trigger emotional responses in their audience. By using metaphors of migration to represent immigration as a threat and immigrants as criminals, Trump arguably attempts to evoke the feeling of outrage and fear amongst the audience.

What’s more, he emphasises these feelings by combining his metaphorical usage with the other strategies mentioned in the paragraphs above. More specifically, this combination of using metaphors of migration with other tactics allows him to either express his message more credibly and understandably or to put more emphasis on certain negative representations. In contrast, it can be argued that Clinton’s different uses of the discussed types of metaphors mostly serve to evoke a feeling of empathy towards immigrants or frustration towards Trump’s vision of migration. One can also observe how her willingness to include immigrants in the United States matches with the slogan of her campaign; “Stronger together”.
Additionally, several points can be made about the limitations of this investigation. The data set might be insufficient to ensure a representative view of the topic in the sense that only eleven data pieces have been analysed and not all of the metaphorical instances in the data set have been discussed. I have limited my enquiry to those sections of the debates and public speeches that dealt with the theme of migration. Nevertheless, regarding Trump’s and Clinton’s discourses on migration, the investigation arguably provides a general impression of some critical aspects of their metaphorical usage. However, to go more deeply into the analysis of Trump’s and Clinton’s use of metaphors of migration, further research is necessary.

This study can be elaborated further with analyses of metaphoric uses in relation to other political themes in the data set. Equally relevant might be an investigation of Trump’s current uses of metaphors of migration, since starting his presidency. Does he continue to use the same metaphorical categories of migration, and have there been any notable changes in his attitude towards immigration? A study of his current metaphorical usage might lead to some interesting additional insights on this topic.
References

Data sources:

[C-SPAN]. (2015, June 13). Hillary Clinton Presidential Campaign Announcement Full Speech (C-SPAN) [Video File]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZgGPMrLHRy0

[C-SPAN]. (2015, June 16). Donald Trump Presidential Campaign Announcement Full Speech (C-SPAN) [Video File]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZgGPMrLHRy0


**Literature:**


Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public*
discourse. [Kindle Cloud Reader version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com


Appendix

1. Hillary Clinton’s presidential announcement speech (April 12, 2015)

1) 00:15:18 – 00:15:25

01. (about Republicans:) They want to put immigrants, who work hard and pay taxes,
02. at risk of deportation [...] 

2) 00:30:19 – 00:30:39

01. In America, every family should feel like they belong, so we should  
02. offer hardworking, law-abiding immigrant families a path to citizenship, 
03. [applause] not second-class status.

3) 00:31:02 – 00:31:24

01. You know, America’s diversity, our openness, our devotion to human rights  
02. and freedom is what’s drawn so many to our shores, 
03. what’s inspired people all over the world. I know, I’ve seen it with my own eyes, 
04. and these are also the qualities that prepare us well for the demands of a world 
05. that is more interconnected than ever before.
4) 0:44:47 - 00:45:03

01. (about her mother:) I wish she could have seen **the America we are going to** build together; an America where - if you do your part - you reap the rewards,
03. **where we don’t leave anyone out or anyone behind.**
2. Donald Trump’s presidential announcement speech (June 16, 2015)

1) 00:03:02 – 00:04:27

01. When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity,
02. and now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend - believe me -
03. but they're killing us economically. The US has become a dumping ground
04. for everybody else's problems. [applause]
05. Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest.
06. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best -
07. they're not sending you, they're not sending you. They're sending people
08. that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us.
09. They're bringing drugs, they're bringing crime, they're rapists and some -
10. I assume - are good people.

11. But I speak to border guards, and they tell us what we're getting.
12. And it only makes common sense, it only makes common sense;
13. they're sending us not the right people.
14. It's coming from more than Mexico; it's coming from all over
15. South and Latin America, and it's coming probably – probably - from the Middle East.
16. But we don't know ‘cause we have no protection, and we have no competence,
17. we don't know what's happening. And it's gotta stop, and it's gotta stop fast.

2) 00:07:35 – 00:07:45

01. That's right; a lot of people up there can't get jobs.
02. They can't get jobs because there are no jobs because China has our jobs
03. and Mexico has our jobs, they all have our jobs.
3) 00:17:50 – 00:17:58

01. I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan,
02. from so many places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money.

4) 00:40:21- 00:40:37

01. I would build a great wall -and nobody builds walls better than me - believe me -
02. and I'll build them very inexpensively.
03. I will build a great, great wall on our southern border
04. and I will have Mexico pay for that wall, mark my words.

5) 00:41:41 – 00:41:50

01. I will immediately terminate President Obama's
02. illegal executive order on immigration. Immediately.
3. Hillary Clinton’s Super Tuesday Speech (March 1, 2016)

1) 00:00:21 – 00:00:30

01. You know - all across our country today - Democrats voted **to break down barriers**
02. so we can all rise together.

2) 00:01:38 – 00:03:37

01. Because **this country belongs to all of us**, not just those at the top.
02. Not just the people who look one way, worship one way, or even think one way.
03. **America prospers when we all prosper, America is strong when we're all strong.**
04. And we know we've got work to do.
05. But that work - that work is not to make America great again,
06. America never stopped being great. We [applause] **we have to make America whole,**
07. **we have to fill in – fill in what's been hollowed out.**
08. No, we have to make strong the broken places,
09. **re-stitch the bonds of trust and respect across our country.**
10. Now, it might be unusual - as I've said before - for a presidential candidate to say this,

11. but I'm going to keep saying it:
12. I believe what we need in America today is more love and kindness.
13. Because you know what - you know what; it works.
14. **Instead of building walls we're going to break down barriers and build** [applause]
15. **build ladders of opportunity and empowerment**
16. **so every American can live up to his or her potential, because then -**
17. **and only then - can America live up to its full potential too.**
3) 00:08:58 – 00:09:07

01. We can break down barriers for hardworking immigrants everywhere
02. who are too often exploited and intimidated.

4) 00:10:01 – 00:10:51

01. Like many of you, I find strength and purpose in the values
02. I learned from my family and my faith.
03. They gave me simple words to live by, an old Methodist saying:
04. do all the good you can for all the people you can, for as long as you can,
05. and that is why - [applause]
06. that is why I believe deeply that if we resist the forces trying to drive us apart,
07. we can come together to make this country work for everyone:
08. the struggling, the striving and the successful.
09. If we all do our part, we can restore our common faith in our common future.
10. That's the spirit powering this campaign.
4. Donald Trump’s Super Tuesday Press Conference Speech
(March 1, 2016)

Participants:
T: Donald Trump
P: Press

1) 00:03:22 – 00:03:48

01. You look at countries like Mexico where they’re killing us on the border.
02. Absolutely destroying us on the border.
03. They're destroying us in terms of economic development;
04. companies like Carrier Air Conditioning are just moving into Mexico,
05. Ford moving into Mexico, Nabisco closing up shop in Chicago
06. and moving into Mexico. We have to stop it, folks. I know how to stop it.
07. We’re gonna create jobs. We’re gonna create jobs like you’ve never seen.

2) 00:09:53 – 00:10:09

01. P: Does it – does it feel to you yet like you are the presumptive Republican nominee
02. P: and along those lines, you had some complimentary things to say
03. P: about planned parenthood, you said you could be flexible on immigration;
04. P: are you trying to adjust your tone to a more general election message?
05. T: I’m just doing what’s right. […]
3) **00:10:58 – 00:11:09**

01. T: And maybe that’s not a perfect conservative view but I can tell you one thing;
02. T: I’m more conservative than anybody on the military, on taking care of our vets,
03. T: on the border, on the wall, […]

4) **00:11:28 – 00:11:34**

01. T: So, Sarah, I mean – you know, you can call it what you want,
02. T: but I am a truth teller and I will tell the truth, O.K.?

5) **00:16:51 – 00:19:39**

01. P: Is immigration negotiable?
02. T: Look, everything – we are going to have a wall, I can tell you.
03. T: We are going to have a wall. I watched the ex-president of Mexico,
04. T: the arrogance of this man. And I get along great with the Hispanics;
05. T: you saw in Nevada, I won in the poll the Hispanic vote.
06. T: I have thousands of people that work for me right now that are Hispanic,
07. T: I’ve had thousands and thousands over my lifetime; these are great people.
08. T: **The Mexican leaders are too smart** for our leaders, and you saw it.
09. T: Uh -Vincente Fox – uh - first of all, he used a word that you should never have –
10. T: if I ever used that word, you folks would have never, ever, ever
11. T: let me get away with it. Nobody even talked about the word he used,
12. T: and this is the ultimate word. But he was angry at the concept
13. T: of somebody saying that they were gonna pay for the wall.
14. T: **Mexico’s gonna pay for the wall.** We have a trade deficit with Mexico
15. T: of 58 billion dollars a year, 58 billion dollars.
16. T: The wall is gonna cost 10 billion dollars….it’s so easy.
17. T: I’ve had these guys, and I’m on the stage with:
18. T: come, you don’t really mean Mexico is gonna pay for the wall.
19. T: **One - as sure as you’re standing there – one hundred percent**
20. T: **Mexico is gonna pay, one hundred percent.**
21. T: And the reason – the reason is I’m a businessman, I know how to do this.
22. T: Politicians are all talk, no action. It’s not gonna – except for Chris Christie, of course –
23. T: It’s not – look – it’s not gonna happen. It’s not gonna happen with these people.
24. T: So when you think of it – and then they say: you’ll never be able to build a wall;
25. T: well, it’s 2000 miles, but we really need 1000 mile.
26. T: The Great Wall of China - built 2000 years ago – is 13 000 miles, folks,
27. T: and they didn’t have Caterpillar tractors -
28. T: ‘cause I only wanna use Caterpillar if you wanna know the truth -
29. T: or John Deerne, I buy a lot of equipment from John Deerne, I love John Deerne too.
30. T: But – but they didn’t have tractors, they didn’t have cranes,
31. T: they didn’t have excavation equipment.
32. T: The wall is 13 000 miles long; we need a 1000 miles. And we have all of the materials.
33. T: **We can do that so beautifully. And this is gonna be a serious wall;**
34. T: **this is gonna be a high wall, this is gonna be a very serious wall.**
35. T: **We’re gonna stop drugs from coming into New Hampshire.**
36. T: You know - when I won New Hampshire, those people were so incredible to me.
37. T: And when you go, you wouldn’t believe it ‘cause it’s so bucolic, so beautiful.
38. T: You look at the fields and you look at everything, it’s so beautiful.
39. T: And yet, you go to a meeting in New Hampshire, their number one problem -
40. T: their number one problem is heroin. **The heroin is pouring in,**
41. T: and they have so many of their young people and other people addicted.
42. T: And I told them I’m gonna stop it; I’m gonna to stop it.
43. T: **We’re gonna have a strong border, and I mean strong.**
44. T: **And by the way, speaking of people: people are gonna come in,**
45. T: and they’re gonna come into this country,
46. T: but they’re going to come in legally, O.K.?

6) 00:20:00 – 00:22:07

01. T: We have a big, big problem. I’ll tell it like it is. We have a big, big problem.
02. T: We’ve gotta figure it out. We’re gonna figure it out. Radical Islamic terrorism –
03. T: big, big problem, not only for us;
04. T: you take a look at Germany, you take a look at Sweden, you take a look at Brussels.
05. T: You look at some of these places; it’s like a disaster.
06. T: And we’re not gonna allow people to come into our country who we have no idea
    who they are; we have no idea where they come from.
07. T: who they are; we have no idea where they come from.
08. T: They have no paperwork. They’re young, and they’re strong.
09. T: You look at that migration line - they’re young, they’re strong, they’re powerful –
10. T: and you say: why aren’t they back fighting for their country?

11. T: Now, with all of that being said, I feel strong – I have a bigger heart than anybody
12. T: – we’re gonna build a safe zone. It’s gonna be in Syria,
13. T: and I’m gonna get the Gulf States who have more money than anybody –
14. T: we gotta loosen up their wallets a little bit. We’re gonna get –
15. T: but they’re not accepting people. We’re gonna get – wait, wait, wait –
16. T: we’re gonna get the Gulf States to pay for it because they should.
17. P: I’m not specifically on the refugees, I’m talking about your plan
18. P: to ban all the Muslims, do you still-
20. P: do you still support that plan?

22. P: Uh - Mister Trump, if you are - uh - indeed the nominee versus Hillary Clinton
23. P: in the fall, what are you gonna do to bring back some those groups though,
24. P: that have been offended by your campaign so far,
25. P: such as women, Muslims, Mexicans,…
26. T: Yeah, we’re gonna bring them back, we’re gonna bring them back.
27. T: Look, I’m telling you, you know how I’m gonna bring them back?
28. T: First of all, we’re gonna do great with the African-Americans,
29. T: and you see that in the polls, where I had one poll where I’m 25 percent
30. T: and one of the commentators - who I think is standing right in the back of the room
31. T: in the corner – said: you know, if Donald Trump gets 25 percent
32. T: of the African-American vote, this election is over, you watch.
33. T: And the reason I’m getting that – and I’m gonna do great with the Hispanics,
34. T: I’m gonna do great with virtually every group -
35. T: the reason is I’m gonna bring jobs back.
36. T: I’m gonna get Apple to start making their computers and their iPhones on our land,
37. T: not in China. How does it help us when they make it in China?
38. T: So I’m gonna create jobs, O.K.?

7) 00:24:54 – 00:24:57

01: But we have to rebuild our country.
02. Our country is going to hell, and people don’t understand that.

8) 00:26:17 – 00:26:58

01. P: Mister Trump, you’ve talked about how – uh - you plan to deport
02. P: all of the undocumented immigrants living in this country
03. P: and yesterday you said that everything is negotiable,
04. P: that your immigration plan is potentially negotiable
05. T: Where did I say that?
06. P: and – and
07. T: Where did I say that?
08. P: yesterday, in
09. T: Where – where – where - tell me where - tell me where.
10. P: on Fox - on Fox - on Fox News yesterday, you talked about how

11. T: I didn’t say that.
12. P: You talked about how parts of the
13. T: Yeah, I’ll negotiate if the wall is gonna be 50 feet, I’ll take two feet off the wall.
14. P: Right, are - are those parts about un-
15. T: You didn’t listen, gentleman.
16. P: about deporting undocumented immigrants, are those parts of your plan negotiable
17. P: and would you consider allowing the people who you’ve said
18. P: you would bring back into the country - would you allow them to stay in the country
19. P: without having to leave the country at first?
20. T: At this moment, absolutely not, no.

21. T: We either have a country, or we don’t, we have a country, or we don’t.
22. T: We have borders, or we don’t have borders.
23. T: And at this moment, the answer is absolutely not.

9) 00:30:27 – 00:30:40

01: And I just wanna leave you with this: I am a unifier,
02: I would love to see the Republican Party and everybody get together and unify.
03: And when we unify, there’s nobody, nobody that’s going to beat us.
5. Hillary Clinton’s Presidential Nomination Speech at the Democratic National Convention (July 28, 2016)

1) 00:07:56 – 00:12:02

01. Now – now America is once again at a moment of reckoning:
02. powerful forces are threatening to pull us apart.
03. Bonds of trust and respect are fraying. And just as with our founders,
04. there are no guarantees. It truly is up to us. We have to decide
05. whether we will all work together, so we can all rise together.
06. Our country's motto is E pluribus unum: out of many, we are one.
07. Will we stay true to that motto?
08. Well, we heard Donald Trump's answer last week at his convention;
09. he wants to divide us from the rest of the world and from each other.
10. He's betting that the perils of today's world will blind us
11. to its unlimited promise.
12. He's taken the Republican Party a long way from morning in America
to midnight in America. He wants us to fear the future and fear each other.
13. Well - you know - a great democratic president, Franklin Delano Roosevelt,
came up with the perfect rebuke to Trump more than eighty years ago
during a much more perilous time: the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.
14. Now, we are clear-eyed about what our country is up against,
15. but we are not afraid. We will rise to the challenge, just as we always have.
16. We will not build a wall. Instead, we will build an economy
17. where everyone who wants a good job can get one.
18. And we'll build a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants
19. who are already contributing to our economy.
20. We – we will not ban a religion; we will work with all Americans
and our allies to fight and defeat terrorism.
Yet we know there is a lot to do.
Too many people haven't had a pay raise since the crash.
There's too much inequality, too little social mobility, too much paralysis in Washington, **too many threats at home and abroad**.
But just look for a minute at **the strengths we bring as Americans** to meet these challenges. We have the most dynamic and diverse people in the world. We have the most tolerant and generous young people we've ever had.
We have the most powerful military, the most innovative entrepreneurs, the most enduring values: freedom and equality, justice and opportunity.
We should be so proud that those words are associated with us.

2) **00:15:57 – 00:16:13**

That's why Stronger Together is not just a lesson from our history, it's not just a slogan for our campaign; it's a guiding principle for the country we've always been and **the future we're going to build**.

3) **00:33:31 – 00:33:58**

I believe that when we have **millions of hardworking immigrants** contributing to our economy, it would be **self-defeating and inhumane to try to kick them out**.
04. Comprehensive immigration reform will grow our economy and keep families together, and it's the right thing to do.

4) 00:50:41 – 00:51:20

01. We have to heal the divides in our country.
02. Not just on guns, but on race, immigration and more.
03. And that starts with listening; listening to each other.
04. Trying, as best we can, to walk in each other’s shoes.
05. So let's put ourselves in the shoes of young black and Latino men and women who face the effects of systemic racism,
06. and are made to feel like their lives are disposable.

5) 00:52:17 – 00:52:49

01. And we will stand up against mean and divisive rhetoric wherever it comes from.
02. You know, for the past year, many people made the mistake of laughing off Donald Trump’s comments;
03. excusing him as an entertainer just putting on a show.
04. They thought he couldn't possibly mean all the horrible things he says,
05. like when he called women pigs or said that an American judge couldn't be fair because of his Mexican heritage.
6) 00:54:28 – 00:54:54

01. I know that **at a time when so much seems to be pulling us apart**, it can be hard to imagine **how we'll ever pull together**.
02. But I'm here to tell you tonight: progress is possible. I know -
03. I know because I've seen it in the lives of people across America who get knocked down and get right back up.
04. And I know it – I know it from my own life.
6. Donald Trump’s Nomination Acceptance Speech at the Republican National Convention, (July 21, 2016)

1) 00:09:09 – 00:11:16

01. Nearly 180,000 **illegal immigrants with criminal records**, order deported from our country, are tonight **roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens**.
02. The number of new illegal immigrant families who have **crossed the border** so far this year, already exceeds the entire total from 2015.
03. They **are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities**, with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources.
04. One such **border-crooser** was released and made his way to Nebraska.
05. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root.
06. She was 21 years old and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0-grade point average, number one in her class.
07. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law.
08. I've met Sarah's beautiful family.
09. But to this administration, their amazing daughter was **just one more American life that wasn’t worth protecting**, no more.
10. **One more child to sacrifice on the order and on the altar of open borders.**

2) 00:20:08 – 00:20:26

01. My plan will begin with **safety at home**, which means **safe neighbourhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism**.
02. There can be no prosperity without law and order.
Lastly - and very importantly - we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism, until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place. We don’t want them in our country. My opponent has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian – think of this, think of this. This is not believable, but this is what’s happening. A 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top of the existing massive refugee flows coming into our country already, under the [uses air quote] leadership of President Obama. She proposes this despite the fact that there is no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from. I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people. Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression, is not welcome in our country and never ever will be. Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages and higher unemployment for our citizens, especially for African-American and Latino workers. We are going to have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people.

On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants: Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden and my friend Jamiel Shaw. They’re just three brave representatives of many thousands who have suffered so gravely. Of all my travels in this country nothing has affected me more – nothing even close, I have to tell you - than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to
violence spilling across our borders - which we can solve, we have to solve it.

These families have no special interests to represent them;
there are no demonstrators to protect them,

and certainly none to protest on their behalf.
My opponent will never meet with them or share in their pain, believe me.
Instead, my opponent wants sanctuary cities.
But where was the sanctuary for Kate Steinle?
Where was the sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann, and Sabine and Jamiel?
Where was the sanctuary for all of the other –oh, it’s so sad to even be talking about it,
‘cause we can solve this problem so quickly –
where was the sanctuary for all of the other Americans,
who have been so brutally murdered, and who have suffered so - so horribly?
These wounded American families have been alone, but they are not alone any longer.

Tonight, this candidate - and the whole nation - stand in their corner to support them,
to send them our love, and to pledge in their honour
that we will save countless more families from suffering at the same awful fate.
We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration,
to stop the gangs and the violence
and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities.
I have been honoured to receive the endorsement of America’s Border Patrol agents
and will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful – lawful -
lawful - immigration system - lawful.
By ending catch-and-release on the border,

we will end the cycle of human smuggling and violence.
Illegal border crossings will go down; we will stop it,
it won’t be happening very much anymore - believe me.
Peace will be restored by enforcing the rules for millions who overstay their visas.
Our laws will finally receive the respect that they deserve.
Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been denied, and every politician who has denied them, to listen very, very closely to the words I am about to say; on January 20th of 2017 - the day I take the Oath of office – Americans will finally wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced.

We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone, but my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens. (cheers along with the audience) USA – USA - USA

My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton. Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration, which is what we have now. Communities want relief, yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness. Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape the tremendous cycle of poverty that they’re going through right now - and make it almost impossible for them to join the middle class.
7. First Presidential Debate between Trump and Clinton  
(Sep 26, 2016)

Participants:
T: Donald Trump  
C: Hillary Clinton  
H: Lester Holt (presenter)

1) 00:40:43 – 00:43:12

01. H: The share of Americans who say race relations are bad in this country  
02. H: is the highest it's been in decades, much of it amplified  
03. H: by shootings of African-Americans by police,  
04. H: as we’ve seen recently in Charlotte and Tulsa.  
05. H: Race has been a big issue in this campaign,  
06. H: and one of you is gonna have to bridge a very wide and bitter gap.  
07. H: So how do you heal the divide? Secretary Clinton, you got two minutes on this.  
08. C: Well, you're right; race remains a significant challenge in our country.  
09. C: Unfortunately, race still determines too much;  
10. C: often determines where people live, determines what kind of education

11. C: in their public schools they can get, and – yes –  
12. C: it determines how they're treated in the criminal justice system.  
13. C: We've just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte.  
14. C: And we've got to do several things at the same time;  
15. C: we have to restore trust between communities and the police,  
16. C: we have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training,  
17. C: the best techniques, that they're well prepared to use force only when necessary.  
18. C: Everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law.  
19. C: Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighbourhoods.
20. C: So I have - ever since the first day of my campaign -

22. C: I've laid out a platform that I think would begin to remedy
23. C: some of the problems we have in the criminal justice system.
24. C: But we also have to recognise, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing,
25. C: there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform.
26. C: So we have to bring communities together
27. C: in order to begin working on that as a mutual goal.
28. C: And we've got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.
29. C: The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African - American men,
30. C: more than the next nine causes put together.

31. C: So we have to do two things, as I said.
32. C: We have to restore trust, we have to work with the police,
33. C: we have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them
34. C: and we have to tackle the plague of gun violence,
35. C: which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we're seeing today.

2) 00:43:59 – 00:44:27

01. T: Uh - we have a situation where we have – uh -
02. T: our inner cities, African- Americans, Hispanics are living in hell
03. T: because it's so dangerous; you walk down the street, you get shot.
04. T: In Chicago, they've had thousands of shootings, thousands since January first.
05. T: Thousands of shootings. And I'm saying, where is this?
06. T: Is this a war-torn country? What are we doing?
01. T: We have **gangs roaming the street, and in many cases, they're illegally here,**
02. T: **illegal immigrants.** And they’ve guns, and they shoot people.
03. T: And we have to be very **strong.** And we have to be very **vigilant.**
04. T: We have to be - we have to know what we're doing.
05. T: Right now, our police - in many cases - are afraid to do anything.
06. T: We have to **protect our inner cities,**
07. T: because African-American communities are being decimated
08. H: [your]
09. T: by crime
10. H: [your two minutes…]

12. H: your two minutes expired. But I do wanna follow up;
13. H: stop-and-frisk was ruled unconstitutional in New York because it -
14. H: it largely singled out black and Hispanic young men.
15. T: No, - uh - you’re wrong - uh - it went before a judge
16. T: who was a very against police judge – uh -
17. T: it was taken away from her and our mayor - our new mayor -
18. T: refused to go forward with the case, they would have won an appeal.
19. T: If you look at it throughout the country, there are many places where it's allowed.
20. H: The argument is that it’s - it’s a form of racial profiling

21. T: No, the argument is that we have to take the guns away
22. T: from these people that have them,
23. T: and that are **bad people that shouldn't have them.**
24. T: These are **felons.** These are people that are **bad people,** that shouldn't be - [...]
4) 00:47:15 – 00:47:13

01. T: But we need – Lester - we need law and order.
02. T: And we need law and order in the inner cities
03. T: because the people that are most affected by what's happening
04. T: are African-American and Hispanic people.
05. T: And it's very unfair to them what our politicians are allowing to happen.

5) 00:47:34 – 00:48:28

01. C: Well, I – I've heard – uh - I've heard Donald say this – uh - at his rallies,
02. C: and it - it's really unfortunate that he paints s- such a dire, negative picture
03. C: of black communities in our country.
04. T: [Ugh.]
05. C: You know, the vibrancy of the black church,
06. C: the black businesses that employ so many people - uh -
07. C: the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids – uh -
08. C: there's a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up.
09. C: But we do always have to make sure we keep people safe.
10. C: There are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective.
11. C: Stop-and-frisk was found to be unconstitutional and -in part -
12. C: because it was ineffective. It did not do what it needed to do.

6) 00:52:15 – 00:52:44

01. T: But – uh - I think we have to look very strongly at no-fly lists and watch lists,
02. T: and when people are on there -even if they shouldn't be on there - we'll help them,
03. T: we'll help them legally, we'll help them get off,
04. T: but I tend to agree with that – uh – quite strongly.
05. T: [to Clinton:] I do want to bring up the fact that you were the one
06. T: that brought up the words **super-predator** about young black youth.
07. T: And that's a term that I think was a - it's horr-, it's been horribly met, as you know.
08. T: I think you've apologised for it. But I think it was a terrible thing to say.

7) **00:54:51 – 00:55:21**

01. T: Uh - look, the African-American community **has been let down** by our politicians.
02. T: They talk good around election time - like right now -
03. T: and after the election, they said: see you later, I'll see you in four years.
04. T: The African-American commu-, uh be – uh - look,
05. T: the community within the inner cities has been so **badly treated**.
06. T: They've been **abused and used** in order to get votes by Democrat politicians
07. T: because that's what it is.
08. T: They've **controlled** these communities for up to a hundred years.

8) **00:57:17 – 00:57:30**

01. T: because I wanna get on to defeating ISIS,
02. T: because I wanna get on to **creating jobs**, 
03. T: because I wanna get on to **having a strong border**, 
04. T: because I wanna get on to things that are **very important to me**
05. T: **and that are very important to the country**.

9) **01:06:15 – 01:06:25**

01. T: Uh - in addition, I was just endorsed by ICE.
02. T: They've never endorsed anybody before on immigration.
03. T:  Uh - I was just endorsed by ICE. I was just recently endorsed,
04. T:  16 500  Border Patrol agents.

10)  01:13:15 – 01:14:00

01. C:  We're working with NATO, the longest military alliance in the history of the world,
02. C:  to really turn our attention to terrorism.
03. C:  We're working with our friends in the Middle East,
04. C:  many of which - as you know - are Muslim majority nations.
05. C:  Donald has consistently insulted Muslims abroad, Muslims at home,
06. C:  when we need to be cooperating with Muslim nations
07. C:  and with the American Muslim community.
08. C:  They're on the front lines. They can provide information to us
09. C:  that we might not get anywhere else.
10. C:  They need to have close working cooperation with law enforcement

11. C:  in these communities, **not be alienated and pushed away** – uh -
12. C:  as some of Donald's rhetoric, unfortunately, has – uh- led to.

11)  01:32:18 – 01:32:38

01.C:  And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest
02. C:  - he loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them -
03. C:  and he called this woman Miss Piggy.
04. C:  Then he called her Miss Housekeeping because she was Latina.
05. C:  Donald, she has a name.
01. T: Uh -I wanna make America great again.

02. T: We are a nation that is seriously troubled:

03. T: **we're losing our jobs, people are pouring into our country.**

04. T: The other day, we were deporting eight hundred people.

05. T: And **perhaps they passed the wrong button, they pressed the wrong button,**

06. T: or perhaps - worse than that - it was corruption
8. Second presidential debate between Trump and Clinton  
(October 9, 2016)

Participants:
T: Donald Trump
C: Hillary Clinton
R: Martha Raddatz (presenter)
C2: Anderson Cooper (presenter)
H: Hamed (someone from the audience):

1) 00:02:43 – 00:03:22

01. C: And we are going to respect one another, lift each other up.
02. C: We are going to be looking for ways to celebrate our diversity,
03. C: and we are going to try to reach out to every boy and girl, as well as every adult – uh –
04. C: to bring them into working on behalf of our country.
05. C: I have a very positive and optimistic view about what we can do together.
06. C: That’s why the slogan of my campaign is Stronger Together.
07. C: Because I think if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness
08. C: that sometimes sets Americans against one another
09. C: and instead, we make some big goals […]

2) 00:03:58 – 00:04:14

01. C: I wanna be the president for all Americans,
02. C: regardless of your political beliefs, where you come from,
03. C: what you look like, your religion.
04. C: I want us to heal our country and bring it together.
05. C: Because that's - I think - the best way for us to get the future that our children and our grandchildren deserve.

3) 00:05:47 – 00:05:52

01. T: We’re gonna make great trade deals, we’re gonna have a strong border,
02. T: we’re gonna bring back law and order.

4) 00:06:07 – 00:06:24

01. T: But I wanna do things that haven’t been done,
02. T: including fixing and making our inner cities better
03. T: for the African-American citizens that are so great and for the Latinos, Hispanics,
04. T: and – uh - I look forward to doing it, it’s called “make America great again”.

5) 00:08:20 – 00:08:50

01. T: And I will tell you – no, I have not -
02. T: and I will tell you that I’m gonna make our country safe,
03. T: we’re gonna have borders in our country which we don't have now.
04. T: People are pouring into our country,
05. T: and they’re coming in from the Middle East and other places.
06. T: Uh - we’re gonna make America safe again, we’re gonna make America great again
07. T: but we’re gonna make America safe again,
08. T: and we’re gonna make America wealthy again.
09. T: Because if you don't do that - uh - it just – uh -
10. T: it sounds harsh to say, but we have to build up the wealth of our nation.
11. C2: [Thank you, Mister Trump.]
12. T: You know, other nations are taking our jobs, and they’re taking our wealth.

6) 00:10:32 – 00:10:53

01. C: But it’s not only women, and it’s not only this video that raises questions
02. C: about his fitness to be our president
03. C: because he has also **targeted** immigrants, African-Americans, Latinos,
04. C: people with disabilities, POWs, Muslims, and so many others.

7) 00:11:20 – 00:11:27

01. C: And we will respect one another, and we will work with one another,
02. C: and we will **celebrate our diversity**.

8) 00:16:44 – 00:16:57

01. C: He never apologised to the distinguished federal judge who was born in Indiana,
02. C: but Donald said he couldn't be trusted to be a judge
03. C: because his parents were - quote - Mexican.

9) 00:33:49 – 00:38:45

01. H: Hi, there are 3.3 million Muslims in the United States, and I'm one of them.
02. H: You’ve mentioned working with Muslim nations, but with Islamophobia on the rise;
03. H: how will you help people like me deal with the consequences of being labelled
04. H: as a threat to the country after the election is over?
05. R: Mister Trump, you’re first.
06. T: Well, you're right about Islamophobia, and that's a shame.

07. T: But one thing we have to do is - we have to make sure that -

08. T: because there is a problem. I mean, whether we like it or not -

09. T: and we can be very politically correct -

10. T: but whether we like it or not, there is a problem,

11. T: and we have to be sure that Muslims come in

12. T: and report when they see something going on.

13. T: When they see hatred going on, they have to report it.

14. T: As an example in San Bernardino: many people saw the bombs all over the apartment

15. T: of the two people that killed fourteen and wounded many, many people.

16. T: Horribly wounded, they'll never be the same.

17. T: Muslims have to report the problems when they see them.

18. T: And - you know - there is - there’s always a reason for everything.

19. T: If they don't do that, **it's a very difficult situation for our country.**

20. T: Because you look at Orlando and you look at San Bernardin-


22. T: Go outside, and you look at Paris, look at that horrible –

23. T: these are radical Islamic terrorists,

24. T: and she won't even mention the word and nor will President Obama.

25. T: He won't use the term ‘radical Islamic terrorist’, no.

26. T: To solve a problem, you have to be able to state what the problem is

27. T: or - at least - say the name.

28. T: She won't say the name and President Obama won't say the name,

29. T: but the name is there. It's radical Islamic terror.

30. T: And before you solve it, you have to say the name.

31. R: Secretary Clinton

32. C: Well, thank you for asking your question,

33. C: and I’ve heard this question from a lot of Muslim Americans across our country.
34. C: Because – unfortunately - there’s been a lot of very divisive, dark things
35. C: said about Muslims and even someone like Captain Khan,
36. C: the young man who sacrificed himself defending our country
37. C: in the United States Army, has been subject to attack by Donald.
38. C: I wanna say just a couple of things.
39. C: First, we’ve had Muslims in America since George Washington.
40. C: And we’ve had many successful Muslims.
41. C: We just lost a particularly well-known one with Muhammad Ali.
42. C: My vision of America is an America where everyone has a place;
43. C: if you’re willing to work hard, you do your part, you contribute to the community.
44. C: That's what America is, that's what we want America to be
45. C: for our children and our grandchildren.
46. C: It's also very short-sighted, and even dangerous
47. C: to be engaging in the kind of demagogic rhetoric that Donald has about Muslims.
48. C: We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lines.
49. C: I’ve worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America.
50. C: I’ve met with a lot of them, and I’ve heard how important it is for them
51. C: to feel that they are wanted and included and part of our country,
52. C: part of our homeland security. And that’s what I wanna see.
53. C: It's also important - I intend to defeat ISIS -
54. C: to do so in a coalition with majority Muslim nations.
55. C: Right now, a lot of those nations are hearing what Donald says and wondering:
56. C: w- why should we cooperate with the Americans?,
57. C: and this is a gift to ISIS and the terrorists, violent jihadist terrorists.
58. C: We are not at war with Islam, and it is a mistake
59. C: and it plays into the hands of the terrorists, to act as though we are,
60. C: so I want a country where citizens like you and your family
61. C: are just as welcome as anyone else.
62. R: Thank you, Secretary Clinton. Mister Trump, in December you said this:
63. R: Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown
64. R: of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives
65. R: can figure out what the hell is going on. We have no choice, we have no choice.
66. R: Your running mate said this week that the Muslim ban is no longer your position.
67 R: Is that correct, and - if it is - was it a mistake to have a religious test?
69. T: First of all, Captain Khan is an American hero,
70. T: and if I were president at that time, he would be alive today because
71. T: unlike her who voted for the war without knowing what she was doing,
72. T: I would not have had our people in Iraq, Iraq was a disaster.
73. T: So he would have been alive today.
74. T: The Muslim ban is something that, i - in some form has morphed into
75. T: an extreme vetting from certain areas of the world.

10) 00:39:02 – 00:42:24

01. T: It’s called extreme vetting. We are going to areas like Syria
02. T: where they’re coming in by the tens of thousands
03. T: because of Barack Obama, and Hillary Clinton
04. T: wants to allow a 550 percent increase over Obama.
05. T: **People are coming into our country like** -
06. T: **we have no idea who they are, where they are from,**
07. T: **what their feelings about our country is** and she wants 550 percent more.
08. T: **This is gonna be the great Trojan horse of all time.**
09. T: We have enough problems in this country.
10. T: I believe in **building safe zones**, I believe in having other people pay for them.

11. T: As an example, the Gulf states, who are not carrying their weight
12. T: but they have nothing but money and take care of people.
13. T: But I don’t wanna have - with all the problems this country has
14. T: and all of the problems that you see going on –
15. T: hundreds of thousands of people come in from Syria
16. T: when we know nothing about them.
17. T: We know nothing about their values,
18. T: and we know nothing about their love for our country.
19. R: And –uh- Secretary Clinton, let me ask you about that
20. R: because you have asked for an increase from 10 to 65 000 Syrian refugees.

21. R: We know you want tougher vetting. That's not a perfect system,
22. R: so why take the risk of having those refugees come into the country?
23. C: Well, first of all, I will not let anyone into our country
24. C: that I think poses a risk to us, but there are a lot of refugees, women and children.
25. C: Think of that picture we all saw of that four-year-old boy with the…
26. C: blood on his forehead because he’d been bombed by the Russian and Syrian air forces.
27. C: There are children suffering in this catastrophic war, largely -I believe -
28. C: because of Russian aggression, and we need to do our part.
29. C: We by no means are carrying anywhere near the load that Europe
30. C: and others are, but we will have vetting that is as tough as it needs to be

31. C: from our professionals, our intelligence - uh – experts and others.
32. C: But it is important for us as a - uh - policy, you know,
33. C: not to say, as Donald has said: we’re gonna ban people based on a religion.
34. C: How do you do that? We are a country founded on religious freedom and liberty.
35. C: How do we do what he has advocated
36. C: without causing great distress within our own country?
37. C: Are we going to have religious tests
38. C: when people fly into our country?
39. C: And how do we expect to be able to implement those?
40. C: So, I thought that what he said was extremely unwise and even dangerous.
41. C: And indeed, you can look at the propaganda on a lot of the terrorist sites,
42. C: and what Donald Trump says about Muslims is used to recruit fighters
43. C: because they want to create a war between us.
44. C: And the final thing I will say, this is the tenth or twelfth time
45. C: that he’s denied being for the war in Iraq.
46. C: We have it on tape, the entire press corps has looked at it, it’s been debunked,
47. C: but it never stops him from saying whatever he wants to say.

11) 00:42:45 – 00:43:59

01. T: Hillary Clinton, in terms of having people come into our country;
02. T: we have many criminal illegal aliens.
03. T: When we wanna send them back to their country,
04. T: their country says: we don't want them.
05. T: In some cases, they’re murderers, drug lords, drug problems and they don't want them.
06. T: And Hillary Clinton - when she was Secretary of State - said:
07. T: that’s O.K., we can’t force them into their country.
08. T: Let me tell you; I’m going to force them right back into their country.
09. T: They’re murderers and some very bad people.
10. T: And I will tell you – uh -very strongly:

11. T: when Bernie Sanders said she had bad judgment,
12. T: she has really bad judgement because we are letting people into this country
13. T: that are gonna cause problems and crime like you’ve never seen.
14. T: We’re also letting drugs pour through our southern border at a record clip.
15. T: At a record clip. And it shouldn't be allowed to happen.
16. T: ICE just endorsed me. They’ve never endorsed a presidential candidate.
17. T: The border patrol agents, 16 500, just recently endorsed me.
18. T: And they endorsed me because I understand the border.
19. T: She doesn't; she wants amnesty for everybody.

20. T: **Come right in, come right over. It's a horrible thing she's doing.**

21. T: She's got bad judgment and – honestly -

22. T: so bad that she should never be president of the United States. That I can tell you.

12) **01:11:27 – 01:12:35**

01. T: But she’s lied about a lot of things.

02. T: I would be a president for all of the people:

03. T: African-Americans, the inner cities…

04. T: Devastating what's happening to our inner cities.

05. T: She’s been talking about it for years. As usual, she talks about it, nothing happens.

06. T: She doesn't get it done. Same with the Latino Americans, the Hispanic Americans.

07. T: The same exact thing. They talk, they don't get it done.

08. T: You go into the inner cities, and you see, it’s 45 percent poverty.


10. T: The education is a disaster, jobs are essentially nonexistent.

11. T: I mean, it’s - uh - you know - I -

12. T: and I’ve been saying in big speeches where I have twenty- and 30 000 people:

13. T: what do you have to lose?

14. T: It can't get any worse, and she’s been talking about the inner cities for 25 years.

15. T: Nothing is gonna ever happen. Let me tell you;

16. T: if she’s president of the United States, nothing’s gonna happen, it's just gonna be talk.

17. T: And all of her friends - the taxes we are talking about.

18. T: And I would just get it by osmosis. She’s not doing me favours.

19. T: but by doing all the others favours, she’s doing me favours.
01. C: You know, I started off as a young lawyer working against discrimination against
02. C: African-American children and schools and in the criminal justice system.
03. C: I worked to make sure that kids with disabilities could get a public education,
04. C: something that I care very much about.
05. C: I have worked with Latinos, one of my first jobs in politics was down in south Texas,
06. C: registering Latino citizens to be able to vote.
07. C: So I have a deep devotion to use your absolutely correct word
08. C: to making sure that every American feels like he or she has a place in our country.
09. C: And I think when you look at the letters that I get,
10. C: a lot of people are worried that maybe they wouldn't have a place

11. C: in Donald Trump’s America - uh -they write me and - a -
12. C: one woman wrote me about her son, Felix.
13. C: She adopted him from Ethiopia when he was a toddler.
14. C: He’s ten years old now, this is the only country he has ever known.
15. C: And he listens to Donald on TV, and he said to his mother one day:
16. C: will he send me back to Ethiopia if he gets elected?
17. C: You know, children listen to what is being said -
18. C: to go back to the very, very first question. And there’s a lot of fear.
19. C: In fact, teachers and parents are calling it the Trump effect:
20. C: bullying is up, a lot of people are feeling - you know, uneasy -

21. C: a lot of kids are expressing their concerns,…
22. C: So first and foremost, I will do everything I can to reach out to everybody.
14) 01:15:01 – 01:15:22

01.C2: I wanna follow on something that Donald Trump actually said to you.
02.C2: Uh – a comment you made last month:
03.C2: you said that half of Donald Trump’s supporters are - quote – deplorables:
04.C2: racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, islamophobic.
05.C2: You said you regretted saying half.
06.C2: You didn't express regret for using the term deplora- deplorables.
07.C2: To Mister Carter’s question; how can you unite the country if you've written off
tens of millions of Americans?
08.C2: Well within hours, I - I said that I was sorry about the way I – I - uh -
talked about that because my argument is not with his supporters,
it's with him and with the hateful and divisive campaign that he has run,
and the inciting of violence at his rallies and the very - uh -
brutal kinds of comments about not just women, but all Americans.
All kinds of Americans. And…
what he has said about African-Americans and Latinos, about Muslims, about POWs,
- uh - about immigrants, about people with disabilities; he’s never apologised for.
And, so I do think that a lot of the tone and tenor that he has said –
I’m proud of the campaign that Bernie Sanders and I ran.
We ran a campaign based on issues, not insults
and he is supporting me a hundred percent.

15) 01:16:25 – 01:17:05

01. T: We have a divided nation, we have a very divided nation.
02. T: You look at Charlotte, you look at Baltimore,
03. T: you look at the violences taking place in the inner cities, Chicago.
04. T: You take a look at Washington D.C.
05. T: We have an increase in murder within our cities, the biggest in 45 years.
06. T: We have a divided nation because people like her –
07. T: and believe me - she has tremendous hate in her heart.
08. T: And when she said deplorables, she meant it.
09. T: And when she said irredeemable, they’re irredeemable - you didn't mention that -
10. T: but when she said they’re irredeemable, to me that might have been even worse.
9. Third presidential debate (October 19, 2016)

Participants:
- Chris Wallace (presenter)
- Donald Trump
- Hillary Clinton

1) 00:16:35 – 00:17:12

01. W: All right, let's move on to the subject of immigration. Uh - and there is almost no
02. W: issue that separates the two of you more than the issue of immigration.
03. W: Actually, there are a lot of issues that separate the two of you.
04. W: Mister Trump, you wanna build a wall.
05. W: Secretary Clinton, you have offered no specific plan for
06. W: how you wanna secure our southern border.
07. W: Mr Trump, you are calling for major deportations.
08. W: Secretary Clinton, you say that within your first hundred days as president,
09. W: you’re gonna offer a package that includes a pathway to citizenship.
10. W: Uh - the question really is why are you right and your opponent wrong?

11. W: Mister Trump, you go first in this segment, you have two minutes.
12. T: Well, first of all, she wants to give amnesty, which is a disaster
13. T: and very unfair to all of the people waiting in line for many, many years.
14. T: We need strong borders.
15. T: In the audience tonight, we have four mothers of - I mean -
16. T: these are unbelievable people that I've gotten to know over a period of years,
17. T: whose children have been killed, brutally killed,
18. T: by people that came into the country illegally.
19. T: You have thousands of mothers, and fathers and relatives all over the country.
20. T: They're coming in illegally. Drugs are pouring in through the border.
21. T: **We have no country if we have no border.**

22. T: **Hillary wants to give amnesty; she wants to have open borders.**

23. T: The border secuir- as you know, the border patrol agents, 16 500 plus ICE,

24. T: last week endorsed me, first time they've ever endorsed a candidate.

25. T: It means their job is tougher, but they know what’s going on,

26. T: and they know it better than anybody.

27. T: They want **strong borders**, they feel we have to **have strong borders**.

28. T: I was up in New Hampshire the other day,

29. T: the biggest complaint they have, it’s with all of the problems going on in the world -

30. T: many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and by Barack Obama -

31. T: all of the problems, **the single biggest problem is heroin**

32. T: **that pours across our southern borders, just pouring and destroying their youth.**

33. T: **It’s poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people.**

34. T: We have to have **strong borders**; we have to **keep the drugs out of our country.**

35. T: **We are- right now, we're getting the drugs, they're getting the cash.**

36. T: We need **strong borders**; we need absolute - we **cannot give amnesty.**

37. T: Now, I wanna build the wall; we need the wall.

38. T: And the border patrol, ICE, they all want the wall.

39. T **We stop the drugs, we-we shore up the border.**

40. T: One of my first acts will be **to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones** -

41. T: **we have some bad, bad people in this country that have to go out.**

42. T: **We're gonna get them out.** We're going to **secure the border,**

43. T: and once the border is secured - at a later date -

44. T: we'll make a determination as to the rest.

45. T: But **we have some bad hombres here, and we're gonna get them out.**
01. C: Well, as he was talking, I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Las Vegas,
02. C: Carla - uh - who is very worried that her parents might be deported because - uh -
03. C: she was born in this country but they were not.
04. C: They work hard, they do everything they can to give her a good life.
05. C: And you're right, I don't wanna rip families apart,
06. C: I don't want to be sending parents away from children, I don't want to see
07. C: the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country.
08. C: We have eleven million undocumented people,
09. C: they have four million American citizen children; fifteen million people.
10. C: He said as recently as a few weeks ago in Phoenix

11. C: that every undocumented person would be subject to deportation
12. C: and here's what that means; it means you would have to have
13. C: a massive law enforcement presence where law enforcement officers
14. C: would be going school to school, home to home, business to business,
15. C: rounding up people who are undocumented.
16. C: And we would then to have put them on trains, on buses
17. C: to get them out of our country.
18. C: I think that is - uh - an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation,
19. C: I think it’s an idea that would rip our country apart.
20. C: I have been for border security for years,

21. C: I voted for border security in the United States Senate,
22. C: and my comprehensive immigration reform plan of course includes border security.
23. C: But I want to put our resources where I think they're most needed;
24. C: getting rid of any violent person, anybody who should be deported,
25. C: we should deport them.
26. C: When it comes to the wall that Donald talks about building -
27. C: he went to Mexico, he had a meeting with the Mexican president -
28. C: didn't even raise it, he choked. And then got into a Twitter war
29. C: because the Mexican president said we're not paying for that wall.
30. C: So I think we are both a nation of immigrants and we are a nation of laws,

31. C: and that we can act accordingly.
32. C: And that's why I'm introducing comprehensive immigration reform
33. C: within the first hundred days with a path to citizenship.
34. W: Th-thank you Secretary Clinton. I wanna follow-up-
35. T: Chris, I think it’s -- I think I should respond to this.
36. T: First of all, I had a very good meeting with the President of Mexico, very nice man.
37. T: Uh - we will be doing very much better with Mexico on trade deals, believe me.
38. T: Uh - the NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made
39. T: of any kind signed by anybody, it’s a disaster.
40. T: Hillary Clinton wanted the wall.

41. T: Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts.
42. T: Now, she never gets anything done, so – naturally - the wall wasn't built,
43. T: but Hillary Clinton wanted the wall.

3) 00:22:06 – 00:23:14

01. C: I voted for border security, and there are uh – some
02. T: [and a wall]
03. C: there are some limited places where that was appropriate.
04. C: There also is necessarily going to be new technology and how best to deploy that.
05. C: Uh -but it is clear when you look at what Donald has been proposing;
06. C: he started his campaign bashing immigrants,
07. C: calling Mexican immigrants rapists and criminals and drug dealers - uh -
08. C: that he has a very different view about what we should do to deal with immigrants.
Now, what I am also arguing is that **bringing undocumented immigrants** out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy, would be good because then employers can't exploit them and undercut Americans' wages. And Donald knows a lot about this; he used **undocumented labour** to build the Trump tower. He underpaid **undocumented workers** and when they complained, he basically said what a lot of employers do: you complain, I'll get you deported. I want to get everybody out of the shadows, get the economy working and not let employers like Donald exploit undocumented workers which hurts them but also hurts American workers.

Mister Trump has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it, nobody talks about it, but under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country, they've been deported. She doesn't want to say that, but that's what has happened, big league. Uh -as far as moving these people out and moving - we either have a country, or we don't. We're a country of laws. We either have a border, or we don't. Now, you can come back in, and you can become a citizen, but it's very unfair. We have millions of people that did it the right way; they're on line, they're waiting.

We're gonna speed up the process bigly because it’s very inefficient. But they're on line, and they’re waiting to become citizens. Very unfair that somebody runs across the border, becomes a citizen. Under her plan, you have open borders. You would have a disaster on trade and you will have a disaster with your open borders.
37. W: [Uh - I wanna...]
38. C: We will -
39. T: But what she doesn’t say is that President Obama has deported
40. T: millions and millions of people, just the way it is.

41. W: [Secretary Clinton, I wanna – uh – and Mister Trump]
42. C: We – we will not have open borders
43. W: [Well let me ask – Secretary]
44. C: that - that is a rank mischaracterisation.
45. W: [Sec – sec – Secretary Clinton]
46. C: We will have secure borders, but we will also have reform
47. C: and this used to be a bipartisan issue. Ronald Reagan
48. W: [Secretary Clinton]
49. C: was the last president to sign - uh -
50. W: [Secretary Clinton, excuse me Secretary Clinton]
51. C: to sign immigration reform and George W. Bush supported it as well.
52. W: Secretary Clinton, I wanna clear up your position on this issue because
53. W: in a speech you gave to a Brazilian bank for which you were paid 225 000 dollars,
54. W: we've learned from the Wikileaks, that you said this, and I wanna quote:
55. W: “My dream is a hemispheric common market with open trade and open borders.” So -
56. T: Thank you.
57. W: That's the question…
58. W: That’s the question. Please, quiet, everybody.
59. W: Is that your dream, open borders?
60. C: Well, If you went on to read the rest of the sentence, I was talking about energy.

61. C: You know, we trade more energy with our neighbours
62. C: than we trade with the rest of the world combined.
63. C: And I do want us to have a- an electric grid, an energy system that crosses borders.
64. C: I think that would be a great benefit to us.
65. C: But you are - uh - very clearly – uh - quoting from WikiLeaks
66. C: and what is really important about WikiLeaks is that
67. C: the Russian government has engaged in espionage against Americans.
68. C: They have hacked American - uh - websites,
69. C: American accounts of private people, of institutions.
70. C: Then they have given that information to WikiLeaks
71. C: for the purpose of putting it on the Internet.
72. C: This has come from the highest levels of the Russian government.
73. C: Clearly from Putin himself in an effort -
74. C: as seventeen of our intelligence agencies have confirmed - to influence our election.
75. C: So I actually think the most important question of this evening, Chris, is:
76. C: finally, will Donald Trump admit and condemn that the Russians are doing this,
77. C: and make it clear that he will not have the help of Putin in this election,
78. C: that he rejects Russian espionage against Americans,
79. C: which he – uh - actually encouraged in the past.
80. C: Those are the questions we need answered.
81. C: We've never had anything like this happen
82. W: Well
83. C: in any of our elections before.
84. T: That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders, O.K.?
85. T: How did we get on to Putin?
86. W: H-hold on, hold on, hold on. W-wait, hold on, folks
87. W: because we can - this is going to end up getting out of control.
88. W: Let's try to keep it quiet so...
89. W: for the candidates and for the American people.
90. T: So just to finish on the borders, she wants open borders.
91. T: People are gonna pour into our country; people are gonna come in from Syria.
92. T: She wants 550 percent more people than Barack Obama
93. T: and he has thousands and thousands of people,
94. T: they have no idea where they come from, and you see,
95. T: we are going to stop radical Islamic terrorism in this country.
96. T: She won’t even mention the words, and neither will President Obama.
97. T: So I just wanna tell you, she wants open borders

4) 01:08:31 – 01:09:27

01. C: But we know we've got lots of work to do.
02. C: Syria will remain a hotbed of terrorism as long as the civil war,
03. C: aided and abetted by the Iranians and the Russians, continue.
04. C: So I have said: look, we need to keep our eye on ISIS.
05. C: That's why I wanna have an intelligence surge that protects us here at home,
06. C: why we have to go after them from the air, on the ground, online.
07. C: Why we have to make sure, here at home we don't let terrorists buy weapons.
08. C: If you're too dangerous to fly; you're too dangerous to buy a gun.
09. C: And I'm going to continue to uh - push for a no-fly zone and safe havens within Syria,
10. C: not only to help protect the Syrians and prevent the constant outflow of refugees,

11. C: but to - frankly - gain some leverage on both the Syrian government and the Russians
12. C: so that perhaps we can have - uh - the kind of serious negotiation necessary
13. C: to bring the conflict to an end and go forward on a political track.

5) 01:17:20 – 01:17:54

01. T: But you may very well end up with worse than Assad.
02. T: If she did nothing, we’d be in much better shape.
03. T: And this is what's caused the Great Migration,
04. T: where she's taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees,
05. T: who probably in many cases - not probably, who are definitely in many cases –  
06. T: ISIS-aligned and we now have them in our country.  
07. T: And wait till you see – and this is gonna be the great Trojan horse -  
08. T: and wait till you see what happens in the coming years.  
09. T: Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.  

6) 01:19:34 – 01:20:32  
01. C: But I wanna respond to what Donald said about refugees,  
02. C: he’s made these claims repeatedly: I am not going to let anyone into this country  
03. C: who is not vetted, whom we do not have confidence in.  
04. C: But I am not gonna slam the door on women and children.  
05. C: I -that picture of that little four-year-old boy in Aleppo  
06. C: wit the blood coming down his face while he sat in an ambulance is haunting,  
07. C: and so we are going to do very careful thorough vetting.  
08. C: That does not solve our internal challenges with ISIS and  
09. C: our need to stop radicalisation to work with American Muslim communities,  
10. C: who are on the front lines to identify and prevent attacks.  
11. C: In fact, the killer...of the...dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando,  
12. C: the Pulse Night Club, was born in Queens; the same place Donald was born.  
13. C: So let's be clear about what the threat is  
14. C: and how we are best going to be able to meet it.  
15. C: And yes, some of that threat emanates from over in Syria and Iraq,  
16. C: and we've gotta keep fighting and I will defeat ISIS.  
17. C: And some of it is we have to up our game and be much smarter here at home.
01. T: She's raising the money from the people she wants to control; doesn't work that way.
02. T: But when I started this campaign, I started it very strongly.
03. T: It's called Make America Great Again. We're going to make America great.
04. T: We have a depleted military; it has to be helped, it has to be fixed.
05. T: We have the greatest people on earth in our military.
06. T: We don't take care of our veterans. **We take care of illegal immigrants,**
07. T: **people that come into the country illegally,**
08. T: **better than we take care of our vets;** that can't happen.
09. T: Our policemen and women are disrespected.
10. T: We need law and order, but we need justice, too.

11. T: **Our inner cities are a disaster:** you get shot walking to the store,
12. T: they have no education, they have no jobs.
13. T: I will do more for African-Americans and Latinos
14. T: than she can ever do in ten lifetimes.
15. T: All she's done is talk to the African-Americans and to the Latinos.
16. T: But they get the vote, and then they come back, they say:
17. T: we'll see you in four years.
18. T: We are going to make America strong again,
19. T: and we are going to make America great again, and it has to start now.
20. T: We cannot take four more years of Barack Obama
21. T: and that's what you get when you get her.
10. Hillary Clinton’s Concession Speech (November 8, 2016)

1) 00:02:16 – 00:02:52

01. I - I know how disappointed you feel because I feel it too,
02. and so do tens of millions of Americans who invested
03. their hopes and dreams in this effort.
04. This is painful, and it will be for a long time, but I want you to remember this:
05. our campaign was never about one person or even one election;
06. it was about the country we love
07. and about building an America that’s hopeful, inclusive and big-hearted.

2) 00:04:32 – 00:05:24

01. We’ve spent a year and a half bringing together millions of people from every corner
02. of our country to say with one voice that we believe
03. that the American dream is big enough for everyone:
04. for people of all races and religions, for men and women, for immigrants,
05. for LGBT people, and people with disabilities; for everyone.
06. So now, our responsibility as citizens is to keep doing our part
07. to build that better, stronger, fairer America we seek. And I know you will.

3) 00:11:24 – 00:12:36

01. Finally - finally, I am so grateful for our country and for all it has given to me.
02. I count my blessings every single day that I am an American.
03. And I still believe - as deeply as I ever have – that if we stand together
04. and work together with respect for our differences, strength in our convictions
05. and love for this nation, our best days are still ahead of us.
Because, you know - you know, I believe **we are stronger together**, and we will go forward together.

And you should never, ever regret fighting for that.

You know, scripture tells us: let us not grow weary in doing good, for in due season, we shall reap if we do not lose heart.
11. Donald Trump’s Victory Speech (November 8, 2016)

1) 00:01:14 – 00:01:50

01. Now, it’s time for America to bind the wounds of division, have to get together.
02. To all Republicans and Democrats and independents across this nation,
03. I say it is time for us to come together as one united people, it’s time.
04. I pledge to every citizen of our land that I will be president for all Americans,
05. and this is so important to me.

2) 00:02:15 – 00:03:21

01. As I’ve said from the beginning, ours was not a campaign,
02. but rather an incredible and great movement
03. made up of millions of hardworking men and women who love their country
04. and want a better, brighter future for themselves and for their family.
05. It’s a movement comprised of Americans from all races, religions,
06. backgrounds and beliefs who want and expect our government to serve the people,
07. and serve the people it will.
08. Working together, we will begin the urgent task of rebuilding our nation
09. and renewing the American dream.
10. I’ve spent my entire life and business looking at the untapped potential
11. in projects and in people all over the world.
12. That is now what I wanna do for our country.
3) 05:56-00:06:16

01. I wanna tell the world community that while we will always put
02. America’s interests first, **we will deal fairly with everyone, with everyone**;
03. all people and all other nations.
04. **We will seek common ground**, not hostility. Partnership, not conflict.