

**ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNICATION IN THE FIRST OF THE 2012
PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE BETWEEN PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA
AND GOVERNOR MITT ROMNEY**

THESIS

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of *SarjanaSastra* (S.S) in English Language.**



**By
Rizkia Prabandini Rahmanita
C11.2009.01027**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIAN NUSWANTORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2013**

PAGE OF APPROVAL

This thesis has been approved by Board of Examiners, Strata 1 Study Program of English Language, Faculty of Humanities, Dian Nuswantoro University on September 23, 2013.

Board of Examiners

Chairperson

First Examiner

Sunardi, SS., M.Pd.

Achmad Basari, SS., M.Pd.

Second Examiner

Advisor

Setyo Prasiyanto Cahyono, SS., M.Pd.

Nina Setyaningsih, M.Hum.

Approved by:

Dean of

Faculty of Humanities

Achmad Basari, S.S., M.Pd.

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that this thesis definitely my own work. I am completely responsible for the content of this thesis. Opinion or findings of others included in this thesis are quoted or cited with respect to ethical standard.

Semarang, 19 September 2013

Rizkia Prabandini R

MOTTO

Religion without science is lame, Science without religion is blind.

(Albert Einstein)

Life as if you were to die tomorrow. Learn as if you were to live forever.

(Mahatma Gandhi)

In the middle of difficulty lies opportunity.

(Albert Einstein)

Do what you can, with what you have, where you are.

(Theodore Roosevelt)

If you are doing your best you will not have time to worry about failure.

(Robert S. Hillyer)

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis especially to :

1. ALLAH SWT
2. My beloved Parents
3. My dear brothers
4. My beloved grandparents
5. My lovely boyfriend
6. All of my beloved family
7. All of my lovely friends
8. And my life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In this happiest moment, I wish a prayer to Allah SWT the Almighty, who has blessed me during writing this thesis.

Furthermore, I would like to express my sincere thanks to:

1. Mr. Achmad Basari,S.S.,M.Pd., Dean of Faculty of Humanities of Dian Nuswantoro University, who gave permission to conduct this thesis;
2. Mr. Sarif Syamsu Rizal, M.Hum., Head of English Department of Strata 1 Program, Faculty of Humanities of Dian Nuswantoro University, who gave me permission to conduct this thesis;
3. Ms. Nina Setyaningsih, M.Hum.,as my thesis adviser for your continuous and valuable guidance, advice and encouragement in completing this thesis
4. Mrs. Rahmanti Asmarani,M.Hum., thesis coordinator of English Department of Strata 1 Program, Faculty of Humanities of Dian Nuswantoro University, who gave permission to me to conduct this thesis;
5. All lecturers at the English Department, Faculty of Humanities for the guidance, advice, and support;
6. All librarians of the Central Library of Dian Nuswantoro University, Self Access Center (SAC) for their permission for me to use some valuable references in writing this thesis;
7. ALLAH SWT who has blessed me in completing this thesis;
8. My beloved Mom and Dad,with their endless love, and a lot of prayer for me to get the bachelor degree.
9. My brothers Koko and Mufid, thank you so much for your support.

10. My beloved boyfriend, thank you so much for your patience and support;

11. All my lovely family who members care and pray for me;

12. My best friends in UDINUS, thanks for togetherness , your support and help.

Finally, I do realize that due to my limited ability this thesis must have shortcoming. For this, I welcome any suggestions and criticisms.

The Researcher

Rizkia Prabandini R

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE OF TITLE	i
PAGE OF APPROVAL	ii
STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	iii
MOTTO.....	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLE	xi
LIST OF APPENDIXES	xii
ABSTRACT.....	xiii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Scope of the Study	4
1.4 Objective of the Study	4
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	5
1.6 Thesis Organization	5
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	7
2.1 Language as means of communication.....	7
2.2 Speech Community.....	8
2.3 Ethnography of Communication.....	17

2.4	Ethnography of Communication (SPEAKING)	20
2.5	A Presidential Debate	23
CHAPTER III	RESEARCH METHOD.....	25
3.1	Research Design	25
3.2	Unit of Analysis	26
3.3	Source of Data	26
3.4	Techniques of Data Collection	26
3.5	Techniques of Data Analysis	27
CHAPTER IV	DATA ANALYSIS.....	28
4.1	Findings.....	28
4.2	Elements of Ethnography of Communication	31
4.2.1	Setting and Scene	31
4.2.2	Participant	33
4.2.3	Ends	36
4.2.4	Act Sequence	51
4.2.5	Key	63
4.2.6	Instrumentalities	64
4.2.7	Norm	68
4.2.8	Genre	69
CHAPTER V	CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	81
5.1	Conclusion	81
5.2	Suggestion	82

BIBLIOGRAPHY	83
APPENDIXES	86

LIST OF TABLE

Table 4.1 Element of Ethnography of Communication 28

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 Transcript..... 86

ABSTRACT

This thesis entitled *Ethnography of Communication in the First of the 2012 Presidential Debate between President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney*. This thesis is aimed to find the elements of ethnography of communication in the debate among Jim Lehrer (the moderator), President Barack Obama (a president candidate from Democratic Party) and Governor Mitt Romney (a president candidate from Republican Party) by using descriptive qualitative method.

In collecting the data, the researcher used two stages. First, she searched the data on first Presidential debate and the transcript. Second, she downloaded the data on <http://edition.cnn.com/election/2012/debates/first-presidential-debate>, transcript on <http://debates.org/index.php?page=october-3-2012-debate-transcript>.

The elements of ethnography of communication are setting and scene, participant, end, act sequence, key, instrument, norm and genre. Setting of time is at night and setting place is Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. Scene of the situation in the debate is serious and quiet. Participants of the debate are Jim Lehrer (the moderator), President Barack Obama (a president candidate from Democratic Party) and Governor Mitt Romney (a president candidate from Republican Party). The end of this debate is discussing on differences about domestic issues. The act sequence of the debate is divided into opening stage, middle stage and closing stage. The key of the debate is serious. The instrumentalities is spoken text, that consists of turn taking, standard grammar, filler, reparation, repetition, colloquialisms, incomplete clause, and closing statement. The norm of the debate uses positive politeness, because there is social status difference between the speakers and the relationship is not intimate. The genre of the text is debate. The genre consists of definition motion, idea development, and rebuttal, and the linguistic features are the use of question and answer, present tense, future tense, past tense, modal verbs, hedging utterances.

Key words: *Ethnography of Communication, Communication, Debate*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

People need a language to communicate each other. Language is believed as a tool to communicate. It plays an important role in life, because all people use language to communicate with each other. As a function of language, communication is defined as a process of transferring and exchanging ideas, information from one person to others in order to get feedback as the result of the communication itself. It is always used in social interaction to make relation with other people, because it is the way to the social life works. To be able to interact, somebody needs to have communicative competence. Communicative competence is human ability to use the language of everyday life in real situation for example to argue, to warn, to deliver, to express, to show his messages of ideas, to wishes, and even to know when to be silent.

Communication is influenced by many aspects of life, such as culture and society. Every particular group of speakers living around the world has its own culture and sociality. They both can be seen from the way the group of speakers communicates with others. Culture has important role in development and variation of language used in particular group of speaker, while society is group of people that use language to communicate. To know language influenced by the culture inside, people need to regard ethnography

of communication. Ethnography of communication is a study of language influenced by the culture and society inside.

The ethnography of communication aims at describing the form and functions of verbal and non- verbal communicative behavior in particular cultural or social setting. Ethnography of communication is based on the premise, that the meaning of an utterance can be understood only in relation to the 'speech event' or 'communicative event' in which it embedded. Formal descriptions in the ethnography of communication focus on linguistic units above the sentences and the character of such communicative events, i.e., speech situation (e.g. ceremonies), speech event (e.g. greetings, compliments) is culturally determined. Studying ethnography can give more knowledge of other aspects of culture, communicative situations and event of the organization. In the ethnographic research, there are several kinds of speech event: talk show, debate, ceremony, news, gossip, interview, etc.

Debate is a formal discussion on a particular matter in a public meeting or legislative assembly, in which opposing arguments are put forward and which usually ends with a vote. An ethnographic research of presidential debate in this thesis seeks to describe the meanings of central themes in the life word of the subjects. The main task in presidential debate is to understand the meaning of what the participants say.

U.S presidential debate is considered as one of the most popular and amazing debates in the world especially for a formal debate. Presidential debate is a debate between president candidate before campaigns are started.

The debate that analyzed in this thesis was held in the Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. The debate was participated by two presidential candidates, they are governor Mitt Romney and president Barack Obama. The debate was lead by a panelist, Jim Lehrer of the PBS News Hour. The debate can determine appreciation and valuation of the people, because they can vote one of both candidates after the debate is over. The debate can be watched in around the world because it was broadcasted live on TV or internet. Whoever wins the polling of the debate shows that his missions or ideas are accepted well by the people in the U.S. The polling was surveyed by some U.S surveyer institutes.

From the explanation above, the researcher chose U.S presidential debate as the data in this study because the researcher is interested in analyzing ethnography of communication in the presidential debate, and analyzing the way two candidate presidents tried to state their mission and vision they want to apply to the country and to know the way both candidates struggle to maintain their ideas in order to get many votes from the people in the U.S through the debate. Based on the explanation above, this study is entitled: Ethnography of Communication of the First Presidential Debate between Governor Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama 2012.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Based on the background above, the research focused on the ethnography of communication in the Presidential Debate between Governor Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama. The researcher analyzed

ethnography of communication in the Presidential Debate. The statement of the problem in this study can be stated as follows: What are the elements of ethnography of communication found in the First Presidential Debate between Governor Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama?

1.3 Scope of the Study

This study concerned on ethnography of communication in the Presidential Debate between Governor Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama. The study also just concerned with the utterances produced by President Barack Obama, Governor Mitt Romney and Jim Lehrer (as a moderator).

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study is aimed at describing the elements of ethnography of communication found in the Presidential Debate between Governor Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama by using Hymes' SPEAKING Grids.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The researcher hopes that this study would be able to:

1. Give knowledge about linguistics studies, especially ethnography of communication.
2. Give advantage and knowledge for all students or everybody in learning ethnography of communication.
3. Give valuable contribution to Dian Nuswantoro University, especially for students of English Department of Faculty of Humanities.

4. Give interesting and good knowledge about the culture and custom especially of US presidential debate.

1.6 Thesis Organization

To make this thesis systematic and easy to read, the organization of the thesis may firstly be explained in general. This thesis is organized in the following chapters.

Chapter I is Introduction. The thesis begins with introduction as the first chapter. This chapter consists of background of the study, statement of the problem, scope of the study, objective of the study, significance of the study, and thesis organization.

Chapter II is Review of Related Literature. In this chapter, the researcher tries to strengthen her thesis by putting forward several underlying theories.

Chapter III is Research Method. It covers the discussion of research method, unit of analysis, source of data, method of collecting data, and method of analyzing data.

Chapter IV is Data Analysis. In this chapter, the researcher presents the result of data analysis, including the elements of Ethnography of Communication in the First Presidential Debate between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney.

Chapter V is Conclusion and Suggestion. This is the last chapter consisting of the conclusion and suggestion of this study.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this part, the researcher presents some theories used in this study. The theories are: Communication, communicative competence, speech community, levels of communication, ethnography of communication and presidential debate.

2.1 Language as means of communication

The main function of language is communication. Communication is needed by all people to make an interaction to each other. Communication is used to get new information and share ideas, feeling, etc, because it is the way to the social life works. Communication also becomes an important thing in life, because it can extend the identity in a certain person. It can be seen from the culture and sociality of that person.

Communication is used a medium to show ideas namely language. Language is the most important element for creating a communication between two people or more. The scientific study of language is linguistics. From the explanation above, it is correlated with (Schiffrin, 1994:138)

To begin with, the main function of human language is **communication**, and since linguistics is the scientific study of language, it goes without saying that the study of communication is one of the major goals of linguistics. On the other hand, the "understanding of communication is ... important for anthropologists: the way we communicate is part of our cultural repertoire for making sense of -and interacting with -the world."

The study related with linguistics, communication and culture is called ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972b:42). Before proceeding any

further, it is essential to define some of basic concepts associated with Hymes's work, particularly those associated with the ethnography of communication. Two important concepts are central to this approach, namely: speech community and communicative competence.

2.2 Speech community

A speech community is a group of people who share rules for using and interpreting at least one communication practice. A communication practice might involve specific events, acts, or situations, with the use and interpretation of at least one essential for membership in a speech community. The term "speech" is used here to stand in for various means of communication, verbal and nonverbal, written and oral; the term "community," while minimally involving one practice, in actuality typically involves many, and is thus used to embrace the diversity in the means and meanings available for communication.

Romaine (1994:22) states "A speech community is a group of people who do not necessarily share the same language, but share a set of norms and rules for the use of language. The boundaries between speech communities are essentially social rather than linguistic. A speech community is not necessarily co-extensive with a language community". In line with that, Labov also states that speech community is a group that used language with rules and norm to interact. Labov (1972:120-1) states that 'the speech community is defined by participation in a set of shared norms which may be observe in overt type of

evaluative behavior, and in the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation in respect in particular level of usage.

In this sense, ethnographers of communication explore various ways of communicating, the situated variety in the events, acts, and situations of communicative life.

Hymes (1986:83) describes speech community as a group which share rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety. For Hymes one can participate in speech community without being a member of it. But the lines of demarcation are not fixed or universal e.g, accent, ways of speaking, grammar, etc in different communities or at different times in one community.

Gumperz (1986:83) defines a speech community as “a group that has regular and frequent interaction that is characterized by shared patterns of interactional and communication”. Both Hymes and Gumperz state that speech community can happen when the participants active to communication. So that, it can be extend the characteristic of the community for example from the accent and pattern that used by the member. To identify it, Saville-Troike (1989:63) suggests the criteria of speech community, these includes:

1. Shared language uses,
2. Frequency of interaction by a group of people,
3. Shared rules of speaking and interpretation of speech performance,
4. Shared attitudes and values regarding languages forms and use,

5. Shared socio-cultural understanding and presuppositions with regard to speech.

In order to study the communicative behavior within a speech community, it is necessary to work with units of interaction. Hymes (1972b:58-9) suggests a nested hierarchy of units called the speech situation, speech event, and speech act that would be useful.

1. Speech Event

Speech event is the happening interaction in the form of speaking that consists of parties, these are: speaker and hearer, topic of speaking, time, place and situation. The same event can happen in discussion speaking on telephone, chatting on internet and e-mail.

Hymes (1974a:52) describes speech event as “what other researchers might term genres“. Those are activities which are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech.

Speech events, on the other hand, are both communicative and governed by rules for the use of speech. A speech event takes place within a speech situation and is composed of one or more speech acts. For example, a joke might be a speech act that is part of conversation (a speech event) which takes place at a party (a speech situation). It is also possible for a speech act to be, in itself, the entire speech event which might be the only the event in a speech situation. A single invocation which is all there is to a prayer when that prayer is the only event in a rite is the example Hymes gives.

Hymes distinguishes between speech events and speech acts. He further argues that speech events occur in a non-verbal context. He refers to this non-verbal context as the speech situation. Below are the definitions of these three notions.

Speech Situation:

Context of language use such as ceremonies, fights, hunts, classrooms, conferences, parties.

Speech Events:

A speech event can be defined by a unified set of components throughout:

- 1) Same purpose of communication.
- 2) Same topic.
- 3) Same participants.
- 4) Same language variety.

2. Communicative competence

Communicative competence becomes very important for people to do an interaction within the society. It is human ability to use the language of everyday life in real situation.

Communicative competence can also indicate how people use grammatically correct sentences. Hymes (1966a) observes that speakers who could produce any and all of the grammatical sentences of a language

Communicative competence extends to both knowledge and expectation of who may or may not speak in certain settings, when to

speak and when to remain silent, to whom one may speak, how one may talk to persons of different statuses and roles, what nonverbal behaviors are appropriate in various contexts, what the routines for turn-taking are in conversation, how to ask for and give information, how to request, how to offer or decline assistance or cooperation, how to give commands, how to enforce discipline, and the like – in short, everything involving the use of language and other communicative modalities in particular social settings.

The term of communicative competence is sometimes used to describe this kind of ability. In such competence, conversational inferences play a key role: participants link the contents of an utterances and verbal, vocal and non-vocal cues with the background knowledge in order to come to an understanding about the specific interchange. Gumperz (1972:205) explains the communicative competence as follows:

Whereas *linguistic competence* covers the speaker's ability to produce grammatically correct sentences, *communicative competence* describes his ability to select, from the totality of grammatically correct expressions available to him, forms which appropriately reflect the social norms governing behavior in specific encounters.

Hymes (1972:64) proposes four criteria which are four facets of a speaker's competence in communication. they are:

1. Whether the utterance is formally possible (grammatically correct),
2. Whether the utterance is feasible (manageable in the sense of being neither too long nor too complex),
3. Whether the utterance is appropriate (whether it fits the linguistic and social context),

4. Whether the utterance is actually done (whether it is accepted regardless of unorthodox grammar or, for instance, rejected as archaic regardless of its perfect grammar).

Canale and Swain (1980:47) explain the above-mentioned Hymes' four types of communication competence in the following way. The first type, 'what is formally possible' is the interaction of grammatical system of competence, for the example: 'the was cheese green' is not grammatical. The second types, 'what is feasible' is the psycholinguistic system of competence, for the example: 'the cheese the rat the cat chased ate was green' is grammatical but not acceptable in that is multiple center-embedded clause difficult to comprehend in terms of human information processing. The third types, 'what is the social meaning or value of a given utterance' the socio-cultural system of competence, for example: if one says good-bye in greeting someone, it is inappropriate in particular social context. The last type, 'what actually occurs' is the probabilistic of occurrence that something is in fact done, actually performed.

Canale and Swain (1980:47) also classify communicative competence into grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, which they divide into sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. Grammatical competence means the acquisition of phonological rules, morphological rules, syntactic rules, semantic rules and lexical terms, they are usually called linguistic competence. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the learning of pragmatic aspect of

various speech acts, namely, the cultural values, norm, and other socio-cultural conventions in social contexts. They are the context and topic of discourse, the participants' social status, sex, age, and other actors which influence styles and register of speech. Discourse competence is the knowledge of rules regarding the cohesion (grammatical links) and coherence appropriate combination communicative functions) of various types of discourse. Strategic competence is to do with knowledge of verbal and non-verbal strategies to compensate for breakdowns such as self-correction and at the same time to enhance the effectiveness of communication such as recognizing discourse structure, activating background knowledge, contextual guessing, and tolerating ambiguity.

Communication competence is necessary when people want to discuss an oral conversation. Communication is the exchange and the negotiation of information between at least two individuals through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, oral and written form, production and comprehensive processes. In oral communication, the knowledge of the language rules and the vocabulary are the basic possibility to communicate. In other words, they should have communicative competence of the language we use. Hymes in Paltridge (2000 : 67) argues that there are eight components qualifying people's communicative competence. Those are setting, participant, ends, act, key, instrumentalities, norms, and genre.

The goal of ethnography of communication is to study communicative competence of a specific speech community by discovering and analyzing of communication that organize the use of language in particular communicative activities.

The communicative units frequently used in ethnographic studies (Hymes, 1972 :369) are situation, event, and act :

1. The communicative situation is the context within which communication occurs. For examples includes a religion service, a court trial, a holiday party, an auction, a train ride, or a class on school. The situation may remains the same even with a change of location, as when a committee meeting or court trial reconvenes in different setting, or it may changes in the same location if very different activities go on there at different times. The same room in university building may successively serves at the site of a lecture, committee meeting, or a play practice, and a family dwelling may provide the venue for a holiday party. A single situation maintains a consistent general configuration of activities, the same overall ecology within which communication takes place, although there may be diversity in the kinds of interaction which occur there.
2. The communicative event is the basic unit for descriptive purpose. A single event is defined by unified set of components throughout, beginning with the same general purpose of communication, the same general topic, and involving the same participants, generally using the

same language variety, maintaining the same tone or key, and using the same rules for interaction, in the same setting. An event terminates whenever there is a change in the major participants, their, role relationships, or the focus of attention. In the context of a communicative event, even silence may be an intentional and conventional communicative act used to question, promise, deny, warn, insult, request, or command (Tannen & Saville-Troike, 198 :37).

3. The communicative act is generally coterminous with a single interactional function, such as : a referential statement, a request, or command, and may be either verbal or non verbal. The term communicative competence is sometimes used to describe this kind of ability. In such competence, conversational inferences play a key role that participants link the content of an utterance an verbal, vocal and non- vocal cues with background knowledge in order to come to an understanding about the specific interchange.

The explanation of communicative competence is important when people make conversation each other in their societies. The using of communicative units can make good conversation, so the communication will functioned well which directly related to the participant purposes and needs.

2.3 Ethnography of Communication

Ethnography is the study of social interactions, behavior, and perceptions that occur within groups, teams, organizations, and communities. Its roots can be traced back to anthropological studies of small, rural (and often remote) societies that were undertaken in the early 1900s and applied to a variety of urban settings in their studies of social life.

An ethnographic approach provides an analysis of language as one part of a complex pattern of actions and beliefs that give meaning to people lives. Consistent to this assumption, our sample analysis does not only focus on questions within different types of debate, but also goals, settings, participants, and other acts that constitute the speech events.

Ethnography of communication is the method of discourse analysis in linguistics, which draws on the anthropological field of ethnography. It takes both language and culture to be constitutive as well constructive. The ethnography of communication explores how and why language is used, and how its use varies in different cultures. The ethnography of communication is an approach to discourse that studies communicative competence. It does so by discovering and analyzing the patterns (structure) and functions of communicating that organize the use of language (in speech situations, events, and acts) in the conduct of social life.

Ethnography of communication is most concerned with the function of language at a societal level, such as its function in creating or reinforcing boundaries which unify members of one speech community while excluding outsiders from intergroup communication

The aim of the ethnography of communication is to explore the means of speaking available to members of particular community. This includes the examination of formal, informal, and ritual events within a particular group of speakers. It also explores language use in particular social and cultural settings, drawing together both anthropological and linguistic views on communication. This examination includes the varieties of language used within the community as well as the speech act and genre available to the members of the community.

“the ethnography of communication examines speech events within the social and cultural context in which they occur and in particular examines patterns of language used in specific group, community, institution, and societies. A particular feature of ethnography of communication is that it has been discourse-centred since inception.” (Sherzen in Paltridge, 2000:61).

Ethnography of communication can be used as a means by which to study the interactions among members of various cultures: being able to discern which communication acts and/or codes are important to different groups, what the types of meanings groups apply to different communication events, and how group members learn these codes providing insight to particular communities.

Hymes (2000:p.312) suggests that “cultures communicate in different ways, but all forms of communication require a shared code,

communicators who know and use the code, a channel, a setting, a message form, a topic, and an event created by transmission of the message ”

The intrinsic relationship of language and culture is widely recognized, and the ways in which system the patterning of communicative behavior and that of other cultural system interrelate are interest both to the description of general theories of communication and to description and analysis of communication within specific speech communities. Hymes’s “SPEAKING“ formula is a very necessary remainder that talking is a complex activity, and that any part of talk is a piece of skilled.

2.4 Ethnography of Communication (SPEAKING)

Hymes creates a framework which is intended to be used to look at any naturally occurring speech to discover the rules for speaking (modes of speaking, topics message forms within particular settings and activities). Hymes (1972a, b:55-57). Hymes uses the word SPEAKING as an acronym for the various factors that he deems to be relevant. The key elements of Hymes’ speaking grids are stated as follows:

1. The setting and scene (S) of speech are important. Setting (physical circumstances) refers to the time and place, e.g. the concrete physical circumstances in which speech takes place. Scene (subjective definition of an occasion) refers to the abstract psychological setting, or the cultural definition of the occasion. It may refer to the

psychological setting, or the cultural definition of the social situation. The important aspects of setting are the time and place in which people interact and their influence on the kind of communication that may occur - or whether communication is permitted at all. In institutionalized settings, such as a church, home, café, office, classroom, the effect on language use is clear enough. But in many everyday social situations, and especially in foreign cultures, the relationship between setting and language can be very difficult to discover. In different times and places the quality and quantity of the language we use will be subject to social evaluation and sanction. The extent to which people recognize submit to, or defy these sanctions is an important factoring any study of contextual identity.

2. The participants (P) refer to the actors in the scene and their role relationship, including personal characteristics, such as: age, sex, social status, and relationship. The participants include various combinations of speaker-hearer, addresser-addressee, or sender-receiver. It generally fills certain socially specified roles. It generally fills certain socially specified roles. A two person conversation involves a speakers and listener whose roles change. For instance a political speech involves an addressor and addressee (audience), a telephone speech involves sender and receiver and etc.
3. Ends (E) (purpose/goal/outcomes) refer to the conventionally recognized and expected outcomes of an exchange as well as to the

personal goals. That participant seeks to accomplish on particular occasion. A trial in courtroom has a recognizable social end in view, but the various participant, i.e., the judge, jury, prosecution, defend, accused and witnesses, have different goals. Likewise, a marriage ceremony serves a certain social end, but each of the various participants may have his or her own unique goals in getting married or seeing a particular couple married.

4. Act sequence (A) (message form and content) refers to the actual form and content of what is said: the precise word used, how they are used, and the relationship of what is said to the actual topic at hand.
5. Key (K) refers to the tone, manner, or spirit in which a particular message is conveyed: light-hearted, serious, mocking, sarcastic, etc. The key may also be marked nonverbally by certain kinds of behavior, gestures, postures, or even department.
6. Instrumentalities (I) refer to the choice of particular channel, e.g. oral, written, or telegraphic, and to the actual forms of speech drawn from community repertoire, such as: the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen. Formal, written. Legal language is one of instrumentality.
7. Norms of interaction and interpretation (N) refer to the specific behavior and proprieties that attach to speaking and also to how this may be viewed by someone who doesn't share them, e.g. loudness, silence, gaze return, etc.

8. Genre (G) (textual categories) refers to the clearly demarcated types of utterance, such as: poems, proverbs, riddles, sermons, prayers, lectures, and editorials, the cultural category of thought (e.g. in such, complements, apologies).

2.5 A Presidential Debate

Debate (North American English) or debating (British English) is a formal method of interactive and position representational argument. Debate is a broader form of argument than logical argument since it includes persuasion which appeals to the emotional responses of an audience, and rules enabling people to discuss and decide on differences, within a framework defining how they will interact. In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, (Hornby, 1995:299) debate is defined as a formal argument or discussion of a question, e.g. at a public meeting or in parliament or congress, with two or more opposing speakers, and often ending with a vote. He also defines it as argument or discussion general.

Informal debate is a common occurrence, but the quality and depth of a debate improves with knowledge and skill of its participants as debaters. Even though debate is basically an act to convince someone else of our argument or opinion, there are some kinds of debate. Each of this has its own characteristics. There are 19 kinds of debate. Those are: Formal Debate in Education, Parliamentary Debate, Mace Debate, Public

Debate, Australian Debate, Asian University Debating Championship, Paris Style Debating, Policy Debating, Classical Debate, Extemporaneous Debate, Lincoln- Douglas Debate, Karl Popper Debate, Simulated Legislature, Impromptu Debate, Moot Court and Mock Trial, Public Forum Debate, Online Debating, U.S Presidential debate, and Comedy Debate. (source: Wikipedia.com)

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD

In conducting this study, it is important for the researcher to determine the research method that used. This method includes: research design, unit of analysis, source of data, technique of data collection, and technique of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

In this study, the researcher used qualitative descriptive method. Isaac and Michael (1987:42) state that: “The purpose of descriptive method is to describe systematically situation or area of interest factually and accurately”. The researcher used descriptive qualitative method because this research cannot be counted by the numbers but it is only based on the quality of the presidential debate. Then, this research is not to compare and identify relations between two variables or more.

This research used qualitative descriptive method which is aimed at finding out the elements of ethnography of communication and also describing all aspects that found in the Presidential Debate between President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney.

3.2 Unit of analysis

Unit of analysis in this research is every utterance produced by the participants in the presidential debate particularly President Barack

Obama, Governor Mitt Romney, and Jim Lehrer (as a moderator). The utterances can also differentiate meaning of language that is used in society.

3.3 Source of Data

The data of this research are utterances. The data were transcript and video of Jim Lehrer (as a moderator), President Barack Obama, and Governor Mitt Romney in first presidential debate 2012. The researcher used not only transcript but also video as the data in this research in order to get the real information and situation in the presidential debate. It is hoped that the video and transcript support this study well.

3.4 Techniques of Data Collection

The data of this study were obtained by doing the following steps.

1. Searching for the transcript and video.

In this step, the researcher collected the data from the websites: <http://debates.org/index.php?page=october-3-2012-debate-transcript> and <http://edition.cnn.com/election/2012/debates/first-presidential-debate>

2. Downloading the data.

In this step, the researcher downloaded the data to find out the real video of the first presidential debate that used to be analyzed.

3.5 Techniques of Data Analysis

The steps in analyzing the data are as follows:

1. Analyzing the data to find out the elements of ethnography of communication in the First Presidential Debate between Governor Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama.
2. Classifying the elements of the ethnography of communication which occur in the debate.
3. Interpreting the data.
4. Drawing conclusion

The researcher drew the conclusion based on the analysis of data.

CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter covers the data analysis of the elements of ethnography of communication proposes Hymes’ speaking grids (1972a, 55-57). They are: setting and scene, participant, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms, genre in first of the 2012 presidential debate between President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney, dated October 3, 2012. Detailed finding and discussion of each elements of ethnography of communication are presented in the following sections.

4.1 Findings

Table 4.1 shows the findings of Ethnography of Communication in the first Presidential debate between President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney. The theory of Ethnography of Communication used belongs to Hymes (1972a, 55-57).

Table 4.1 the elements of Ethnography of Communication used in the first presidential debate between President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney.

Elements of Ethnography of Communication	Description	Turn
Setting and scene	<p>Setting of time: dated on October 3, 2012. In the Evening at 9.00p.m-10.30p.m Eastern Time</p> <p>Setting of Place: in the Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado.</p> <p>Scene of debate: the situation in the debate is serious and quite.</p>	1
Participants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jim Lehrer as a moderator 2. President Barack Obama as a president 	1

	<p>candidate from Democratic Party</p> <p>3. Governor Mitt Romney as a president candidate from Republican Party</p>	
Ends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ends of the presidential debate is to discuss on differences about domestic issues in United States between the candidates. • The ends of Jim Lehrer in the debate is to give topic discussion (how to create new job, to tackle the deficit problem, in social security, in Health Care, in the Role of Government and in the governing) and control the debate (control the time management in the debate) • The end of President Barack Obama in the debate is to explain his mission and give argumentation in domestic policy particularly in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing to people in the United States. • The end of Governor Mitt Romney in the debate is to explain his mission and give argumentation in domestic policy particularly in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing to people in the United States. 	<p>1</p> <p>1, 52, 99, 168, 198, 226</p> <p>2, 57, 102, 171, 201, 231</p> <p>4, 53, 114, 118, 169, 203, 229</p>
Act Sequences	<p>1. Opening stage: The opening stage can be shown in the beginning of the debate when Jim Lehrer (moderator) greeted to the people in the entire world especially in United States.</p>	1

	<p>2. Middle stage: The middle stage is shown from the discussion among Jim Lehrer (moderator), President Barack Obama (first candidate) and Mitt Romney (second candidate). The discussion about domestic issue in United States, specifically in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing. It starts from the economy, divided into three segments, such as to create new jobs, to tackling deficit problem and to Social Security, and the other segment each in one segment.</p> <p>3. Closing stage: The closing stage is known when Jim Lehrer said thank you to both candidates and everybody who has joined in the first of the 2012 presidential debate.</p>	<p>1,2,4; 52,53,57; 99,102, 114,118; 168,169,171; 198,201,203; 226, 292,231</p> <p>236</p>
Key	The key of the presidential debate is serious, but occasionally, the participants make jokes and laugh.	53, 168, 231
Instrumentalities	<p>The instrument of this presidential debate is spoken text.</p> <p>Turn taking</p> <p>Standard grammar</p> <p>Filler</p> <p>Reparation</p> <p>Repetition</p> <p>Colloquialisms</p> <p>Incomplete clause</p> <p>Closing statement</p>	<p>1</p> <p>100-102</p> <p>2</p> <p>99-100</p> <p>235</p> <p>127-130</p> <p>17-18</p> <p>88-90</p> <p>233,235</p>
Norms	The speakers use positive politeness, because there is social status difference between them.	74-76, 138-140.
Genre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition Motion 	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas Development 	1, 52, 99, 168, 198, 226
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebuttal 	106-111
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linguistic features: 	
	The use of question and answer	63-66
	The use of present tense	210,211
	The use of future tense	22
	The use of Past tense	2
	The use of Modal Verbs	53
	The use of Hedging Utterances	211, 233, 55, 10, 26, 233

4.2 Elements of Ethnography of Communication

The elements of Ethnography of Communication consist of Setting and scene, Participants, Ends, Act sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms, and Genre.

4.2.1 Setting and Scene

Setting refers to the time and place, the concrete physical circumstances in which speech takes place. Setting of time in this analysis is at night. The setting of time can be seen in the opening of the debate, reported by Jim Lehrer from PBS News Hour. It can be shown in the utterance below:

Turn speaker utterance

1 Lehrer **“Good evening from the Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. I’m Jim Lehrer of the "PBS NewsHour," and I welcome you to the**

first of the 2012 presidential debates between President Barack Obama, the Democratic nominee, and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee. ...”

Based on the utterance above, the researcher can see that the debate occurred at night. It can be seen when Jim Lehrer says ‘good evening’ in the beginning of his opening. The time signal also mentioned at U.S. presidential schedule from commission on presidential debate shows that it was held accurately on October 3, 2012 at 9.00p.m-10.30p.m Eastern Time.

Regarding to the setting of place of the debate, it happened in Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. It is appropriate with what Jim Lehrer says in the opening of the debate.

Scene refers to the abstract psychological setting or the cultural definition of occasion. Scene in this debate is the situation that only focuses on the situation in the debate. The situation in the debate is serious and quiet. It is because the candidate needed quiet situation to concentrate in delivering their mission in domestic policy, so that the purpose of their plans can be received by people in America clearly. It can be shown in the utterance below:

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	“... The audience here in the hall has promised to remain silent. No cheers, applause, boos, hisses — among other noisy distracting things — so we may all concentrate on what the candidates have to say. There is a noise exception right now, though, as we welcome President Obama and Governor Romney. (Cheers, applause.) ...”

4.2.2 Participant

Participant refers to the actors in the scene and their role relationships, including personal characteristics, such as: age, sex, social status, and relationship. The participant includes various combination of speaker-hearer, addresser-addressee or sender-receiver. It generally fills certain social specified roles. The participants in the debate are Jim Lehrer (the moderator), President Barack Obama (the president candidate from Democratic Party), and Governor Mitt Romney (the president candidate from Republican Party). The participants of the debate can be seen in the utterance below:

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	“Good evening from the Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. I'm Jim Lehrer of the "PBS NewsHour," and I welcome you to the first of the 2012 presidential debates between President Barack Obama, the Democratic nominee, and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee. ... ”

4.2.2.1 Jim Lehrer

Jim Lehrer, 79 years old, is a moderator in the first presidential debate of 2012. He is the reporter of PBS NewsHour and also a moderator in the debate. His role in the debate is to give topic questions and to control the debate. The relationship between Lehrer and the candidates is not intimate. He has higher status than the candidate in the debate, because he can interrupt and stop the candidate when the time in debating is up. In moderating, he uses formal language to give questions and switches the turn of speaker to Barack Obama and Mitt Romney as the candidates. As the moderator in the debate, he wants to know

the notion of Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in domestic policy specifically in economy, health care, the role of government and governing clearly. Jim Lehrer is very dominant in giving topic discussion in the debate, because he tries to get more information about missions of both candidates. He also wants to convey the messages of their missions in the debate to the people in the world especially in the U.S.

4.2.2.2 President Barack Obama

President Barack Obama, 52 years old, is a president candidate from Democratic Party. He served as president of United States in the previous period. In this debate, Obama becomes the first debate candidate. He came in the presidential debate to deliver his mission in domestic policy in U.S., and to respond the argumentation from another candidate. His relationship with the other participants is not intimate. In the debate, Obama as a president and the partner of debate is a governor that has the same status in this debate. Obama uses formal language in giving argumentation to the moderator and the other candidate to respect each other. As a candidate, Obama has to give an argumentation very clearly to the other candidate and even people in the whole U.S.

4.2.2.3 Governor Mitt Romney

Governor Mitt Romney, 65 years old, is a president candidate from Republican Party. He looks really excited in the debate. In this debate, Romney becomes the second debate candidate. He came in the presidential debate to deliver his mission in domestic policy in U.S., and to respond the argumentation from another candidate. His relationship with the other participants in the debate

is not intimate. In this debate, Romney and Obama have the same status as the president candidates. In giving argumentation, Romney always uses formal language. The social statuses among the participant of the debate can be seen in the following excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterances
58	Lehrer	“Mr. President, I’m sorry —”
59	Obama	“And that is not a right strategy for us to move forward.”
60	Lehrer	“Way over the two minutes.”
61	Obama	“Sorry.”

From, the utterances above, it can be seen that Lehrer has a high social status than both candidates. He can interrupt and stop Obama, because the two minutes of Obama to respond the discussion has finished. So that, Lehrer interrupted and stopped Obama in giving argumentation

4.2.3 Ends

Ends (purposes/goal/outcomes) refer to the conventionally recognized and expected outcomes of an exchange as well as to the personal goals that participants seek to accomplish on particular occasion. In this research, Ends involve the end of the debate, Jim Lehrer (the moderator), President Barack Obama (the president candidate from Democratic party), and Governor Mitt Romney (the president candidate from Republican party).

4.2.3.1 The end of the Presidential Debate

The debate aims to discuss on differences about domestic issues in United States between the candidates. It is very important for people in U.S who want to know about vision and mission that will be carried of both candidate. The candidates delivered their plan about domestic policy particularly in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing. So, people in America have a view about their own candidate and their plans. It can be seen from Lehrer's utterance:

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	"... Tonight's 90 minutes will be about ' domestic issues ', and will follow a format designed by the commission. There will be six roughly 15-minute segments, with two-minute answers for the first question, then open discussion for the remainder of each segment"

4.2.3.2 The end of Jim Lehrer (the moderator)

Jim Lehrer has aim to give topic discussion and control the debate. He gives topic discussion about domestic issues in the U.S especially in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing. He asks the candidate to tell their plans specifically. It can be seen from this utterance below:

Segment 1		
Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	"... Let's start the economy, segment one. And let's begin with jobs. What are the major differences between the two of you about how you would go about creating new jobs? You have two minutes — each of you have two minutes to start. The coin toss has determined, Mr. President, you go first."

In this segment, Jim asked about both candidates' plans on how to create new jobs in America. Jim wanted to know what different views the candidates had.

Segment 2

Turn	speaker	utterance
52	Lehrer	“All right. Let's talk — we're still on the economy. This is, theoretically now, a second segment still on the economy, and specifically on what do about the federal deficit, the federal debt. And the question — you each have two minutes on this — and, Governor Romney you go first because the president went first on segment one. And the question is this: What are the differences between the two of you as to how you would go about tackling the deficit problem in this country? ”

Segment two of the debate is still on economy issue, but on different topic. Jim asked both candidates to explain their plans about how to tackle the deficit problem in America. The main is in federal deficit and federal debt in America.

Segment 3

Turn	speaker	utterance
99	Lehrer	“All right? All right, this is this is segment three, the economy, entitlements. First answer goes to you. It's two minutes. Mr. President, do you see a major difference between the two of you on Social Security? ”

Segment three is also still on economy, but has different segment subject, in this segment Jim wants to know a major difference in both candidates' view in Social Security problem, because it is not only the problem for future seniors retirees, but also for young people in America.

Segment 4

Turn speaker utterance

168 Lehrer “All right, I think we have another clear difference between the two of you. Now let's move to health care, where I know there is a clear difference — (laughter) — and that has to do with the Affordable Care Act, "Obamacare." And it's a two-minute new segment, and it's — that means two minutes each. And you go first, Governor Romney. You wanted repeal. **You want the Affordable Care Act repealed. Why?**”

Segment four is about health care. It talks about Affordable Care Act “Obamacare”. Jim asked Governor Romney about this program, because he knows that Romney wanted to repeal it, and he also asked Obama’s argument about the reason of Romney’s plan.

Segment 5

Turn speaker utterance

198 Lehrer “That is a terrific segue to our next segment, and is the role of government. And let's see, role of government and it is — you are first on this, Mr. President. The question is this. Do you believe — both of you — but you have the first two minutes on this, Mr. President — **do you believe there's a fundamental difference between the two of you as to how you view the mission of the federal government?**”

Segment five talks about the candidates’ missions of the federal government, specifically in their view of the responsibility of federal government to improve the quality of public education in America.

Segment 6

Turn speaker utterances

226 Lehrer “Oh, well, no. But the fact is, government — the role of government and governing, we've lost a (pod ?), in other words, so we only have three minutes left in the — in the debate before we go to your closing statements. And so I want to ask finally here — and remember, we've got three minutes total time here. And the question is this: Many of the legislative functions of the federal government right now are in a state of paralysis as a result of partisan gridlock. **If elected in your case, if re-elected in your case, what would you do about that?** Governor?”

228 Lehrer “**Well, what would you do as a president?**”

In last segment, Jim asked both candidates about what they would do if they were elected as a president, from the first day.

Jim as a moderator also plays role to give turn in the debate by choosing who was telling the plans first in every segment. Besides that, he also stopped the speaker when the time to speak is up. The example can be seen from this utterance below:

Turn speaker utterance

1 Lehrer “... **Let's start the economy, segment one.** And let's begin with jobs. What are the major differences between the two of you about how you would go about creating new jobs? **You have two minutes — each of you have two minutes to start. The coin toss has determined, Mr. President, you go first.**”

From the utterance above, the researcher can see that Lehrer as a moderator starts by giving topic of discussion to the candidate in the first segment. He also decided who was starting to tell the plans in every segment.

Besides that, Lehrer also plays role to organize the time in the debate, when the candidate must start and finish the discussion. It can be seen in the utterances below:

Turn	speaker	utterances
172	Lehrer	Two minutes —
173	Obama	— before —
174	Lehrer	Two minutes is up, sir.

4.2.3.3 The end of President Barack Obama

In the debate, Barack Obama as the first president candidate from democratic party has aim to explain his mission and give argumentation in domestic policy particularly in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing to people in the United States. It can be shown in his utterance below:

Segment 1

Turn	speaker	utterance
2	Obama	“... I've got a different view. I think we've got to invest in education and training. I think it's important for us to develop new sources of energy here in America, that we change our tax code to make sure that we're helping small businesses and companies that are investing here in the United States, that we take some of the money that we're saving as we wind down two wars to rebuild America and that we reduce our deficit in a balanced way that allows us to make these critical investments...”

From that utterance, Obama tells his plans in economy segment about creating new jobs in America. His first plan is to invest in education and training. For this plan, Obama has a program named Race to the Top that has prompted reform in 46 states around the country. This program is to raise standards, and

improving how to train teachers. The purpose of this program is to train people in Unites States in order to get a job. His second plan is to develop new sources of energy production in America. He wants to make the investment to the wind, solar, and biofuel. Third, is to change the tax code and help small business. It is because he realized that the tax rate in United States is too high, so that he wants to lower it with taking down to 25% and provide tax break for companies that want to invest in America. He also wants to balance budget by reducing the deficit.

Segment 2

Turn speaker utterance

57 Obama “... Now, we all know that we've got to do more. And so **I've put forward a specific \$4 trillion deficit-reduction plan.** It's on a website. You can look at all the numbers, what cuts we make and what revenue we raise. And the way we do it is \$2.50 for every cut, we ask for a dollar of additional revenue, paid for, as I indicated earlier, by asking those of us who have done very well in this country to contribute a little bit more to reduce the deficit. ...”

Segment 2 is still on economy, about tackle the deficit problem in America. Obama explained that he wanted to reduce the deficit specifically \$4 trillion by cut \$2.50 and a dollar of additional from the revenue. It is to contribute little bit more to reduce the deficit. In this segment, Obama also gives argument perceived from Romney’s plan that he won’t give tax breaks that in shipping jobs overseas, whereas that all raised revenue. He has a plan to help young people in America in order to make sure that they can afford to go to college. Education is

very important. He also asked Romney to give specific number of average to reduce deficit.

Segment 3

Turn speaker utterance

102 Obama “... So my approach is to say, how do we strengthen the system over the long term? And in Medicare, what we did was we said, we are going to have to bring down the costs if we're going to deal with our long- term deficits, but to do that, let's look where some of the money is going. **Seven hundred and sixteen billion dollars we were able to save from the Medicare program by no longer overpaying insurance companies, by making sure that we weren't overpaying providers.**

And using that money, we were actually able to lower prescription drug costs for seniors by an average of \$600, and we were also able to make a — make a significant dent in providing them the kind of preventive care that will ultimately save money through the — throughout the system. ...”

In segment three, Obama wanted to criticize about the values behind social security and also Medicare, because it is very important to deficit in America. His plan is to strengthen the system. He didn't need a major structural change in future Social Security.

In Medicare, America can save seven hundred and sixteen billion dollars. The way is to not extend this program to insurance companies. He wanted to use that money to lower the prescription drug costs for seniors. He also wanted to provide them the kind of preventive care, and it can save money throughout the system. The principle to deal with Medicare is to lower health care costs.

Segment 4

Turn speaker utterance

171 Obama “... And let me tell you exactly what "Obamacare" did. **Number one, if you've got health insurance it doesn't mean a government take over.** You keep your own insurance. You keep your own doctor. But it does say insurance companies can't jerk you around. They can't impose arbitrary lifetime limits. They have to let you keep your kid on their insurance — your insurance plan till you're 26 years old. And it also says that they're — you're going to have to get rebates if insurance companies are spending more on administrative costs and profits than they are on actual care.

Number two, if you don't have health insurance, we're essentially setting up a group plan that allows you to benefit from group rates that are typically 18 percent lower than if you're out there trying to get insurance on the individual market.

Segment four, Obama explains how Obamacare works, because in the turn before, Romney's plan is to repeal Obamacare. First, if people have their own health insurance it doesn't mean that government takes over their insurance. They can keep in their own insurance and the doctor, but the insurance companies must keep for them and their kids until 26 years old. They also should get rebates if insurance companies are spending more on administrative costs and profits than actual care. Second, if people don't have health insurance, government will set up a group plan that allows people to get benefit around 18% lower than if they try to get insurance themselves.

The fact is that when “Obamacare” is repealed, 50 million people are losing health care insurance at vitally important, but when it is fully implemented, people can see the progress that the costs are going down.

Segment 5

Turn speaker utterance

201 Obama **“The first role of the federal government is to keep the American people safe. That's its most basic function.** And as commander in chief, that is something that I've worked on and thought about every single day that I've been in the Oval Office.

But I also believe that government has the capacity — the federal government has the capacity to help open up opportunity and create ladders of opportunity and to create frameworks where the American people can succeed. Look, the genius of America is the free enterprise system, and freedom, and the fact that people can go out there and start a business, work on an idea, make their own decisions. ...”

In this segment, Obama responds the question about the role of government. He tells that the main function of federal government is to keep American people safe. He also believed that federal government has a responsibility to help open up opportunity and create ladders of opportunity and to create frameworks to make American people successful. As a president he has tried to apply the principles, and when it comes to education, he has a plan named Race to the Top that will reform schools in 46 states around the country. He also wanted to hire another hundred thousand math and science teachers to make sure that the government supplied the people with skilled workforce are able to success. He takes it, because he thinks that it is the kind of investment if federal government can help.

Segment 6

Turn speaker utterance

231 Obama “Well, first of all, I think Governor Romney's going to have a busy first day, because he's also going to repeal "Obamacare," which will not be very popular among Democrats as you're sitting down with them.

(Laughter.)

But look, my philosophy has been I will take ideas from anybody, Democrat or Republican, as long as they're advancing the cause of making middle-class families stronger and giving ladders of opportunity into the middle class. That's how we cut taxes for middle-class families and small businesses. That's how we cut a trillion dollars of spending that wasn't advancing that cause. That's how we signed three trade deals into law that are helping us to double our exports and sell more American products around the world. ...”

In the last segment, it talked about what the president will do if they are elected starting from the first day. Obama responded that question by giving argument to make middle-class families stronger and giving ladder of opportunity by giving them cut taxes and also to small businesses which works in export and sell American product around the world. The other opinion in this segment is to fight for the security in health insurance that is needed by people in America.

In contrast with Obama’s plans, Romney as the second candidate has a different view in domestic policy. He will explain his mission specifically.

4.2.3.4 The end of Governor Romney

In the debate, Romney as the second president candidate from republican party aims to explain his mission and give argumentation in domestic policy

particularly in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing to people in the United States. It can be shown in his utterance below:

Segment 1

Turn speaker utterance

- 4 Romney **“...My plan has five basic parts. One, get us energy independent, North American energy independent. That creates about four million jobs. Number two, open up more trade, particularly in Latin America; crack down on China if and when they cheat. Number three, make sure our people have the skills they need to succeed and the best schools in the world. We're far away from that now. Number four, get us to a balanced budget. Number five, champion small business. ...”**

In the first segment, about how to create new jobs in America, Romney has five basic parts for his plans. His plan is to reduce the tax in middle-class, but not on high-income people, because he thinks that the middle-income have been buried under president's policies. So that, how to get them going again, first by making America energy independent. Contrary to Obama, who increases the natural gas and oil in private land, Romney will give double permit and license in government land to get oil from offshore and Alaska. He also wanted to continue to burn clean coal, so that America and North America become energy independent and can create those as a land for jobs. Second, is to open up more trade especially in small business. He wanted to cut taxes to make sure that small business can hire worker more.

Third, to make sure people in America have the skills to be successful and go to the best schools in the world, but he has a different view with Obama, he prefers to get the dollar from training program to the worker, so they can create

their own pathways to get training that they need for jobs. Forth, his plan is to balance budget. He wanted to bring down rates, lower deduction, exemption, and credits at the same time, to create more jobs, so that he can keep getting the revenue that he needs. The last is to champion in small business, his plan is to open up greater opportunities for business people who will go their business in America.

Segment 2

Turn speaker utterance

53 Romney “... So how do we deal with it? Well, mathematically there are — **there are three ways that you can cut a deficit. One, of course, is to raise taxes. Number two is to cut spending. And number three is to grow the economy** because if more people work in a growing economy they're paying taxes and you can get the job done that way. ...”

In segment 2, Romney responds about how to tackle the deficit problem in America by three ways plans. One is to raise taxes. He has a different view with Obama, who prefer raising taxes. In Romney's opinion, raising taxes can slow down the rate of growth, so he wanted to lower spending and encourage economy growth at the same time. Next, he will spend the cut, he doesn't want to borrow money from China again to pay the government's program that not efficient. He will make good program that can run more efficiently. The last is to grow the economy. He will make government more efficient by cutting back the number of employees, and combine some agencies and department.

Segment 3

Turn	speaker	utterance
114	Romney	“What I support is no change for current retirees and near-retirees to Medicare and the president supports taking \$716 billion out of that program.”
118	Romney	“Number two is for people coming along that are young. What I'd do to make sure that we can keep Medicare in place for them is to allow them either to choose the current Medicare program or a private plan — their choice. They get to — and they'll have at least two plans that will be entirely at no cost to them. So they don't have to pay additional money, no additional \$6,000. That's not going to happen. They'll have at least two plans. ...”

Segment three is still on economy, but has a different segment subject. It discusses about Social Security. Romney responds Obama's statement that it will take \$716 billion out of Medicare program. Contrary to his opinion, Romney supported no change in Medicare for current retiree and near-retirees, and for young people he also wanted to keep in Medicare for them and they can choose the current Medicare and private plan. They will have at least two plans that will be entirely at no costs to them. So they don't have to pay \$6000 for additional money. From his experience private sector can be more efficient than government, and he suggests people to have a private plan, because they can get rid of the insurance company when people don't like them and find the other insurance companies. And to save Medicare his plan is to cross-subsidy from high-income to lower-income, so that the lower-income can get the benefits.

Segment 4

Turn speaker utterance

169 Romney “... And unfortunately, when — when you look at "Obamacare," **the Congressional Budget Office has said it will cost \$2,500 a year more than traditional insurance. So it's adding to cost.** And as a matter of fact, when the president ran for office, he said that by this year he would have brought down the cost of insurance for each family by \$2,500 a family. Instead, it's gone up by that amount. **So it's expensive. Expensive things hurt families. So that's one reason I don't want it.**

Second reason, it cuts \$716 billion from Medicare to pay for it. I want to put that money back in Medicare for our seniors.

Number three, it puts in place an unelected board that's going to tell people, ultimately, what kind of treatments they can have. I don't like that idea.

Fourth, there was a survey done of small businesses across the country. ...”

Segment four talks about health care, especially in Affordable Care Act “Obamacare”. When the question comes to Romney, his plan is to repeal it. He has a different view with Obama, because in his view, “Obamacare” will spend costs \$2500 a year more than traditional insurance, it is very expensive for each family, and he doesn’t agree with that plan. Second reason is because Obama wants to take \$716 billion from Medicare to pay it, and his plan is to put back that money in Medicare for the senior. He also does not agree if that money is put in an unelected board to know what kind of treatment that people can have, and he doesn’t want the president to fight the “Obamacare” whereas 23 million people in America out of work and economic crisis.

Segment 5

Turn	speaker	utterance
203	Romney	<p>“... The role of government is to promote and protect the principles of those documents. First, life and liberty. We have a responsibility to protect the lives and liberties of our people, and that means the military, second to none. I do not believe in cutting our military. I believe in maintaining the strength of America's military.</p> <p>Second, in that line that says, we are endowed by our Creator with our rights — I believe we must maintain our commitment to religious tolerance and freedom in this country. ...”</p>

In segment five about the role of government, due to “the Constitutional and the Declaration of Independence”, the role of government is one, life and liberty. The government has a responsibility to protect the liberties of people in America, particularly in military, therefore Romney doesn’t want to cut the budget in order to make the military in America stronger. Two, is to maintain the commitment to religious tolerance and freedom in America. People in America have a freedom to make their own happiness.

Segment 6

Turn	speaker	utterance
229	Romney	<p>“... And the challenges America faces right now — look, the reason I'm in this race is there are people that are really hurting today in this country, and we face — this deficit could crush the future generations. What's happening in the Middle East? There are developments around the world that are of real concern. And Republicans and Democrats both love America, but we need to have leadership — leadership in Washington that will actually bring people together and get the job done and could not care less if it's a Republican or a Democrat. I've done it before. I'll do it again.”</p>

The last segment is about the government and governing, and the question is what the candidate will do if elected as a president. Romney responded that his plan is to bring the people together and get the job done. He will get income up again, by helping 12 million new jobs in America with rising incomes, getting the cost health care down, and keeping America stronger and getting America middle class to work again.

4.2.4 Act sequence

Act sequence refers to the actual form and content of what is said: the precise words used, how they are used and relationship of what is said to the actual topic at hand. The presidential debate consists of three stages such as, opening stage, middle stage and closing stage.

4.2.4.1 Opening Stage

The opening stage can be shown in the beginning of the debate when Jim Lehrer (moderator) greeted the people in the entire world especially in United States. He welcomed people in the first of the 2012 presidential debate to watch the discussion between the candidates President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney from University Denver. It can be shown in this excerpt below:

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	“Good evening from the Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. I’m Jim Lehrer of the PBS NewsHour, and I welcome you to the first of the 2012 presidential debates between President Barack Obama, the Democratic nominee, and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee. ...”

4.2.4.2 Middle Stage

The middle stage is shown from the discussion among Jim Lehrer (moderator), President Barack Obama (first candidate) and Mitt Romney (second candidate). Lehrer asks the candidate to share their own mission in domestic policy, specifically in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing. It starts from the economy, divided into three segments, such as to create new jobs, to tackle deficit problem and to solve Social Security problem, and the other segment each in one segment. It can be shown in this excerpt:

Segment 1

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	Let's start the economy, segment one. And let's begin with jobs. What are the major differences between the two of you about how you would go about creating new jobs? You have two minutes — each of you have two minutes to start. The coin toss has determined, Mr. President, you go first.
2	Obama	“... I've got a different view. I think we've got to invest in education and training. I think it's important for us to develop new sources of energy here in America, that we change our tax code to make sure that we're helping small businesses and companies that are investing here in the United States, that we take some of the money that we're saving as we wind down two wars to rebuild America and that we reduce our deficit in a balanced way that allows us to make these critical investments. ...”
4	Romney	“ ... My plan has five basic parts. One, get us energy independent, North American energy independent. That creates about four million jobs. Number two, open up more trade, particularly in Latin America; crack down on China if and when they cheat. Number three, make sure our people have the skills they need to succeed and the best schools in the world. We're far away from that

now. Number four, get us to a balanced budget. Number five, champion small business. ...”

In segment one, Jim asked about both candidates’ plans how to create new jobs in America. Jim wanted to know what the differences of their plans. Obama responded by telling his plans in economy segment. His first plan is to invest in education and training. Second plan is to develop new sources of energy production in America. Third, is to change the tax code and help small business. The last, he wanted to balance budget by reducing the deficit. In contrast, Romney has five basic parts for his plans. His plan is to reduce the tax in middle-class, but not in high-income people, first by making America energy independent. Second, is to open up more trade especially in small business by cutting taxes to make sure that small business can hire worker more. Third, to make sure people in America have the skills to be successful and have the best school in the world. Forth, his plan is to balance budget. The last is to champion in small business.

Segment 2

Turn	speaker	utterances
52	Lehrer	“All right. Let's talk — we're still on the economy. This is, theoretically now, a second segment still on the economy, and specifically on what do about the federal deficit, the federal debt. And the question — you each have two minutes on this — and, Governor Romney you go first because the president went first on segment one. And the question is this: What are the differences between the two of you as to how you would go about tackling the deficit problem in this country? ”
53	Romney	“... there are three ways that you can cut a deficit. One, of course, is to raise taxes. Number two is to cut spending. And number three is to grow the economy because if more people work in a growing economy

they're paying taxes and you can get the job done that way. ...”

57 Obama “... Now, we all know that we've got to do more. And so **I've put forward a specific \$4 trillion deficit-reduction plan.** It's on a website. You can look at all the numbers, what cuts we make and what revenue we raise. ...”

In segment two, the debate is still on economy issue, but on different topic. Jim asked the candidates to explain their plans about how to tackle the deficit problem in America. The main plan is in federal deficit and federal debt in America. Romney offered a three-way plan. One is to raise taxes. It has different view with Obama, who prefers raising taxes. In Romney’s opinion, raising taxes can slow down the rate of growth, so he wanted to lower spending and encourage economy growth at the same time. Next, he will spend the cut, he didn’t want to borrow money from China again to pay the government program that not efficient he will make good program that can run more efficiently. The last is to grow the economy. He will make government more efficient by cutting back the number of employees, and combining some agencies and departments. In contrast, Obama explained that he wanted to reduce the deficit specifically \$4 trillion by cut \$2.50 and a dollar of additional from the revenue. It is to contribute a little bit more to reduce the deficit. Obama also gives argument perceive from Romney’s plan that won’t give tax breaks that in shipping jobs overseas, whereas that all raised revenue. He has a plan to help young people in America in order to make sure that they can go afford to go to college. Education is very important. He also asked Romney to give specific number of average to reduce deficit.

Segment 3

- | Turn | speaker | utterances |
|------|---------|---|
| 99 | Lehrer | <p>“All right? All right, this is this is segment three, the economy, entitlements.
First answer goes to you. It's two minutes. Mr. President, do you see a major difference between the two of you on Social Security?”</p> |
| 102 | Obama | <p>“...Seven hundred and sixteen billion dollars we were able to save from the Medicare program by no longer overpaying insurance companies, by making sure that we weren't overpaying providers.</p> <p>And using that money, we were actually able to lower prescription drug costs for seniors by an average of \$600, and we were also able to make a — make a significant dent in providing them the kind of preventive care that will ultimately save money through the — throughout the system. ...”</p> |
| 114 | Romney | <p>“What I support is no change for current retirees and near-retirees to Medicare and the president supports taking \$716 billion out of that program.”</p> |
| 118 | Romney | <p>“Number two is for people coming along that are young. What I'd do to make sure that we can keep Medicare in place for them is to allow them either to choose the current Medicare program or a private plan — their choice. They get to — and they'll have at least two plans that will be entirely at no cost to them. So they don't have to pay additional money, no additional \$6,000. That's not going to happen. They'll have at least two plans. ...”</p> |

Segment three is also still on economy, but has different segment subject, in this segment Jim wanted to know a major difference of both candidate in Social Security problem, because it is not only the problem for future seniors retirees, but also for young people in America. Obama wanted to criticize about the values behind social security and also Medicare, because it is very important to reduce deficit in America. His plan is to strengthen the system. He didn't need a major

structural change in future Social Security. Contrary to Obama's opinion, Romney supported no change in Medicare for current retiree and near-retirees, and for young people he also wanted to keep in Medicare for them and they can choose the current Medicare and private plan. He also wants to save Medicare by applying the cross-subsidy from high-income to lower-income, so that the lower-income can get the benefits.

Segment 4

Turn speaker utterances

168 Lehrer “ ...You wanted repeal. **You want the Affordable Care Act repealed. Why?**”

169 Romney “... And unfortunately, when — when you look at "Obamacare," **the Congressional Budget Office has said it will cost \$2,500 a year more than traditional insurance. So it's adding to cost.** And as a matter of fact, when the president ran for office, he said that by this year he would have brought down the cost of insurance for each family by \$2,500 a family. Instead, it's gone up by that amount. **So it's expensive. Expensive things hurt families. So that's one reason I don't want it. Second reason, it cuts \$716 billion from Medicare to pay for it. I want to put that money back in Medicare for our seniors. Number three, it puts in place an unelected board that's going to tell people, ultimately, what kind of treatments they can have. I don't like that idea. Fourth, there was a survey done of small businesses across the country. ...**”

171 Obama “ ... And let me tell you exactly what "Obamacare" did. **Number one, if you've got health insurance it doesn't mean a government take over.**

Number two, if you don't have health insurance, we're essentially setting up a group plan that allows you to benefit from group rates that are typically 18 percent lower than if you're out there trying to get insurance on the individual market. ...”

Segment four is about health care. It talks about Affordable Care Act “Obamacare”. Jim asked Governor Romney about this program, because he knows that Romney wanted to repeal it, and he also asked Obama’s argument about the reason of Romney’s plan. Romney explains his plan that he has different view with Obama, because in his view, “Obamacare” will spend costs \$2500 a year more than traditional insurance, it is very expensive for each family, and he doesn’t agrees with that plan. Second reason is because Obama wants to take \$716 billion from Medicare to pay it, and his plan is to put back that money in Medicare for the senior. He also does not agree if money is put in an unelected board to know what kind of treatment that people can have, and he doesn’t want the president to fight the “Obamacare” whereas 23 million people in America out of work and economic crisis. Obama responded by explaining how Obamacare works, because in Romney’s turn before his turn, Romney’s plans is to repeal Obamacare. First, if people have their own health insurance it doesn’t means that government’s take over their insurance. Second, if people don’t have health insurance, government will set up a group plan that allows the people to get benefit around 18% lower than if they try to get insurance themselves. The fact is that when “Obamacare” was repealed, 50 million people are losing health care insurance, but when it is fully implemented, people can see the progress that the costs are going down.

Segment 5

Turn speaker utterances

198 Lehrer “That is a terrific segue to our next segment, and is the role of government. And let's see, role of government and it is — you are first on this, Mr. President. The question is this. Do you believe — both of you — but you have the first two minutes on this, Mr. President — **do you believe there's a fundamental difference between the two of you as to how you view the mission of the federal government?**”

201 Obama “**The first role of the federal government is to keep the American people safe. That's its most basic function.** And as commander in chief, that is something that I've worked on and thought about every single day that I've been in the Oval Office.

But I also believe that government has the capacity — the federal government has the capacity to help open up opportunity and create ladders of opportunity and to create frameworks where the American people can succeed. ...”

203 Romney “... **The role of government is to promote and protect the principles of those documents. First, life and liberty. We have a responsibility to protect the lives and liberties of our people, and that means the military, second to none. I do not believe in cutting our military. I believe in maintaining the strength of America's military.**

Second, in that line that says, we are endowed by our Creator with our rights — I believe we must maintain our commitment to religious tolerance and freedom in this country. ...”

Segment five talked about the candidate's mission of the federal government, specifically in their view of the responsibility of federal government to improve the quality of public education in America. Obama tells that the main function of federal government is to keep the America people safe. He also believed that federal government has a responsibility to help open up opportunity

and create ladders of opportunity and to create frameworks to make American people success. As a president he has tried to apply the principles, and when it comes to education, he has a plan named Race to the Top that will reform the school in 46 states around the country. He also wanted to hire another hundred thousand math and science teachers to make sure that the government supplied the people with skilled are able to success. He takes it, because he thinks that is the kind of investment if federal government can help. Romney's view, the role of government is one, life and liberty. The government has a responsibility to protect and liberties of people in America. The main plan is in military, Romney won't cut budget in the military, because he wanted to make America stronger. Two, is to maintain the commitment to religious tolerance and freedom in America. People in America have a freedom to make their own happiness. As a government they should support what American people do to success.

Segment 6

Turn	speaker	utterances
226	Lehrer	“... And the question is this: Many of the legislative functions of the federal government right now are in a state of paralysis as a result of partisan gridlock. If elected in your case, if re-elected in your case, what would you do about that? ”
229	Romney	“... we need to have leadership — leadership in Washington that will actually bring people together and get the job done and could not care less if it's a Republican or a Democrat. I've done it before. I'll do it again.”
231	Obama	“ ... But look, my philosophy has been I will take ideas from anybody, Democrat or Republican, as long as

they're advancing the cause of making middle-class families stronger and giving ladders of opportunity into the middle class. That's how we cut taxes for middle-class families and small businesses. That's how we cut a trillion dollars of spending that wasn't advancing that cause. That's how we signed three trade deals into law that are helping us to double our exports and sell more American products around the world. ...”

In last segment, Jim asked both candidates about what they would do if they were elected as a president, from the first day. Romney’s plan is to bring the people together and get the job done. He will get income up again, by help 12 million new jobs in America with rising incomes, getting the cost health care down, and keep America stronger and get America middle class working again. Obama responded that question by giving argument to make middle-class families stronger and giving ladder of opportunity by giving them cut taxes and also to small businesses which works in export and sell American product around the world. The other opinion in this segment is to fight for the security in health insurance that needed by people in America.

4.2.4.3 Closing Stage

The closing stage is known when Jim Lehrer thanked to both candidates and everybody who has joined in the first of the 2012 presidential debate. Then, he informs people about the next debate of vice presidents at Center Collage in Danville. It can be shown in this excerpt below:

Turn speaker utterance

236 Lehrer **“Thank you, Governor.**

Thank you, Mr. President.

The next debate will be the vice presidential event on Thursday, October 11th at Center College in Danville, Kentucky. For now, from the University of Denver, I'm Jim Lehrer. Thank you, and good night.” (Cheers, applause.)

4.2.5 Key

Key refers to the tone, manner or spirit in which a particular message is conveyed: light-hearted, serious, mocking, sarcastic, etc. The key may also be marked nonverbally by certain kinds of behavior, gesture, posture, or event department. In the video it also can be seen that the candidates, that are Obama and Romney used some gestures. Obama moved his hands while he explained his plans. Romney frowned and furrowed his brows that it indicates he is still concentrating in what Obama talked about. In explaining his plans, Romney is slowing his intonation in order to make sure his explanation is clearly understood by other candidate. Beside that, he also repeated his speech in order to oppose what Obama told about Romney's plan. According to the explanations above, it can be concluded that the key of the debate is serious but the candidates make jokes and laughter occasionally. It can be seen from the transcript in the excerpt below:

Turn	speaker	utterance
47	Romney	“Let me — let me repeat — let me repeat what I said — (inaudible). I'm not in favor of a \$5 trillion tax cut. That's not my plan. My plan is not to put in place any tax cut that will add to the deficit. That's point one. So you may keep referring to it as a \$5 trillion tax cut, but that's not my plan.”

Based on the transcript, the candidates are really serious when they are discussing domestic issues. When discussing deficit problem, Romney is really

serious in responding this case because in his opinion, tackling the deficit problem is crucial in America. It can be seen from this excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterance
53	Lehrer	“Well, good. I'm glad you raised that. And it's a — it's a critical issue. I think it's not just an economic issue. I think it's a moral issue. I think it's, frankly, not moral for my generation to keep spending massively more than we take in, knowing those burdens are going to be passed on to the next generation. And they're going to be paying the interest and the principle all their lives. And the amount of debt we're adding, at a trillion a year, is simply not moral....”

Contrary to that situation, in the presidential debate there is also joking situation among the participants, the researcher saw that Lehrer are laughing when he talks about Obama's health care program that is named by Romney “Obamacare”. It can be seen from this excerpt below:

Turn	speaker	utterance
168	Lehrer	“All right, I think we have another clear difference between the two of you. Now let's move to health care, where I know there is a clear difference — (laughter) — and that has to do with the Affordable Care Act, "Obamacare." ... ”

The researcher also saw that Obama makes a joke to Romney about “Obamacare”, he quipped Romney because he really wanted to repeal that program. It can be seen in this excerpt below:

Turn	speaker	utterance
231	Obama	“ Well, first of all, I think Governor Romney's going to have a busy first day, because he's also going to repeal "Obamacare," which will not be very popular among Democrats as you're sitting down with them. (Laughter.) ...”

At the other segment Romney also make a joke for Obama by giving felicitation to Obama to respond the opening statement of Obama that at the day of the first debate occurred, it coincides with an anniversary of Obama and his wife Michelle Obama. It can be seen in this excerpt below:

Turn	speaker	utterance
231	Romney	“... And congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your anniversary. I'm sure this was the most romantic place you could imagine here — here with me, so I — (laughter) — congratulations. ... ”

4.2.6 Instrumentalities

Instrumentalities refer to the choice of the particular channel, e.g. oral, written, or telegraphic, and to the actual forms of speech drawn from community repertoire, such as: the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen.

The form of this discussion is a presidential debate. The presidential debate is included in spoken text. It is held in formal setting in a stage on podium. It can be seen from the situation where they used spoken language in typically serious situation. The spoken language used in the discussion can be seen from the context of the debate. In the context, Lehrer opens the debate by addressing both candidates, and giving a turn to them to start their speech with formal language. It can be seen from this excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	Gentlemen, welcome to you both. Let's start the economy, segment one. And let's begin with jobs. What are the major differences between the two of you about how you would go about creating new jobs? You have two minutes — each of you have two minutes to

start. The coin toss has determined, Mr. President, you go first.

In the presidential debate, it can also be seen that the debate has turn taking. The turn taking is the following:

Turn	speaker	utterances
100	Obama	“You know, I suspect that on Social Security, we've got a somewhat similar position. Social Security is structurally sound. It's going to have to be tweaked the way it was by Ronald Reagan and Speaker — Democratic Speaker Tip O'Neill. But it is — the basic structure is sound. But — but I want to talk about the values behind Social Security and Medicare and then talk about Medicare, because that's the big driver — “
101	Lehrer	“ Sure — it — you bet. ”
102	Obama	“ — of our deficits right now. ... ”

In the presidential debate, standard grammar is used because standard grammar is very important in a formal discussion. It can be seen from the utterance which is produced by Obama in the debate.

Turn	speaker	utterance
2	Obama	Well, thank you very much, Jim, for this opportunity. I want to thank Governor Romney and the University of Denver for your hospitality.

Another feature which indicates spoken language is spontaneity. In this debate, a lot of spontaneity phenomena are found in the debate, such as; filler, reparations, repetition, colloquialisms, incomplete clause, and closing statement. The filler can be seen from utterances among the participants. The filler is used to respond and to turn the conversation the way that they wanted it to go. It can be shown in this following excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterances
99	Lehrer	<p>“All right? All right, this is this is segment three, the economy, entitlements.</p> <p>First answer goes to you. It's two minutes. Mr. President, do you see a major difference between the two of you on Social Security?”</p>
100	Obama	<p>“You know, I suspect that on Social Security, we've got a somewhat similar position. Social Security is structurally sound. It's going to have to be tweaked the way it was by Ronald Reagan and Speaker — Democratic Speaker Tip O'Neill. But it is — the basic structure is sound. But — but I want to talk about the values behind Social Security and Medicare and then talk about Medicare, because that's the big driver —“</p>

The researcher saw that there is reparation in the debate. It is used by Romney, he repairs his utterance because he wants to make his plan clear. It can be seen in this excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterance
235	Romney	<p>“... There's no question in my mind that if the president were to be re-elected you'll continue to see a middle-class squeeze with incomes going down and prices going up. I'll get incomes up again. You'll see chronic unemployment. We've had 43 straight months with unemployment above 8 percent. If I'm president, I will create — help create 12 million new jobs in this country with rising incomes. ...”</p>

The researcher also found the repetition utterances used by Lehrer and Romney, because Romney wanted to assert that he wants to clarify the statement of Obama. It can be seen in this following excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterances
127	Romney	<p>“Let's get back to Medicare. “</p>
128	Lehrer	<p>“— before we leave the economy —“</p>

129 Romney **“Let's get back to Medicare. “**

130 Lehrer **“No, no, no, no —“**

The researcher saw the colloquialisms in used in this debate, it indicates that the data is spoken language and uses daily language. It can be seen in the utterances above:

Turn speaker utterances

17 Lehrer **“OK. Yeah, just — let's just stay on taxes for a moment.”**

18 Romney **“Yeah. Well, but — but —“**

The researcher saw the incomplete clause is used by the participant in the debate, because Romney interrupts the discussion. It can be seen in this following excerpt:

Turn speaker utterances

88 Romney **“But the — the idea that you get a break for shipping jobs overseas is simply not the case.”**

89 Lehrer **“Let's have —“**

90 Romney **“What we do have right now is a setting —“**

The researcher also found closing statement used by the participant in the debate to sum up the discussion of each candidate. It can be seen in this following excerpt:

Turn speaker utterances

233 Obama **“I've kept that promise and if you'll vote for me, then I promise I'll fight just as hard in a second term.”**

235 Romney **“...And finally, military. If the president's re-elected, you'll see dramatic cuts to our military. The secretary of defense has said these would be even devastating. I will**

not cut our commitment to our military. I will keep America strong and get America's middle class working again. Thank you, Jim. “

From the statement above, Obama sums up his discussion by promising that he will fight for America in the second term if he was elected again. While Romney sums up his discussion by giving contrary mission between his and Obama’s to people in America.

4.2.7 Norm

Norm refers to the specific behaviors and proprieties that attach to speaking and also to how these may be viewed by someone who does not share them, e.g. loudness, silence, gaze return, etc.

In the presidential debate, the participants did not know their each other’s personality. Therefore, the debate used positive politeness that is necessary for the participant in the debate, because there is different social status between them. The positive politeness becomes the most important thing in a formal conversation. It is used by the participant, because the relationships between the participants are not intimate and there is distance between the participants. So, positive politeness is required in this debate. It can be shown in the utterances below:

Turn	speaker	utterances
74	Lehrer	“ That's true, right? “
75	Romney	“ Absolutely. “
76	Obama	“ OK, so —“

In the conversation above, it can be shown that the participants respected each other by giving attention of what the moderator said to make the discussion clearly understood. It can also be seen in this following excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterances
138	Lehrer	“Can we — can the two of you agree that the voters have a choice, a clear choice between the two of you —“
139	Romney	“ Absolutely. ”
140	Obama	“ Yes. ”

From the utterances above, it can be seen that the politeness strategies are also used to seek agreement.

4.2.8 Genre

Genre refers to the clearly demarcated types of utterance. The genre of this text is debate. This genre contains of definition motion, idea development, and rebuttal.

4.2.8.1 Definition Motion

The definition motion can be shown in the beginning of the debate when Jim Lehrer (moderator) gives a topic discussion to the candidates about domestic issues in the U.S.

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	“... Tonight's 90 minutes will be about domestic issues , and will follow a format designed by the commission. There will be six roughly 15-minute segments, with two-minute answers for the first question, then open discussion for the remainder of each segment. ...”

4.2.8.2 Ideas Development

The ideas development is shown from the discussion among Jim Lehrer (moderator), President Barack Obama (first candidate) and Mitt Romney (second candidate). Lehrer asks the candidate to share their own mission in domestic policy, specifically in economy, health care, the role of government, and governing. It starts from the economy, there are three segments, such as to create new jobs, to tackle deficit problem and to solve Social Security problem, and the other segment each in one segment. It can be shown in this excerpt:

Segment 1

Turn	speaker	utterance
1	Lehrer	Let's start the economy, segment one. And let's begin with jobs. What are the major differences between the two of you about how you would go about creating new jobs? You have two minutes — each of you have two minutes to start. The coin toss has determined, Mr. President, you go first.

In segment one, Jim asked about both candidates' plans on how to create new jobs in America. Jim wanted to know the different view of their plans. Obama responded by telling his plans in economy segment. His first plan is to invest in education and training. Second plan is to develop new sources of energy production in America. Third, is to change the tax code and help small business. The last, he wants to balanced budget by reduce the deficit. In contrast, Romney has five basic parts for his plans. His plan is to reduce the tax in middle-class, but not in high-income people, first by making America energy independent. Second, is to open up more trade especially in small business by cutting taxes to make sure that small business can hire worker more. Third, to make sure people in America

have the skills to be successful and the best school in the world. Forth, his plan is to balance budget. The last is to champion in small business.

Segment 2

Turn	speaker	utterance
52	Lehrer	“All right. Let's talk — we're still on the economy. This is, theoretically now, a second segment still on the economy, and specifically on what do about the federal deficit, the federal debt. And the question — you each have two minutes on this — and, Governor Romney you go first because the president went first on segment one. And the question is this: What are the differences between the two of you as to how you would go about tackling the deficit problem in this country?”

In segment two, the debate is still on economy issue, but on different topic. Jim asked the candidates to explain their plans about how to tackle the deficit problem in America. The main problem is in federal deficit and federal debt in America. Romney responded by explaining three-way plans. One is to raise taxes. It has different view with Obama, who prefers raising taxes. In Romney's opinion, raising taxes can make slow down the rate of growth, so he wanted to lower spending and encourage economy growth at the same time. Next, he will spend the cut, he doesn't want to borrow money from China again to pay the government program that is not efficient he will make good program that can run more efficiently. The last is to grow the economy. He will make government more efficient by cut back the number of employees, and combine some agencies and department. In contrast, Obama explained that he wanted to reduce the deficit specifically \$4 trillion by cut \$2.50 and a dollar of additional from the revenue. It is to contribute a little bit more to reduce the deficit. Obama also gives argument

perceived from Romney's plan that he won't give tax breaks that in shipping jobs overseas, whereas that all raised revenue. He has a plan to help young people in America in order to make sure that they can go afford to go to college. Education is very important. He also asked Romney to give specific number of average to reduce deficit.

Segment 3

Turn speaker utterance

99 Lehrer "All right? **All right, this is this is segment three, the economy, entitlements.**
First answer goes to you. It's two minutes. Mr. President, **do** you see a major difference between the two of you on Social Security?"

Segment three is also still on economy, but has different segment subject, in this segment Jim wanted to know a major difference of both candidate in Social Security problem, because it is not only the problem for future seniors retirees, but also for young people in America. Obama wanted to criticize about the values behind social security and also Medicare, because it is very important to reduce deficit in America. His plan is to strengthen the system. He didn't need a major structural change in future Social Security. Contrary to Obama's opinion, Romney supported no change in Medicare for current retiree and near-retirees, and for young people he also wanted to keep in Medicare for them and they can choose the current Medicare and private plan. He also wants to save Medicare by applying the cross-subsidy from high-income to lower-income, so that the lower-income can get the benefits.

Segment 4

Turn	speaker	utterance
168	Lehrer	“All right, I think we have another clear difference between the two of you. Now let's move to health care, where I know there is a clear difference — (laughter) — and that has to do with the Affordable Care Act, "Obamacare." And it's a two-minute new segment, and it's — that means two minutes each. And you go first, Governor Romney. You wanted repeal. You want the Affordable Care Act repealed. Why?”

Segment four is about health care. It talks about Affordable Care Act “Obamacare”. Jim asked Governor Romney about this program, because he knows that Romney wanted to repeal it, and he also asked Obama’s argument about the reason of Romney’s plan. Romney explains his plan that he has different view with Obama, because in his view, “Obamacare” will spend costs \$2500 a year more than traditional insurance, it is very expensive for each family, and he doesn’t agrees with that plan. Second reason is because Obama wants to take \$716 billion from Medicare to pay it, and his plan is to put back that money in Medicare for the senior. He also does not agree if money is put in an unelected board to know what kind of treatment that people can have, and he doesn’t want the president to fight the “Obamacare” whereas 23 million people in America out of work and economic crisis. Obama responded by explaining how Obamacare works, because in Romney’s turn before his turn, Romney’s plans is to repeal Obamacare. First, if people have their own health insurance it doesn’t means that government’s take over their insurance. Second, if people don’t have health insurance, government will set up a group plan that allows the people to get

benefit around 18% lower than if they try to get insurance themselves. The fact is that when “Obamacare” was repealed, 50 million people are losing health care insurance, but when it is fully implemented, people can see the progress that the costs are going down.

Segment 5

Turn speaker utterance

198 Lehrer “**That is a terrific segue to our next segment, and is the role of government.** And let's see, role of government and it is — you are first on this, Mr. President. The question is this. Do you believe — both of you — but you have the first two minutes on this, Mr. President — do you believe there's a fundamental difference between the two of you as to how you view the mission of the federal government?”

Segment five talked about the candidate's mission of the federal government, specifically in their view of the responsibility of federal government to improve the quality of public education in America. Obama tells that the main function of federal government is to keep the America people safe. He also believed that federal government has a responsibility to help open up opportunity and create ladders of opportunity and to create frameworks to make American people success. As a president he has tried to apply the principles, and when it comes to education, he has a plan named Race to the Top that will reform the school in 46 states around the country. He also wanted to hire another hundred thousand math and science teachers to make sure that the government supplied the people with skilled are able to success. He takes it, because he thinks that is the kind of investment if federal government can help. Romney's view, the role of government is one, life and liberty. The government has a responsibility to protect

and liberties of people in America. The main plan is in military, Romney won't cut budget in the military, because he wanted to make America stronger. Two, is to maintain the commitment to religious tolerance and freedom in America. People in America have a freedom to make their own happiness. As a government they should support what American people do to success.

Segment 6

Turn speaker utterance

226 Lehrer "Oh, well, no. But the fact is, government — the role of government and governing, we've lost a (pod ?), **in other words, so we only have three minutes left in the — in the debate before we go to your closing statements. And so I want to ask finally here** — and remember, we've got three minutes total time here.

And the question is this: Many of the legislative functions of the federal government right now are in a state of paralysis as a result of partisan gridlock. If elected in your case, if re-elected in your case, what would you do about that?"

In last segment, Jim asked both candidates about what they would do if they were elected as a president, from the first day. Romney's plan is to bring the people together and get the job done. He will get income up again, by help 12 million new jobs in America with rising incomes, getting the cost health care down, and keep America stronger and get America middle class working again. Obama responded that question by giving argument to make middle-class families stronger and giving ladder of opportunity by giving them cut taxes and also to small businesses which works in export and sell American product around the

world. The other opinion in this segment is to fight for the security in health insurance that needed by people in America.

4.2.8.3 Rebuttal

The rebuttal is shown when both candidates have different ideas to solve the domestic issues in the U.S. It can be shown in this excerpt below:

Turn	speaker	utterances
106	Obama	First of all, I think it's important for Governor Romney to present this plan that he says will only affect folks in the future. And the essence of the plan is that he would turn Medicare into a voucher program. It's called premium support, but it's understood to be a voucher program. His running mate —
107	Lehrer	And you — and you don't support that?
108	Obama	I don't. And — and let me explain why.
109	Romney	Again, that's for future people —
110	Obama	I understand.
111	Romney	— right, not for current retirees.

4.2.8.4 Linguistic features

This genre has specific linguistic choice. It can be seen from the following excerpt below:

4.2.8.4.1 The use of question and answer

In the debate, the speech function is used question-answer to make a clear the discussion. In the debate, Jim Lehrer as a moderator asked for the suggestion about Simpson-Bowles whether Romney supports his plan or not, Lehrer asked it to make clear which plan that Romney's have. It can be shown in this excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterances
62	Lehrer	“Governor, what about Simpson-Bowles. Will you support Simpson-Bowles?” ”
63	Romney	Simpson-Bowles, the president should have grabbed that. “
64	Lehrer	“No, I mean do you support Simpson-Bowles?”
65	Romney	“I have my own plan. It's not the same as Simpson-Bowles. But in my view, the president should have grabbed it. If you wanted to make some adjustments to it, take it, go to Congress, fight for it.”

4.2.8.4.2 The use of present tense

In the debate, the participants used present tense to show that this discussion is spontaneous, Romney tells how his plan to the cut taxes. It can be seen in this excerpt:

Turn	speaker	utterances
210	Lehrer	“Do you think you have a difference with your views and those of Governor Romney on — about education and the federal government?”
211	Obama	“You know, this is where budgets matter because budgets reflect choices. So when Governor Romney indicates that he wants to cut taxes and potentially benefit folks like me and him, and to pay for it, we're having to initiate significant cuts in federal support for education, that makes a difference.”

4.2.8.4.3 The use of future tense

In the presidential debate, the participants used future tense, it is to show that the discussion about the plans of the candidate in the domestic policy for the future America. It can be seen in this utterance below:

Turn speaker utterance

22 Romney “... Number two, **I will not reduce the share paid by high-income individuals.** I — I know that you and your running mate keep saying that, and I know it's a popular things to say with a lot of people, but it's just not the case....”

4.2.8.4.4 The use of Past Tense

In the presidential debate, the participants also used past tense, it is to show that the debate relates to what the speaker talked about the problems that happened in America and the plan previously. the discussion about the plans of the candidate in the domestic policy for the future America. It can be seen in this utterance below:

Turn speaker utterance

2 Obama “... You know, **four years ago we went through the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Millions of jobs were lost. The auto industry was on the brink of collapse. The financial system had frozen up. And because of the resilience and the determination of the American people, we've begun to fight our way back.** ...”

4.2.8.4.5 The use of Modal Verbs

In this debate, the researcher also found the uses of modal verbs in the discussion. Modal verbs are used by the speakers to show them in believing something is certain or uncertain, probable or possible (or not), and politeness. It also used modals to do things like talking about ability, making decision, suggestion, to ask polite question, to make promise or show willingness, and so on. It can be seen in the utterance below:

Turn	speaker	utterances
53	Romney	“...The presidents would — president would prefer raising taxes. I understand. The problem with raising taxes is that it slows down the rate of growth and you could never quite get the job done. I want to lower spending and encourage economic growth at the same time. ...”

From the context utterance above, the modal verb *would* is used to indicate a repeated action in the past and modal verb *could* to show impossibility.

4.2.8.4.6 The use of Hedging Utterances

In this debate, the researcher also found the use of hedges (adverbial phrases, approximators of degree quantity and time, introductory phrases, if clauses, compound hedges) in the discussion. Hedges are mitigating device used to lessen the impact of an utterance. Hedges are mostly verbal and adverbial expressions such as *could*, *perhaps*, *may*, *suggest*, *seem* that deal with degree of probability. It can be seen in the utterances below:

Turn	speaker	utterances
211	Obama	“...When it comes to community colleges, we are seeing great work done out there all over the country because we have the opportunity to train people for jobs that exist right now. And one of the things I suspect Governor Romney and I probably agree on is getting businesses to work with community colleges so that they're setting up their training programs —“

The use of *adverbial phrase* in utterance above indicates the possibility of Obama having the same plan as Governor Romney in training program.

55	Romney	“... The president's put it in place as much public debt — almost as much debt held by by the public as all prior presidents combined. ...”
----	--------	--

The use of *approximators of degree quantity* from the context above shows that Romney's not sure of the amount of debt.

10 Obama "...We cut taxes for middle-class families by about \$3,600. And the reason is because **I believe** we do best when the middle class is doing well. ..."

The use of *introductory phrases* from the context above, Obama gives opinion to help the middle-class family in United States by cutting the taxes.

233 Obama "I've kept that promise and **if you'll vote for me, then I promise I'll fight just as hard in a second term.**"

The use of *if clauses* in the utterance above is to promote himself by giving a promise to people who will vote for him.

55 Romney "...Number two, I'll take programs that are currently good programs but I **think could** be run more efficiently at the state level and send them to state. ..."

The *compound hedge* in the context above is used as a positive strategy in delivering his opinion.

Also there are some expressions that are commonly used in a debate, such as: believe, have a different though, I tried to. It is used by the speakers to show them in believing himself to convince people in U.S. that his plan is better than the other candidates' plans. It can be seen in the utterance below:

Turn speaker utterances

10 Obama "Well, I think — let's talk about taxes because I think it's instructive. Now, four years ago when I stood on this stage I said that I would cut taxes for middle-class families. And that's exactly what I did. We cut taxes for middle-class

families by about \$3,600. And the reason is because **I believe** we do best when the middle class is doing well. ...”

26 Obama “...And **we do have a difference, though, when it comes to definitions of small business.** Now, under — under my plan, 97 percent of small businesses would not see their income taxes go up. Governor Romney says, well, those top 3 percent, they're the job creators. They'd be burdened. ...”

233 Obama “... And so the question now is, how do we build on those strengths? And everything that **I've tried to do** and everything that I'm now proposing for the next four years in terms of improving our education system, or developing American energy, or making sure that we're closing loopholes for companies that are shipping jobs overseas and focusing on small businesses and companies that are creating jobs here in the United States, or — or closing our deficit in a responsible, balanced way that allows us to invest in our future — all those things are designed to make sure that the American people, their genius, their grit, their determination is — is channeled, and — and — and they have an opportunity to succeed. ...”

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter presents the conclusion of the study and presents the suggestion for everyone who reads this thesis.

5.1 Conclusion

This thesis studies about ethnography of communication by using Hymes' framework, which is called SPEAKING grids, from First Presidential debate between President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney, and there are significance elements of ethnography of communication, such as setting and scene, participant, ends, act sequence, key instrumentalities, norms, and genre. The setting in which the debate occurs in Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado on October 3, 2012. It can be seen from the video of the debate. Scene in the debate is the situation that focuses only on the debate, the scene is serious and quite. There are three participants in the debate, they are, Jim Lehrer becomes the moderator, President Barack Obama is a president candidate from Democratic Party, and Governor Mitt Romney is a president candidate from Republican Party. The end of the presidential debate is to discuss on differences about domestic issues in United States between the candidates. The act sequence in the debate consists of three stages such as, opening stage, middle stage and closing stage. The key of the debate is serious, but occasionally, the participants make jokes and laugh. The instrument of this debate is spoken text. The norm of the debate uses positive politeness, because there is social status difference

between the speakers. The genre of this text is debate. This genre contains of definition motion, idea development, rebuttal, and the linguistic features are the use of question and answer, present tense, future tense, past tense, modal verbs, and hedging utterances.

5.2 Suggestion

From the previous data analysis, the researcher suggests the other researchers who are interested in ethnography of communication that take other genres to be analyzed. The researcher also expects that other researchers can develop this study further and better than before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Canale, M and M Swain. 1980. Theoretical bases of communication approaches to second language teaching and testing.' *Applied linguistic* 1/1. 47.
- Gumperz, J.J. Sociolinguistics & Communication of Small Groups, (In Pride & Holmes. 1977 . *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, p (205).
- Hornby, A.S. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.p662.
- Hymes, D. H. 1971. *On communicative competence*. In J. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds), *Sociolinguistic*. Penguin, 1972. (Excerpt from the paper published 1971, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press).
- Hymes, Dell. 1972. *Models of the interaction of language and social life*. (Revised from 1967 paper.) In Gumperz & Hymes, eds. 1972 *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Blackwell:35-71.
- Hymes, D. 1973. "On Communicative Competence, "In *Sociolinguistics*. J.B Pride and J. Holmes, Eds. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hymes, D. 1974b. *Ways of Speaking*. In J. Sherzer and R. Bauma (eds), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. 1986. *Models of Interaction of Language and Social Life*.In J. J.Gumperz, and D. Hymes (eds), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Brasil Blackwell.
- Hymes, D. H. 1989 'Way of Speaking', in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds) *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. 2ndedn.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 433-51.
- Hymes, D. Dell H. *Hymes Personal Web Page*. Retrieved 16 January 2009,from <http://www.virginia.edu/antropology/dhymes.html>.

Issac, Stephen and William B. Michael. *Handbook in research and evaluation: a collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in the planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral sciences*, 2nd. San Diego, CA: EDITS Publishers, 1981.

Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University Pannsylvania Press.

Paltridge, Brian. 2000. *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*. Australia: Merino Lithographics.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1994. *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Blackwell.

Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Saville-Troike, M. 1989. *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction* (2nd edn). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Website:

<http://aggslanguage.wordpress.com/spoken-language-%E2%80%93-technical-terms-defined/> (accessed on September, 3 2013)

<http://debates.org/index.php?page=october-3-2012-debate-transcript> (accessed on March, 18 2013)

<http://edition.cnn.com/election/2012/debates/first-presidential-debate> (accessed on March, 18 2013)

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Debate> (accessed on March, 23 2013)

<http://www.tesol-direct.com/guide-to-english-grammar/modal-auxiliary-verbs> (accessed on September, 3 2013)

<http://www.uspresidentialelectionnews.com/2012-debate-schedule/2012-presidential-debate-schedule/> (accessed on August, 11 2013)

APPENDIX

1.) JIM LEHRER: Good evening from the Magness Arena at the University of Denver in Denver, Colorado. I'm Jim Lehrer of the PBS NewsHour, and I welcome you to the first of the 2012 presidential debates between President Barack Obama, the Democratic nominee, and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee.

This debate and the next three — two presidential, one vice-presidential — are sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates.

Tonight's 90 minutes will be about **domestic issues**, and will follow a format designed by the commission. There will be six roughly 15-minute segments, with two-minute answers for the first question, **then open discussion for the remainder of each segment.**

Thousands of people offered suggestions on segment subjects of questions via the Internet and other means, but I made the final selections, and for the record, they were not submitted for approval to the commission or the candidates.

The segments, as I announced in advance, will be three on the economy and one each on health care, the role of government, and governing, with an emphasis throughout on differences, specifics and choices. Both candidates will also have two-minute closing statements.

The audience here in the hall has promised to remain silent. No cheers, applause, boos, hisses — among other noisy distracting things — so we may all concentrate on what the candidates have to say. There is a noise exception right now, though, as we welcome President Obama and Governor Romney. (Cheers, applause.)

Gentlemen, welcome to you both.

Let's start the economy, segment one. And let's begin with jobs. What are the major differences between the two of you about how you would go about creating new jobs? You have two minutes — each of you have two minutes to start. The coin toss has determined, Mr. President, you go first.

2.) PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA: Well, thank you very much, Jim, for this opportunity. I want to thank Governor Romney and the University of Denver for your hospitality.

There are a lot of points that I want to make tonight, but the most important one is that 20 years ago I became the luckiest man on earth because Michelle Obama agreed to marry me. (Laughter.) And so I just want to wish, Sweetie, you happy anniversary and let you know that a year from now, we will not be celebrating it in front of 40 million people. (Laughter.)

You know, four years ago we went through the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Millions of jobs were lost. The auto industry was on the brink of collapse.

The financial system had frozen up. And because of the resilience and the determination of the American people, we've begun to fight our way back.

Over the last 30 months, we've seen 5 million jobs in the private sector created. The auto industry has come roaring back and housing has begun to rise. But we all know that we've still got a lot of work to do. And so the question here tonight is not where we've been but where we're going. Governor Romney has a perspective that says if we cut taxes, skewed towards the wealthy, and roll back regulations that we'll be better off.

I've got a different view. **I think we've got to invest in education and training. I think it's important for us to develop new sources of energy here in America, that we change our tax code to make sure that we're helping small businesses and companies that are investing here in the United States, that we take some of the money that we're saving as we wind down two wars to rebuild America and that we reduce our deficit in a balanced way that allows us to make these critical investments.**

Now, it ultimately is going to be up to the voters, to you, which path we should take. Are we going to double down on the top-down economic policies that helped to get us into this mess, or do we embrace a new economic patriotism that says, America does best when the middle class does best? And I'm looking forward to having that debate.

3.) MR. LEHRER: Governor Romney, two minutes.

4.) MR. ROMNEY: Thank you, Jim. It's an honor to be here with you, and I appreciate the chance to be with the president. I am pleased to be at the University of Denver, appreciate their welcome and also the presidential commission on these debates.

And congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your anniversary. I'm sure this was the most romantic place you could imagine here — here with me, so I — (laughter) — congratulations.

This is obviously a very tender topic. I've had the occasion over the last couple of years of meeting people across the country. I was in Dayton, Ohio, and a woman grabbed my arm, and she said, I've been out of work since May. Can you help me?

Ann yesterday was a rally in Denver, and a woman came up to her with a baby in her arms and said, Ann, my husband has had four jobs in three years, part-time jobs. He's lost his most recent job, and we've now just lost our home. Can you help us?

And the answer is yes, we can help, but it's going to take a different path, not the one we've been on, not the one the president describes as a top-down, cut taxes for the rich. That's not what I'm going to do.

My plan has five basic parts. One, get us energy independent, North American energy independent. That creates about four million jobs. Number two, open up more trade, particularly in Latin America; crack down on China if and when they cheat. Number three, make sure our people have the skills they need to succeed and the best schools in the world. We're far away from that now. Number four, get us to a balanced budget. Number five, champion small business.

It's small business that creates the jobs in America. And over the last four years small-business people have decided that America may not be the place to open a new business, because new business startups are down to a 30-year low. I know what it takes to get small business growing again, to hire people.

Now, I'm concerned that the path that we're on has just been unsuccessful. The president has a view very similar to the view he had when he ran four years ago, that a bigger government, spending more, taxing more, regulating more — if you will, trickle-down government would work. That's not the right answer for America. I'll restore the vitality that gets America working again.

Thank you.

5.) MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, please respond directly to what the governor just said about trickle-down — his trickle-down approach. He's — as he said yours is.

6.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, let me talk specifically about what I think we need to do.

First, we've got to improve our education system. And we've made enormous progress drawing on ideas both from Democrats and Republicans that are already starting to show gains in some of the toughest-to-deal-with schools. We've got a program called Race to the Top that has prompted reforms in 46 states around the country, raising standards, improving how we train teachers. So now I want to hire another hundred thousand new math and science teachers and create 2 million more slots in our community colleges so that people can get trained for the jobs that are out there right now. And I want to make sure that we keep tuition low for our young people.

When it comes to our tax code, Governor Romney and I both agree that our corporate tax rate is too high. So I want to lower it, particularly for manufacturing, taking it down to 25 percent. But I also want to close those loopholes that are giving incentives for companies that are shipping jobs overseas. I want to provide tax breaks for companies that are investing here in the United States.

On energy, Governor Romney and I, we both agree that we've got to boost American energy production.

And oil and natural gas production are higher than they've been in years. But I also believe that we've got to look at the energy source of the future, like wind and solar and biofuels, and make those investments.

So, all of this is possible. Now, in order for us to do it, we do have to close our deficit, and one of the things I'm sure we'll be discussing tonight is, how do we deal with our tax code, and how do we make sure that we are reducing spending in a responsible way, but also how do we have enough revenue to make those investments? And this is where there's a difference because Governor Romney's central economic plan calls for a \$5 trillion tax cut, on top of the extension of the Bush tax cuts, so that's another \$2 trillion, and \$2 trillion in additional military spending that the military hasn't asked for. That's \$8 trillion. How we pay for that, reduce the deficit and make the investments that we need to

make without dumping those costs on the middle-class Americans I think is one of the central questions of this campaign.

7.) MR. LEHRER: Both of you have spoken about a lot of different things, and we're going to try to get through them in as specific a way as we possibly can.

But first, Governor Romney, do you have a question that you'd like to ask the president directly about something he just said?

8.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, sure. I'd like to clear up the record and go through it piece by piece. First of all, I don't have a \$5 trillion tax cut. I don't have a tax cut of a scale that you're talking about. My view is that we ought to provide tax relief to people in the middle class. But I'm not going to reduce the share of taxes paid by high-income people. High-income people are doing just fine in this economy. They'll do fine whether you're president or I am.

The people who are having the hard time right now are middle-income Americans. Under the president's policies, middle-income Americans have been buried. They're — they're just being crushed. Middle-income Americans have seen their income come down by \$4,300. This is a — this is a tax in and of itself. I'll call it the economy tax. It's been crushing. The same time, gasoline prices have doubled under the president, electric rates are up, food prices are up, health care costs have gone up by \$2,500 a family.

Middle-income families are being crushed. And so the question is how to get them going again, and I've described it. It's energy and trade, the right kind of training programs, balancing our budget and helping small business. Those are the — the cornerstones of my plan.

But the president mentioned a couple of other ideas, and I'll just note: first, education. I agree, education is key, particularly the future of our economy. But our training programs right now, we got 47 of them housed in the federal government, reporting to eight different agencies. Overhead is overwhelming. We got to get those dollars back to the states and go to the workers so they can create their own pathways to getting the training they need for jobs that will really help them.

The second area: taxation. We agree; we ought to bring the tax rates down, and I do, both for corporations and for individuals. But in order for us not to lose revenue, have the government run out of money, I also lower deductions and credits and exemptions so that we keep taking in the same money when you also account for growth.

The third area: energy. Energy is critical, and the president pointed out correctly that production of oil and gas in the U.S. is up. But not due to his policies. In spite of his policies. Mr. President, all of the increase in natural gas and oil has happened on private land, not on government land. On government land, your administration has cut the number of permits and license in half. If I'm president, I'll double them. And also get the — the oil from offshore and Alaska. And I'll bring that pipeline in from Canada.

And by the way, I like coal. I'm going to make sure we continue to burn clean coal. People in the coal industry feel like it's getting crushed by your policies. I want to get America and North America energy independent, so we can create those jobs.

And finally, with regards to that tax cut, look, I'm not looking to cut massive taxes and to reduce the — the revenues going to the government. My — my number one principle is there'll be no tax cut that adds to the deficit.

I want to underline that — no tax cut that adds to the deficit. But I do want to reduce the burden being paid by middle-income Americans. And I — and to do that that also means that I cannot reduce the burden paid by high-income Americans. So any — any language to the contrary is simply not accurate.

9.) MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

10.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, I think — let's talk about taxes because I think it's instructive. Now, four years ago when I stood on this stage I said that I would cut taxes for middle-class families. And that's exactly what I did. We cut taxes for middle-class families by about \$3,600. And the reason is because **I believe** we do best when the middle class is doing well.

And by giving them those tax cuts, they had a little more money in their pocket and so maybe they can buy a new car. They are certainly in a better position to weather the extraordinary recession that we went through. They can buy a computer for their kid who's going off to college, which means they're spending more money, businesses have more customers, businesses make more profits and then hire more workers.

Now, Governor Romney's proposal that he has been promoting for 18 months calls for a \$5 trillion tax cut on top of \$2 trillion of additional spending for our military. And he is saying that he is going to pay for it by closing loopholes and deductions. The problem is that he's been asked a — over a hundred times how you would close those deductions and loopholes and he hasn't been able to identify them.

But I'm going to make an important point here, Jim.

11.) MR. LEHRER: All right.

12.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: When you add up all the loopholes and deductions that upper income individuals can — are currently taking advantage of — if you take those all away — you don't come close to paying for \$5 trillion in tax cuts and \$2 trillion in additional military spending. And that's why independent studies looking at this said the only way to meet Governor Romney's pledge of not reducing the deficit — or — or — or not adding to the deficit, is by burdening middle-class families.

The average middle-class family with children would pay about \$2,000 more. Now, that's not my analysis; that's the analysis of economists who have looked at this. And — and that kind of top — top-down economics, where folks at the top are doing well so the average person making 3 million bucks is getting a \$250,000 tax break while middle-

class families are burdened further, that's not what I believe is a recipe for economic growth.

13.) **MR. LEHRER:** All right. What is the difference?

14.) **MR. ROMNEY:** Well —

15.) **MR. LEHRER:** Let's just stay on taxes for —

16.) **MR. ROMNEY:** But I — but I — right, right.

17.) **MR. LEHRER:** OK. **Yeah**, just — let's just stay on taxes for a moment.

18.) **MR. ROMNEY:** **Yeah. Well**, but — but —

19.) **MR. LEHRER:** What is the difference?

20.) **MR. ROMNEY:** — virtually every — virtually everything he just said about my tax plan is inaccurate.

21.) **MR. LEHRER:** All right, go —

22.) **MR. ROMNEY:** So — so if — if the tax plan he described were a tax plan I was asked to support, I'd say absolutely not. I'm not looking for a \$5 trillion tax cut. What I've said is I won't put in place a tax cut that adds to the deficit. That's part one. So there's no economist can say Mitt Romney's tax plan adds 5 trillion (dollars) if I say I will not add to the deficit with my tax plan.

Number two, **I will not reduce the share paid by high-income individuals.** I — I know that you and your running mate keep saying that, and I know it's a popular thing to say with a lot of people, but it's just not the case. Look, I got five boys. I'm used to people saying something that's not always true, but just keep on repeating it and ultimately hoping I'll believe it — (scattered laughter) — but that — that is not the case, all right? I will not reduce the taxes paid by high-income Americans.

And number three, I will not, under any circumstances, raise taxes on middle-income families. I will lower taxes on middle-income families. Now, you cite a study. There are six other studies that looked at the study you describe and say it's completely wrong. I saw a study that came out today that said you're going to raise taxes by 3,000 (dollars) to \$4,000 on — on middle-income families. There are all these studies out there.

But let's get to the bottom line. That is, I want to bring down rates. I want to bring down the rates down, at the same time lower deductions and exemptions and credits and so forth so we keep getting the revenue we need.

And you think, well, then why lower the rates? And the reason is because small business pays that individual rate. Fifty-four percent of America's workers work in businesses that are taxed not at the corporate tax rate but at the individual tax rate. And if we lower that rate, they will be able to hire more people.

For me, this is about jobs.

23.) **MR. LEHRER:** All right. That's where we started.

24.) **MR. ROMNEY:** This is about getting jobs for the American people.

25.) **MR. LEHRER:** Yeah.

Do you challenge what the governor just said about his own plan?

26.) **PRESIDENT OBAMA:** Well, for 18 months he's been running on this tax plan. And now, five weeks before the election, he's saying that his big, bold idea is "never mind." And the fact is that if you are lowering the rates the way you describe, Governor, then it is not possible to come up with enough deductions and loopholes that only affect high-income individuals to avoid either raising the deficit or burdening the middle class. It's — it's math. It's arithmetic.

Now, Governor Romney and I do share a deep interest in encouraging small-business growth. So at the same time that my tax plan has already lowered taxes for 98 percent of families, I also lowered taxes for small businesses 18 times. And what I want to do is continue the tax rates — the tax cuts that we put into place for small businesses and families.

But I have said that for incomes over \$250,000 a year that we should go back to the rates that we had when Bill Clinton was president, when we created 23 million new jobs, went from deficit to surplus and created a whole lot of millionaires to boot.

And the reason this is important is because by doing that, we can not only reduce the deficit, we can not only encourage job growth through small businesses, but we're also able to make the investments that are necessary in education or in energy.

And **we do have a difference, though, when it comes to definitions of small business.** Now, under — under my plan, 97 percent of small businesses would not see their income taxes go up. Governor Romney says, well, those top 3 percent, they're the job creators. They'd be burdened.

But under Governor Romney's definition, there are a whole bunch of millionaires and billionaires who are small businesses. Donald Trump is a small business. And I know Donald Trump doesn't like to think of himself as small anything, but — but that's how you define small businesses if you're getting business income. And that kind of approach, I believe, will not grow our economy because the only way to pay for it without either burdening the middle class or blowing up our deficit is to make drastic cuts in things like education, making sure that we are continuing to invest in basic science and research, all the things that are helping America grow. And I think that would be a mistake.

27.) **MR. LEHRER:** All right.

28.) **MR. ROMNEY:** Jim, let me just come back on that — on that point.

29.) **MR. LEHRER:** Just for the — just for the record —

30.) **MR. ROMNEY:** These small businesses we're talking about —

31.) **MR. LEHRER:** Excuse me. Just so everybody understands —

32.) **MR. ROMNEY:** Yeah.

33.) **MR. LEHRER:** — we're way over our first 15 minutes.

34.) **MR. ROMNEY:** It's fun, isn't it?

35.) **MR. LEHRER:** It's OK. It's great.

36.) **PRESIDENT OBAMA:** That's OK.

37.) **MR. LEHRER:** No problem. No, you don't have — you don't have a problem, I don't have a problem, because we're still on the economy, but we're going to come back to taxes and we're going to move on to the deficit and a lot of other things, too.

OK, but go ahead, sir.

38.) **MR. ROMNEY:** You bet.

Well, President, you're — Mr. President, you're absolutely right, which is that with regards to 97 percent of the businesses are not — not taxed at the 35 percent tax rate, they're taxed at a lower rate. But those businesses that are in the last 3 percent of businesses happen to employ half — half — of all of the people who work in small business. Those are the businesses that employ one quarter of all the workers in America. And your plan is take their tax rate from 35 percent to 40 percent.

Now, I talked to a guy who has a very small business. He's in the electronics business in — in St. Louis. He has four employees.

He said he and his son calculated how much they pay in taxes. Federal income tax, federal payroll tax, state income tax, state sales tax, state property tax, gasoline tax — it added up to well over 50 percent of what they earned.

And your plan is to take the tax rate on successful small businesses from 35 percent to 40 percent. The National Federation of Independent Businesses has said that will cost 700,000 jobs. I don't want to cost jobs. My priority is jobs. And so what I do is I bring down the tax rates, lower deductions and exemptions — the same idea behind Bowles-Simpson, by the way. Get the rates down, lower deductions and exemptions to create more jobs, because there's nothing better for getting us to a balanced budget than having more people working, earning more money, paying — (chuckles) — more taxes. That's by far the most effective and efficient way to get this budget balanced.

39.) **PRESIDENT OBAMA:** Jim, I — you may want to move on to another topic, but I would just say this to the American people. If you believe that we can cut taxes by \$5

trillion and add \$2 trillion in additional spending that the military is not asking for — \$7 trillion, just to give you a sense, over 10 years that's more than our entire defense budget — and you think that by closing loopholes and deductions for the well-to-do, somehow you will not end up picking up the tab, then Governor Romney's plan may work for you.

But I think math, common sense and our history shows us that's not a recipe for job growth.

Look, we've tried this — we've tried both approaches. The approach that Governor Romney's talking about is the same sales pitch that was made in 2001 and 2003. And we ended up with the slowest job growth in 50 years. We ended up moving from surplus to deficits. And it all culminated in the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Bill Clinton tried the approach that I'm talking about. We created 23 million new jobs. We went from deficit to surplus, and businesses did very well.

So in some ways, we've got some data on which approach is more likely to create jobs and opportunity for Americans, and I believe that the economy works best when middle-class families are getting tax breaks so that they've got some money in their pockets and those of us who have done extraordinarily well because of this magnificent country that we live in, that we can afford to do a little bit more to make sure we're not blowing up the deficit.

40.) MR. LEHRER: OK. (Inaudible) —

41.) MR. ROMNEY: Jim, the president began this segment, so I think I get the last word, so I'm going to take it. All right?(Chuckles.)

42.) MR. LEHRER: Well, you're going to get the first word in the next segment.

43.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, but — but he gets the first word of that segment. I get the last word of that segment, I hope. Let me just make this comment.

44.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: (Chuckles.) He can — you can have it. He can —

45.) MR. ROMNEY: First of all —

46.) MR. LEHRER: That's not how it works.

47.) MR. ROMNEY: Let me — let me repeat — let me repeat what I said — (inaudible). I'm not in favor of a \$5 trillion tax cut. That's not my plan. My plan is not to put in place any tax cut that will add to the deficit. That's point one. So you may keep referring to it as a \$5 trillion tax cut, but that's not my plan.

48.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: OK.

49.) MR. ROMNEY: Number two, let's look at history. My plan is not like anything that's been tried before. My plan is to bring down rates but also bring down deductions and exemptions and credits at the same time so the revenue stays in, but that we bring

down rates to get more people working. My priority is putting people back to work in America. They're suffering in this country. And we talk about evidence — look at the evidence of the last four years. It's absolutely extraordinary. We've got 23 million people out of work or stop looking for work in this country.

50.) MR. LEHRER: All right.

51.) MR. ROMNEY: It's just — it's — we've got — we got — when the president took office, 32 million people on food stamps; 47 million on food stamps today. Economic growth this year slower than last year, and last year slower than the year before. Going forward with the status quo is not going to cut it for the American people who are struggling today.

52.) MR. LEHRER: All right. Let's talk — we're still on the economy. **This is, theoretically now, a second segment still on the economy, and specifically on what do about the federal deficit, the federal debt.** And the question — you each have two minutes on this — and, Governor Romney you go first because the president went first on segment one. And the question is this: **What are the differences between the two of you as to how you would go about tackling the deficit problem in this country?**

53.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, good. I'm glad you raised that. And it's a — **it's a critical issue. I think it's not just an economic issue. I think it's a moral issue. I think it's, frankly, not moral** for my generation to keep spending massively more than we take in, knowing those burdens are going to be passed on to the next generation. And they're going to be paying the interest and the principle all their lives. And the amount of debt we're adding, at a trillion a year, is simply not moral.

So how do we deal with it? Well, mathematically there are — **there are three ways that you can cut a deficit. One, of course, is to raise taxes. Number two is to cut spending. And number three is to grow the economy** because if more people work in a growing economy they're paying taxes and you can get the job done that way.

The presidents **would** — president **would** prefer raising taxes. I understand. The problem with raising taxes is that it slows down the rate of growth and you **could** never quite get the job done. I want to lower spending and encourage economic growth at the same time.

What things would I cut from spending? Well, first of all, I will eliminate all programs by this test — if they don't pass it: Is the program so critical it's worth borrowing money from China to pay for it? And if not, I'll get rid of it. "Obamacare" is on my list. I apologize, Mr. President. I use that term with all respect.

54.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: I like it.

55.) MR. ROMNEY: Good. OK, good. (Laughter.) So I'll get rid of that. I'm sorry, Jim. I'm going to stop the subsidy to PBS. I'm going to stop other things. I like PBS. I love Big Bird. I actually like you too. But I'm not going to — I'm not going to keep on spending money on things to borrow money from China to pay for it. That's number one.

Number two, I'll take programs that are currently good programs but I **think could** be run more efficiently at the state level and send them to state.

Number three, I'll make government more efficient, and to cut back the number of employees, combine some agencies and departments. My cutbacks will be done through attrition, by the way.

This is the approach we have to take to get America to a balanced budget. The president said he'd cut the deficit in half. Unfortunately, he doubled it. Trillion-dollar deficits for the last four years. The president's put it in place as much public debt — **almost** as much debt held by the public as all prior presidents combined.

56.) MR. LEHRER: Mr. President. two minutes.

57.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: When I walked in the Oval Office, I had more than a trillion dollar deficit greeting me, and we know where it came from. Two wars that were paid for on a credit card. Two tax cuts that were not paid for, and a whole bunch of programs that were not paid for. And then a massive economic crisis.

And despite that, what we've said is, yes, we had to take some initial emergency measures to make sure we didn't slip into a Great Depression. But what we've also said is, let's make sure that we are cutting out those things that are not helping us grow.

So, 77 government programs — everything from aircrafts that the Air Force had ordered but weren't working very well. Eighteen government — 18 government programs for education that were well- intentioned but weren't helping kids learn. We went after medical fraud in Medicare and Medicaid very aggressively — more aggressively than ever before, and have saved tens of billions of dollars. Fifty billion dollars of waste taken out of the system.

And I worked with Democrats and Republicans to cut a trillion dollars out of our discretionary domestic budget. That's the largest cut in the discretionary domestic budget since Dwight Eisenhower.

Now, we all know that we've got to do more. And so **I've put forward a specific \$4 trillion deficit-reduction plan.**

It's on a website. You can look at all the numbers, what cuts we make and what revenue we raise.

And the way we do it is \$2.50 for every cut, we ask for a dollar of additional revenue, paid for, as I indicated earlier, by asking those of us who have done very well in this country to contribute a little bit more to reduce the deficit.

And Governor Romney earlier mentioned the Bowles-Simpson commission. Well, that's how the commission — bipartisan commission that talked about how we should move forward suggested we have to do it — in a balanced way with some revenue and some spending cuts. And this is a major difference that Governor Romney and I have.

Let — let me just finish this point because you're looking for contrast. You know, when Governor Romney stood on a stage with other Republican candidates for the nomination, and he was asked, would you take \$10 of spending cuts for just \$1 of revenue, and he said no. Now, if you take such an unbalanced approach, then that means you are going to be gutting our investments in schools and education. It means that — Governor Romney talked about Medicaid and how we could send it back to the states, but effectively this means a 30 percent cut in the primary program we help for seniors who are in nursing homes, for kids who are with disabilities —

58.) MR. LEHRER:Mr. President, I'm sorry —

59.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: And that is not a right strategy for us to move forward.

60.) MR. LEHRER:Way over the two minutes.

61.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Sorry.

62.) MR. LEHRER:Governor, what about Simpson-Bowles. Will you support Simpson-Bowles?

63.) MR. ROMNEY:Simpson-Bowles, the president should have grabbed that.

64.) MR. LEHRER:No, I mean do you support Simpson-Bowles?

65.) MR. ROMNEY:I have my own plan. It's not the same as Simpson- Bowles. But in my view, the president should have grabbed it. If you wanted to make some adjustments to it, take it, go to Congress, fight for it.

66.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: That's what we've done, made some adjustments to it; and we're putting it forward before Congress right now, a \$4 trillion plan, (a balanced ?) —

67.) MR. ROMNEY: But you've been — but you've been president four years. You've been president four years. You said you'd cut the deficit in half. It's now four years later. We still have trillion- dollar deficits.

The CBO says we'll have a trillion-dollar deficit each of the next four years. If you're re-elected, we'll get to a trillion-dollar debt. You have said before you'd cut the deficit in half. And this four — I love this idea of 4 trillion (dollars) in cuts. You've found \$4 trillion of ways to reduce or to get closer to a balanced budget, except we still show trillion dollar deficits every year. That doesn't get the job done.

Let me come back and say, why is that I don't want to raise taxes? Why don't I want to raise taxes on people? And actually, you said it back in 2010. You said, look, I'm going to extend the tax policies that we have. Now, I'm not going to raise taxes on anyone because when the economy's growing slow like this, when we're in recession you shouldn't raise taxes on anyone.

Well, the economy is still growing slow. As a matter of fact, it's growing much more slowly now than when you made that statement. And so if you believe the same thing,

you just don't want to raise taxes on people. And the reality is it's not just wealthy people — you mentioned Donald Trump — it's not just Donald Trump you're taxing; it's all those businesses that employ one-quarter of the workers in America. These small businesses that are taxed as individuals. You raise taxes and you kill jobs. That's why the National Federation of Independent Businesses said your plan will kill 700,000 jobs. I don't want to kill jobs in this environment.

Let me make one more point. And that's — and that —

68.) MR. LEHRER: Let's let him answer the taxes thing for a moment, OK?

69.) MR. ROMNEY: OK.

70.) MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

71.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, we've had this discussion before.

72.) MR. LEHRER: No, about the idea that in order to reduce the deficit there has to be revenue in addition to cuts.

73.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: There has to be revenue in addition to cuts. Now, Governor Romney has ruled out revenue. He's — he's ruled out revenue.

74.) MR. LEHRER: That's true, right?

75.) MR. ROMNEY: Absolutely.

76.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: OK, so —

77.) MR. LEHRER: Completely?

78.) MR. ROMNEY: I — look, the revenue I get is by more people working, getting higher pay, paying more taxes. That's how we get growth and how we balance the budget. But the idea of taxing people more, putting more people out of work — you'll never get there. You never balance the budget by raising taxes.

Spain — Spain spends 42 percent of their total economy on government. We're now spending 42 percent of our economy on government.

I don't want to go down the path to Spain. I want to go down the path of growth that puts Americans to work, with more money coming in because they're working.

79.) MR. LEHRER: Yeah.

But Mr. President, you're saying in order to get it — the job done, it's got to be balanced. You've got to have —

80.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: If we're serious, we've got to take a balanced, responsible approach. And by the way, this is not just when it comes to individual taxes.

Let's talk about corporate taxes. Now, I've identified areas where we can, right away, make a change that I believe would actually help the economy. The — the oil industry gets \$4 billion a year in corporate welfare. Basically, they get deductions that those small businesses that Governor Romney refers to, they don't get. Now, does anybody think that ExxonMobil needs some extra money when they're making money every time you go to the pump? Why wouldn't we want to eliminate that?

Why wouldn't we eliminate tax breaks for corporate jets? My attitude is if you got a corporate jet, you can probably afford to pay full freight, not get a special break for it.

When it comes to corporate taxes, Governor Romney has said he wants to, in a revenue-neutral way, close loopholes, deductions — he hasn't identified which ones they are — but thereby bring down the corporate rate. Well, I want to do the same thing, but I've actually identified how we can do that.

And part of the way to do it is to not give tax breaks to companies that are shipping jobs overseas. Right now you can actually take a deduction for moving a plant overseas. I think most Americans would say that doesn't make sense. And all that raises revenue.

And so if we take a balanced approach, what that then allows us to do is also to help young people, the way we already have during my administration, make sure that they can afford to go to college. It means that the teacher that I met in Las Vegas, wonderful young lady, who describes to me — she's got 42 kids in her class.

The first two weeks, she's got them — some of them sitting on the floor until finally they get reassigned. They're using textbooks that are 10 years old. That is not a recipe for growth; that's not how America was built.

And so budgets reflect choices. Ultimately we're going to have to make some decisions. And if we're asking for no revenue, then that means that we've got to get rid of a whole bunch of stuff, and the magnitude of the tax cuts that you're talking about, Governor, would end up resulting in severe hardship for people, but more importantly, would not help us grow.

As I indicated before, when you talk about shifting Medicaid to states, we're talking about potentially a — a 30 — a 30 percent cut in Medicaid over time. Now, you know, that may not seem like a big deal when it just is — you know, numbers on a sheet of paper, but if we're talking about a family who's got an autistic kid and is depending on that Medicaid, that's a big problem. And governors are creative. There's no doubt about it. But they're not creative enough to make up for 30 percent of revenue on something like Medicaid. What ends up happening is some people end up not getting help.

81.) MR. ROMNEY: Jim, let's — we — we've gone on a lot of topics there, and — so I've got to take — it's going to take a minute to go from Medicaid to schools to —

82.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: (Inaudible.)

83.) MR. LEHRER: Come back to Medicaid, here, yeah, yeah, right.

84.) MR. ROMNEY: — oil to tax breaks and companies overseas. So let's go through them one by one. First of all, the Department of Energy has said the tax break for oil companies is \$2.8 billion a year. And it's actually an accounting treatment, as you know, that's been in place for a hundred years. Now —

85.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: It's time to end it.

86.) MR. ROMNEY: And — and in one year, you provided \$90 billion in breaks to the green energy world. Now, I like green energy as well, but that's about 50 years' worth of what oil and gas receives, and you say Exxon and Mobil — actually, this \$2.8 billion goes largely to small companies, to drilling operators and so forth.

But you know, if we get that tax rate from 35 percent down to 25 percent, why, that \$2.8 billion is on the table. Of course it's on the table. That's probably not going to survive, you get that rate down to 25 percent.

But — but don't forget, you put \$90 billion — like 50 years worth of breaks — into solar and wind, to — to Solyndra and Fisker and Tesla and Ener1. I mean, I — I had a friend who said, you don't just pick the winners and losers; you pick the losers. All right? So — so this is not — this is not the kind of policy you want to have if you want to get America energy-secure.

The second topic, which is you said you get a deduction for getting a plant overseas. Look, I've been in business for 25 years. I have no idea what you're talking about. I maybe need to get a new accountant.

87.) MR. LEHRER: Let's —

88.) MR. ROMNEY: But the — the idea that you get a break for shipping jobs overseas is simply not the case.

89.) MR. LEHRER: Let's have —

90.) MR. ROMNEY: What we do have right now is a setting —

91.) MR. LEHRER: Excuse me.

92.) MR. ROMNEY: — where I'd like to bring money from overseas back to this country.

And finally, Medicaid to states, I'm not quite sure where that came in, except this, which is, I would like to take the Medicaid dollars that go to states and say to a state, you're going to get what you got last year plus inflation — inflation — plus 1 percent. And then you're going to manage your care for your poor in the way you think best.

And I remember as a governor, when this idea was floated by Tommy Thompson, the governors, Republican and Democrats, said, please let us do that. We can care for our own poor in so much better and more effective a way than having the federal government tell us how to care for our poor.

So let states — one of the magnificent things about this country is the whole idea that states are the laboratories of democracy. Don't have the federal government tell everybody what kind of training programs they have to have and what kind of Medicaid they have to have. Let states do this.

And by the way, if a states get — gets in trouble, why, we could step in and see if we could find a way to help them. But —

93.) MR. LEHRER: Let's go.

94.) MR. ROMNEY: But — but the right — the right approach is one which relies on the brilliance —

95.) MR. LEHRER: Two seconds.

96.) MR. ROMNEY: — of our people and states, not the federal government.

97.) MR. LEHRER: Two seconds and we're going on, still on the economy on another — but another part of it.

98.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: OK.

99.) MR. LEHRER: All right? **All right, this is this is segment three, the economy, entitlements.**

First answer goes to you. It's two minutes. Mr. President, **do you see a major difference between the two of you on Social Security?**

100.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: **You know,** I suspect that on Social Security, we've got a somewhat similar position. Social Security is structurally sound. It's going to have to be tweaked the way it was by Ronald Reagan and Speaker — Democratic Speaker Tip O'Neill. But it is — the basic structure is sound. **But — but I want to talk about the values behind Social Security and Medicare and then talk about Medicare, because that's the big driver —**

101.) MR. LEHRER: **Sure — it — you bet.**

102.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: **— of our deficits right now.**

You know, my grandmother, some of you know, helped to raise me. My grandparents did. My grandfather died awhile back. My grandmother died three days before I was elected president. And she was fiercely independent. She worked her way up, only had a high school education, started as a secretary, ended up being the vice president of a local bank. And she ended up living alone by choice. And the reason she could be independent was because of Social Security and Medicare. She had worked all her life, put in this money and understood that there was a basic guarantee, a floor under which she could not go.

And that's the perspective I bring when I think about what's called entitlements. You know, the name itself implies some sense of dependency on the part of these folks. These are folks who've worked hard, like my grandmother. And there are millions of people out there who are counting on this.

So my approach is to say, how do we strengthen the system over the long term? And in Medicare, what we did was we said, we are going to have to bring down the costs if we're going to deal with our long-term deficits, but to do that, let's look where some of the money is going. **Seven hundred and sixteen billion dollars we were able to save from the Medicare program by no longer overpaying insurance companies, by making sure that we weren't overpaying providers.**

And using that money, we were actually able to lower prescription drug costs for seniors by an average of \$600, and we were also able to make a — make a significant dent in providing them the kind of preventive care that will ultimately save money through the — throughout the system.

So the way for us to deal with Medicare in particular is to lower health care costs. But when it comes to Social Security, as I said, you don't need a major structural change in order to make sure that Social Security is there for the future.

103.) MR. LEHRER: We'll follow up on this.

First, Governor Romney, you have two minutes on Social Security and entitlements.

104.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, Jim, our seniors depend on these programs. And I know any time we talk about entitlements, people become concerned that something's going to happen that's going to change their life for the worst, and the answer is, neither the president nor I are proposing any changes for any current retirees or near retirees, either to Social Security or Medicare. So if you're 60 or around 60 or older, you don't need to listen any further.

But for younger people, we need to talk about what changes are going to be occurring.

Oh, I just thought about one, and that is in fact I was wrong when I said the president isn't proposing any changes for current retirees. In fact, he is on Medicare. On Social Security, he's not.

But on Medicare, for current retirees he's cutting \$716 billion from the program. Now, he says by not overpaying hospitals and providers, actually just going to them and saying we're going to reduce the rates you get paid across the board, everybody's going to get a lower rate. That's not just going after places where there's abuse, that's saying we're cutting the rates. Some 15 percent of hospitals and nursing homes say they won't take anymore Medicare patients under that scenario.

We also have 50 percent of doctors who say they won't take more Medicare patients. This — we have 4 million people on Medicare Advantage that will lose Medicare Advantage because of those \$716 billion in cuts. I can't understand how you can cut Medicare \$716 billion for current recipients of Medicare.

Now, you point out, well, we're putting some back; we're going to give a better prescription program. That's one — that's \$1 for every 15 (dollars) you've cut. They're smart enough to know that's not a good trade.

I want to take that \$716 billion you've cut and put it back into Medicare. By the way, we can include a prescription program if we need to improve it, but the idea of cutting \$716 billion from Medicare to be able to balance the additional cost of "Obamacare" is, in my opinion, a mistake. And with regards to young people coming along, I've got proposals to make sure Medicare and Social Security are there for them without any question.

105.) MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

106.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: First of all, I think it's important for Governor Romney to present this plan that he says will only affect folks in the future. And the essence of the plan is that he would turn Medicare into a voucher program. It's called premium support, but it's understood to be a voucher program. His running mate —

107.) MR. LEHRER: And you — **and you don't support that?**

108.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: **I don't. And — and let me explain why.**

109.) MR. ROMNEY: Again, that's for future people —

110.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: I understand.

111.) MR. ROMNEY: — right, not for current retirees.

112.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: For — for — so if you're — if you — you're 54 or 55, you might want to listen, because this — this will affect you. The idea, which was originally presented by Congressman Ryan, your running mate, is that we would give a voucher to seniors, and they could go out in the private marketplace and buy their own health insurance. The problem is that because the voucher wouldn't necessarily keep up with health care inflation, it was estimated that this would cost the average senior about \$6,000 a year.

Now, in fairness, what Governor Romney has now said is he'll maintain traditional Medicare alongside it. But there's still a problem, because what happens is those insurance companies are pretty clever at figuring out who are the younger and healthier seniors.

They recruit them leaving the older, sicker seniors in Medicare. And every health care economist who looks at it says over time what'll happen is the traditional Medicare system will collapse. And then what you've got is folks like my grandmother at the mercy of the private insurance system, precisely at the time when they are most in need of decent health care.

So I don't think vouchers are the right way to go. And this is not my own — only my opinion. AARP thinks that the — the savings that we obtained from Medicare bolster the system, lengthen the Medicare trust fund by 8 years. Benefits were not affected at all and

ironically if you repeal "Obamacare" — and I have become fond of this term, "Obamacare" — (laughter) — if you repeal it, what happens is those seniors right away are going to be paying \$600 more in prescription care. They're now going to have to be paying copays for basic check-ups that can keep them healthier.

And the primary beneficiary of that repeal are insurance companies that are estimated to gain billions of dollars back when they aren't making seniors any healthier. And I — I don't think that's right approach when it comes to making sure that Medicare is stronger over the long term.

113.) MR. LEHRER: We'll talk about — specifically about health care in a moment, but what is — do you support the voucher system, Governor?

114.) MR. ROMNEY: **What I support is no change for current retirees and near-retirees to Medicare and the president supports taking \$716 billion out of that program.**

115.) MR. LEHRER: What about the vouchers?

116.) MR. ROMNEY: So that's — that's number one.

117.) MR. LEHRER: OK. All right.

118.) MR. ROMNEY: **Number two is for people coming along that are young. What I'd do to make sure that we can keep Medicare in place for them is to allow them either to choose the current Medicare program or a private plan — their choice.** They get to — and they'll have at least two plans that will be entirely at no cost to them. So they don't have to pay additional money, no additional \$6,000. That's not going to happen.

They'll have at least two plans.

And by the way, if the government can be as efficient as the private sector and offer premiums that are as low as the private sector, people will be happy to get traditional Medicare, or they'll be able to get a private plan. I know my own view is I'd rather have a private plan. I — I'd just as soon not have the government telling me what kind of health care I get. I'd rather be able to have an insurance company. If I don't like them, I can get rid of them and find a different insurance company. But people will make their own choice.

The other thing we have to do to save Medicare, we have to have the benefits high for those that are low-income, but for higher-income people, we're going to have to lower some of the benefits. We have to make sure this program is there for the long term. That's the plan that I've put forward.

And by the way, the idea came not even from Paul Ryan or — or Senator Wyden, who's a co-author of the bill with — with Paul Ryan in the Senate, but also it came from Bill Clinton's — Bill Clinton's chief of staff. This is an idea that's been around a long time, which is saying, hey, let's see if we can't get competition into the Medicare world so that

people can get the choice of different plans at lower cost, better quality. I believe in competition.

119.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Jim, if I — if I can just respond very quickly, first of all, every study has shown that Medicare has lower administrative cost than private insurance does, which is why seniors are generally pretty happy with it. And private insurers have to make a profit. Nothing wrong with that; that's what they do. And so you've got higher administrative costs, plus profit on top of that, and if you are going to save any money through what Governor Romney's proposing, what has to happen is that the money has to come from somewhere.

And when you move to a voucher system, you are putting seniors at the mercy of those insurance companies. And over time, if traditional Medicare has decayed or fallen apart, then they're stuck. And this is the reason why AARP has said that your plan would weaken Medicare substantially, and that's why they were supportive of the approach that we took.

One last point I want to make. We do have to lower the cost of health care. Not just in Medicare and —

120.) MR. LEHRER: We'll talk about that in a minute.

121.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: — but — but overall.

122.) MR. LEHRER: Go. OK.

123.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: And so —

124.) MR. ROMNEY: That's — that's a big topic. Could we — could we stay on Medicare?

125.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Is that a — is that a separate topic? I'm sorry.

126.) MR. LEHRER: Yeah, we're going to — yeah. I want to get to it, but all I want to do is very quickly —

127.) MR. ROMNEY:Let's get back to Medicare.

128.) MR. LEHRER: — before we leave the economy —

129.) MR. ROMNEY:Let's get back to Medicare.

130.) MR. LEHRER:No, no, no, no —

131.) MR. ROMNEY: The president said that the government can provide the service at lower —

132.) MR. LEHRER: No.

133.) MR. ROMNEY: — cost and without a profit.

134.) MR. LEHRER: All right.

135.) MR. ROMNEY: If that's the case, then it will always be the best product that people can purchase. But my experience —

136.) MR. LEHRER: Wait a minute, Governor.

137.) MR. ROMNEY: My experience is the private sector typically is able to provide a better product at a lower cost.

138.) MR. LEHRER: Can we — **can the two of you agree** that the voters have a choice, a clear choice between the two of you —

139.) MR. ROMNEY: Absolutely.

140.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Yes.

141.) MR. LEHRER: — on Medicare?

142.) MR. ROMNEY: Absolutely.

143.) MR. LEHRER: All right. So, to finish quickly, briefly, on the economy, what is your view about the level of federal regulation of the economy right now? Is there too much, and in your case, Mr. President, is there — should there be more? Beginning with you — this is not a new two-minute segment — to start, and we'll go for a few minutes and then we're going to go to health care. OK?

144.) MR. ROMNEY: Regulation is essential. You can't have a free market work if you don't have regulation. As a business person, I had to have — I needed to know the regulations. I needed them there. You couldn't have people opening up banks in their — in their garage and making loans. I mean, you have to have regulations so that you can have an economy work. Every free economy has good regulation.

At the same time, regulation can become excessive.

145.) MR. LEHRER: Is it excessive now, do you think?

146.) MR. ROMNEY: In some places, yes, in other places, no.

147.) MR. LEHRER: Like where?

148.) MR. ROMNEY: It can become out of date. And what's happened in — with some of the legislation that's been passed during the president's term, you've seen regulation become excessive and it's hurt the — it's hurt the economy. Let me give you an example. Dodd- Frank was passed, and it includes within it a number of provisions that I think have some unintended consequences that are harmful to the economy. One is it designates a

number of banks as too big to fail, and they're effectively guaranteed by the federal government.

This is the biggest kiss that's been given to — to New York banks I've ever seen. This is an enormous boon for them. There's been — 122 community and small banks have closed since Dodd-Frank. So there's one example.

Here's another. In Dodd-Frank, it says that —

149.) MR. LEHRER: You want to repeal Dodd-Frank?

150.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, I would repeal it and replace it. You — we're not going to get rid of all regulation. You have to have regulation. And there's some parts of Dodd-Frank that make all the sense in the world. You need transparency, you need to have leverage limits for institutes —

151.) MR. LEHRER: Well, here's a specific — let's — excuse me —

152.) MR. ROMNEY: Let me mention the other one. Let's talk the —

153.) MR. LEHRER: No, no, let's do — right now, let's not. Let's let him respond.

154.) MR. ROMNEY: OK.

155.) MR. LEHRER: Let's let him respond to this specific on Dodd-Frank and what the governor just said.

156.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, I think this is a great example. The reason we have been in such a enormous economic crisis was prompted by reckless behavior across the board. Now, it wasn't just on Wall Street. You had — loan officers were — they were giving loans and mortgages that really shouldn't have been given, because they're — the folks didn't qualify. You had people who were borrowing money to buy a house that they couldn't afford. You had credit agencies that were stamping these as A-1 (ph) great investments when they weren't. But you also had banks making money hand-over-fist, churning out products that the bankers themselves didn't even understand in order to make big profits, but knowing that it made the entire system vulnerable.

So what did we do? We stepped in and had the toughest reforms on Wall Street since the 1930s. We said you've got — banks, you've got to raise your capital requirements. You can't engage in some of this risky behavior that is putting Main Street at risk. We're going to make sure that you've got to have a living will, so — so we can know how you're going to wind things down if you make a bad bet so we don't have other taxpayer bailouts.

In the meantime, by the way, we also made sure that all the help that we provided those banks was paid back, every single dime, with interest.

Now, Governor Romney has said he wants to repeal Dodd-Frank, and, you know, I appreciate, and it appears we've got some agreement that a marketplace to work has to have some regulation, but in the past, Governor Romney has said he just wants to repeal

Dodd-Frank, roll it back. And so the question is does anybody out there think that the big problem we had is that there was too much oversight and regulation of Wall Street? Because if you do, then Governor Romney is your candidate. But that's not what I believe.

157.) MR. ROMNEY: (Inaudible) — sorry, Jim. That — that's just not — that's just not the facts. Look, we have to have regulation of Wall Street.

158.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Yeah.

159.) MR. ROMNEY: That — that's why I'd have regulation. But I wouldn't designate five banks as too big to fail and give them a blank check. That's one of the unintended consequences of Dodd-Frank. It wasn't thought through properly. We need to get rid of that provision, because it's killing regional and small banks. They're getting hurt.

Let me mention another regulation of Dodd-Frank. You say we were giving mortgages to people who weren't qualified. That's exactly right. It's one of the reasons for the great financial calamity we had. And so Dodd-Frank correctly says we need to —

160.) MR. LEHRER: All right.

161.) MR. ROMNEY: — have qualified mortgages, and if you give a mortgage that's not qualified, there are big penalties. Except they didn't ever go on to define what a qualified mortgage was.

162.) MR. LEHRER: All right.

163.) MR. ROMNEY: It's been two years. We don't know what a qualified mortgage is yet. So banks are reluctant to make loans, mortgages. Try and get a mortgage these days. It's hurt the housing market —

164.) MR. LEHRER: All right —

165.) MR. ROMNEY: — because Dodd-Frank didn't anticipate putting in place the kinds of regulations you have to have. It's not that Dodd-Frank always was wrong with too much regulation. Sometimes they didn't come out with a clear regulation.

166.) MR. LEHRER: OK.

167.) MR. ROMNEY: I will make sure we don't hurt the functioning of our — of our marketplace and our businesses, because I want to bring back housing and get good jobs.

168.) MR. LEHRER: All right, I think we have another clear difference between the two of you. **Now let's move to health care, where I know there is a clear difference — (laughter) — and that has to do with the Affordable Care Act, "Obamacare."**

And it's a two-minute new segment, and it's — that means two minutes each. And you go first, Governor Romney. You wanted repeal. You want the Affordable Care Act repealed. Why?

169.) MR. ROMNEY: I sure do. Well, in part, it comes, again, from my experience. I was in New Hampshire. A woman came to me, and she said, look, I can't afford insurance for myself or my son. I met a couple in Appleton, Wisconsin, and they said, we're thinking of dropping our insurance; we can't afford it. And the number of small businesses I've gone to that are saying they're dropping insurance because they can't afford it — the cost of health care is just prohibitive. And — and we've got to deal with cost.

And unfortunately, when — when you look at "Obamacare," **the Congressional Budget Office has said it will cost \$2,500 a year more than traditional insurance. So it's adding to cost.** And as a matter of fact, when the president ran for office, he said that by this year he would have brought down the cost of insurance for each family by \$2,500 a family. Instead, it's gone up by that amount. **So it's expensive. Expensive things hurt families. So that's one reason I don't want it.**

Second reason, it cuts \$716 billion from Medicare to pay for it. I want to put that money back in Medicare for our seniors.

Number three, it puts in place an unelected board that's going to tell people, ultimately, what kind of treatments they can have. I don't like that idea.

Fourth, there was a survey done of small businesses across the country. It said, what's been the effect of "Obamacare" on your hiring plans? And three-quarters of them said, it makes us less likely to hire people. I just don't know how the president could have come into office, facing 23 million people out of work, rising unemployment, an economic crisis at the — at the kitchen table and spent his energy and passion for two years fighting for "Obamacare" instead of fighting for jobs for the American people.

It has killed jobs. And the best course for health care is to do what we did in my state, craft a plan at the state level that fits the needs of the state. And then let's focus on getting the costs down for people rather than raising it with the \$2,500 additional premium.

170.) MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, the argument against repeal.

171.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, four years ago when I was running for office I was traveling around and having those same conversations that Governor Romney talks about. And it wasn't just that small businesses were seeing costs skyrocket and they couldn't get affordable coverage even if they wanted to provide it to their employees; it wasn't just that this was the biggest driver of our federal deficit, our overall health care costs. But it was families who were worried about going bankrupt if they got sick — millions of families, all across the country.

If they had a pre-existing condition they might not be able to get coverage at all. If they did have coverage, insurance companies might impose an arbitrary limit. And so as a consequence, they're paying their premiums, somebody gets really sick, lo and behold they don't have enough money to pay the bills because the insurance companies say that they've hit the limit. So we did work on this alongside working on jobs, because this is part of making sure that middle-class families are secure in this country.

And let me tell you exactly what "Obamacare" did. **Number one, if you've got health insurance it doesn't mean a government take over.** You keep your own insurance. You keep your own doctor. But it does say insurance companies can't jerk you around. They can't impose arbitrary lifetime limits. They have to let you keep your kid on their insurance — your insurance plan till you're 26 years old. And it also says that they're — you're going to have to get rebates if insurance companies are spending more on administrative costs and profits than they are on actual care.

Number two, if you don't have health insurance, we're essentially setting up a group plan that allows you to benefit from group rates that are typically 18 percent lower than if you're out there trying to get insurance on the individual market.

Now, the last point I'd make before —

172.) MR. LEHRER: Two minutes —

173.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: — before —

174.) MR. LEHRER: Two minutes is up, sir.

175.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: No, I — I think I've — I had five seconds before you interrupted me — was — (laughter) — that the irony is that we've seen this model work really well in Massachusetts, because Governor Romney did a good thing, working with Democrats in the state to set up what is essentially the identical model. And as a consequence, people are covered there. It hasn't destroyed jobs. And as a consequence, we now have a system in which we have the opportunity to start bringing down cost, as opposed to just —

176.) MR. LEHRER: Your five —

177.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: — leaving millions of people out in the cold.

178.) MR. LEHRER: Your five seconds went away a long time ago. (Laughter.)

179.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: That —

180.) MR. LEHRER: All right, Governor. Governor, tell the — tell the president directly why you think what he just said is wrong about "Obamacare."

181.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, I did with my first statement.

182.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: You did.

183.) MR. ROMNEY: But I'll go on.

184.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Please elaborate.

185.) MR. ROMNEY: I'll elaborate.

Exactly right.

First of all, I like the way we did it in Massachusetts. I like the fact that in my state, we had Republicans and Democrats come together and work together. What you did instead was to push through a plan without a single Republican vote. As a matter of fact, when Massachusetts did something quite extraordinary, elected a Republican senator to stop "Obamacare," you pushed it through anyway. So entirely on a partisan basis, instead of bringing America together and having a discussion on this important topic, you pushed through something that you and Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid thought was the best answer and drove it through.

What we did, in a legislature 87 percent Democrat, we worked together. Two hundred legislators in my legislature — only two voted against the plan by the time we were finished.

What were some differences?

We didn't raise taxes. You've raised them by a trillion dollars under "Obamacare." We didn't cut Medicare. Of course, we don't have Medicare, but we didn't cut Medicare by \$716 billion. We didn't put in place a board that can tell people ultimately what treatments they're going to receive.

We didn't — we didn't also do something that I think a number of people across this country recognize, which is put — put people in a position where they're going to lose the insurance they had and they wanted. Right now, the CBO says up to 20 million people will lose their insurance as "Obamacare" goes into effect next year. And likewise, a study by McKinsey & Company of American businesses said 30 percent of them are anticipating dropping people from coverage. So for those reasons, for the tax, for Medicare, for this board and for people losing their insurance, this is why the American people don't want — don't want "Obamacare." It's why Republicans said, do not do this.

And the Republicans had a — had a plan. They put a plan out. They put out a plan, a bipartisan plan. It was swept aside. I think something this big, this important has to be done in a bipartisan basis. And we have to have a president who can reach across the aisle and fashion important legislation with the input from both parties.

186.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Governor Romney said this has to be done on a bipartisan basis. This was a bipartisan idea. In fact, it was a Republican idea.

And Governor Romney, at the beginning of this debate, wrote and said, what we did in Massachusetts could be a model for the nation. And I agree that the Democratic legislators in Massachusetts might have given some advice to Republicans in Congress about how to cooperate, but the fact of the matter is, we used the same advisers, and they say it's the same plan.

It — when Governor Romney talks about this board, for example — unelected board that we've created — what this is, is a group of health care experts, doctors, et cetera, to figure out how can we reduce the cost of care in the system overall, because the — there are two ways of dealing with our health care crisis.

One is to simply leave a whole bunch of people uninsured and let them fend for themselves, to let businesses figure out how long they can continue to pay premiums until finally they just give up and their workers are no longer getting insured, and that's been the trend line. Or, alternatively, we can figure out how do we make the cost of care more effective. And there are ways of doing it.

So at — at Cleveland Clinic, one of the best health care systems in the world, they actually provide great care cheaper than average. And the reason they do is because they do some smart things. They — they say, if a patient's coming in, let's get all the doctors together at once, do one test instead of having the patient run around with 10 tests. Let's make sure that we're providing preventive care so we're catching the onset of something like diabetes. Let's — let's pay providers on the basis of performance as opposed to on the basis of how many procedures they've — they've engaged in. Now, so what this board does is basically identifies best practices and says, let's use the purchasing power of Medicare and Medicaid to help to institutionalize all these good things that we do.

And the fact of the matter is that when "Obamacare" is fully implemented, we're going to be in a position to show that costs are going down. And over the last two years, health care premiums have gone up, it's true, but they've gone up slower than any time in the last 50 years. So we're already beginning to see progress. In the meantime, folks out there with insurance, you're already getting a rebate.

Let me make one last point. Governor Romney says we should replace it. I'm just going to repeal it, but we can replace it with something. But the problem is he hasn't described what exactly we'd replace it with other than saying we're going to leave it to the states.

But the fact of the matter is that some of the prescriptions that he's offered, like letting you buy insurance across state lines, there's no indication that that somehow is going to help somebody who's got a pre-existing condition be able to finally buy insurance. In fact, it's estimated that by repealing "Obamacare," you're looking at 50 million people losing health insurance at a time when it's vitally important.

187.) MR. LEHRER: Let's let the governor explain what you would do if "Obamacare" is repealed. How would you replace it? What do you have in mind?

188.) MR. ROMNEY: Let — well, actually — actually it's — it's — it's a lengthy description, but number one, pre-existing conditions are covered under my plan. Number two, young people are able to stay on their family plan. That's already offered in the private marketplace; you don't have — have the government mandate that for that to occur.

But let's come back to something the president — I agree on, which is the — the key task we have in health care is to get the costs down so it's more affordable for families, and — and then he has as a model for doing that a board of people at the government, an unelected board, appointed board, who are going to decide what kind of treatment you ought to have.

189.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: No, it isn't.

190.) MR. ROMNEY: In my opinion, the government is not effective in — in bringing down the cost of almost anything. As a matter of fact, free people and free enterprises trying to find ways to do things better are able to be more effective in bringing down the costs than the government will ever be. Your example of the Cleveland clinic is my case in point, along with several others I could describe. This is the private market. These are small — these are enterprises competing with each other, learning how to do better and better jobs.

I used to consult to businesses — excuse me, to hospitals and to health care providers. I was astonished at the creativity and innovation that exists in the American people. In order to bring the cost of health care down, we don't need to have a — an — a board of 15 people telling us what kinds of treatments we should have. We instead need to put insurance plans, providers, hospitals, doctors on targets such that they have an incentive, as you say, performance pay, for doing an excellent job, for keeping costs down, and that's happening.

Intermountain Health Care does it superbly well.

191.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: They do.

192.) MR. ROMNEY: Mayo Clinic is doing it superbly well, Cleveland Clinic, others. But the right answer is not to have the federal government take over health care and start mandating to the providers across America, telling a patient and a doctor what kind of treatment they can have. That's the wrong way to go. The private market and individual responsibility always work best.

193.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Let me just point out, first of all, this board that we're talking about can't make decisions about what treatments are given. That's explicitly prohibited in the law.

But let's go back to what Governor Romney indicated, that under his plan he would be able to cover people with pre-existing conditions. Well, actually, Governor, that isn't what your plan does. What your plan does is to duplicate what's already the law, which says if you are out of health insurance for three months then you can end up getting continuous coverage and an insurance company can't deny you if you've — if it's been under 90 days.

But that's already the law. And that doesn't help the millions of people out there with pre-existing conditions. There's a reason why Governor Romney set up the plan that he did in Massachusetts. It wasn't a government takeover of health care. It was the largest expansion of private insurance. But what it does say is that insurers, you've got to take everybody. Now, that also means that you've got more customers.

But when Governor Romney says that he'll replace it with something but can't detail how it will be in fact replaced, and the reason he set up the system he did in Massachusetts is because there isn't a better way of dealing with the pre-existing conditions problem, it — it just reminds me of — you know, he says that he's going to close deductions and loopholes for his tax plan.

That's how it's going to be paid for. But we don't know the details. He says that he's going to replace Dodd-Frank, Wall Street reform. But we don't know exactly which ones. He won't tell us. He now says he's going to replace "Obamacare" and assure that all the good things that are in it are going to be in there and you don't have to worry.

And at some point, I think the American people have to ask themselves, is the reason that Governor Romney is keeping all these plans to replace secret because they're too good? Is — is it because that somehow middle-class families are going to benefit too much from them? No, the — the reason is because when we reform Wall Street, when we tackle the problem of pre-existing conditions, then, you know, these are tough problems, and we've got to make choices. And the choices we've made have been ones that ultimately are benefiting middle-class families all across the country.

194.) MR. LEHRER: All right, we're going to move to a —

195.) MR. ROMNEY: No, I — I have to respond to that —

196.) MR. LEHRER: No, but —

197.) MR. ROMNEY: — which is — which is my experience as a governor is if I come in and — and lay down a piece of legislation and say it's my way or the highway, I don't get a lot done. What I do is the same way that Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan worked together some years ago. When Ronald Reagan ran for office, he laid out the principles that he was going to foster. He said he was going to lower tax rates. He said he was going to broaden the base. You've said the same thing: You're going to simplify the tax code, broaden the base. Those are my principles.

I want to bring down the tax burden on middle-income families. And I'm going to work together with Congress to say, OK, what are the various ways we could bring down deductions, for instance? One way, for instance, would be to have a single number. Make up a number — 25,000 (dollars), \$50,000. Anybody can have deductions up to that amount. And then that number disappears for high-income people. That's one way one could do it. One could follow Bowles-Simpson as a model and take deduction by deduction and make differences that way.

There are alternatives to accomplish the objective I have, which is to bring down rates, broaden the base, simplify the code and create incentives for growth.

And with regards to health care, you had remarkable details with regards to my pre-existing condition plan. You obviously studied up on — on my plan. In fact, I do have a plan that deals with people with pre-existing conditions. That's part of my health care plan. And what we did in Massachusetts is a model for the nation, state by state. And I said that at that time. The federal government taking over health care for the entire nation and whisking aside the 10th Amendment, which gives states the rights for these kinds of things, is not the course for America to have a stronger, more vibrant economy.

198.) MR. LEHRER: That is a terrific segue to our next segment, and is the role of government. And let's see, role of government and it is — you are first on this, Mr. President. The question is this. Do you believe — both of you — but you have the first

two minutes on this, Mr. President — **do you believe there's a fundamental difference between the two of you as to how you view the mission of the federal government?**

199.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, I definitely think there are differences.

200.) MR. LEHRER: And — yeah.

201.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: **The first role of the federal government is to keep the American people safe. That's its most basic function.** And as commander in chief, that is something that I've worked on and thought about every single day that I've been in the Oval Office.

But I also believe that government has the capacity — the federal government has the capacity to help open up opportunity and create ladders of opportunity and to create frameworks where the American people can succeed. Look, the genius of America is the free enterprise system, and freedom, and the fact that people can go out there and start a business, work on an idea, make their own decisions.

But as Abraham Lincoln understood, there are also some things we do better together.

So in the middle of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln said, let's help to finance the Transcontinental Railroad. Let's start the National Academy of Sciences. Let's start land grant colleges, because we want to give these gateways of opportunity for all Americans, because if all Americans are getting opportunity, we're all going to be better off. That doesn't restrict people's freedom; that enhances it.

And so what I've tried to do as president is to apply those same principles. And when it comes to education, what I've said is we've got to reform schools that are not working. We use something called Race to the Top. Wasn't a top-down approach, Governor. What we've said is to states, we'll give you more money if you initiate reforms. And as a consequence, you had 46 states around the country who have made a real difference.

But what I've also said is let's hire another hundred thousand math and science teachers to make sure we maintain our technological lead and our people are skilled and able to succeed. And hard-pressed states right now can't all do that. In fact, we've seen layoffs of hundreds of thousands of teachers over the last several years, and Governor Romney doesn't think we need more teachers. I do, because I think that that is the kind of investment where the federal government can help. It can't do it all, but it can make a difference, and as a consequence, we'll have a better-trained workforce, and that will create jobs, because companies want to locate in places where we've got a skilled workforce.

202.) MR. LEHRER: Two minutes, Governor, on the role of government, your view.

203.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, first, I love great schools. Massachusetts, our schools are ranked number one of all 50 states. And the key to great schools: great teachers. So I reject the idea that I don't believe in great teachers or more teachers. Every school district, every state should make that decision on their own.

The role of government — look behind us: the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

The role of government is to promote and protect the principles of those documents. **First, life and liberty. We have a responsibility to protect the lives and liberties of our people, and that means the military, second to none. I do not believe in cutting our military. I believe in maintaining the strength of America's military.**

Second, in that line that says, we are endowed by our Creator with our rights — I believe we must maintain our commitment to religious tolerance and freedom in this country. That statement also says that we are endowed by our Creator with the right to pursue happiness as we choose. I interpret that as, one, making sure that those people who are less fortunate and can't care for themselves are cared by — by one another.

We're a nation that believes we're all children of the same God. And we care for those that have difficulties — those that are elderly and have problems and challenges, those that disabled, we care for them. And we look for discovery and innovation, all these things desired out of the American heart to provide the pursuit of happiness for our citizens.

But we also believe in maintaining for individuals the right to pursue their dreams, and not to have the government substitute itself for the rights of free individuals. And what we're seeing right now is, in my view, a — a trickle-down government approach which has government thinking it can do a better job than free people pursuing their dreams. And it's not working.

And the proof of that is 23 million people out of work. The proof of that is one out of six people in poverty. The proof of that is we've gone from 32 million on food stamps to 47 million on food stamps. The proof of that is that 50 percent of college graduates this year can't find work.

204.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: (Inaudible) —

205.) MR. ROMNEY: We know that the path we're taking is not working. It's time for a new path.

206.) MR. LEHRER: All right, let's go through some specifics in terms of what — how each of you views the role of government. How do — education. Does the federal government have a responsibility to improve the quality of public education in America?

207.) MR. ROMNEY: Well, the primary responsibility for education is — is of course at the state and local level. But the federal government also can play a very important role. And I — and I agree with Secretary Arne Duncan. He's — there's some ideas he's put forward on Race to the Top — not all of them but some of them I agree with, and congratulate him for pursuing that. The federal government can get local and — and state schools to do a better job.

My own view, by the way, is I've added to that. I happen to believe — I want the kids that are getting federal dollars from IDEA or — or Title I — these are disabled kids or — or poor kids or — or lower-income kids, rather. I want them to be able to go to the school of

their choice. So all federal funds, instead of going to the — to the state or to the school district, I'd have go — if you will, follow the child and let the parent and the child decide where to send their — their — their student.

208.) MR. LEHRER: How do you see the federal government's responsibility to — as I say, to improve the quality of public education in this country?

209.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, as I've indicated, I think that it has a significant role to play. Through our Race to the Top program, we've worked with Republican and Democratic governors to initiate major reforms, and they're having an impact right now.

210.) MR. LEHRER: Do you think you have a difference with your views and those of Governor Romney on — about education and the federal government?

211.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: You know, this is where budgets matter because budgets reflect choices. So when Governor Romney indicates that he wants to cut taxes and potentially benefit folks like me and him, and to pay for it, we're having to initiate significant cuts in federal support for education, that makes a difference.

You know, his running mate, Congressman Ryan, put forward a budget that reflects many of the principles that Governor Romney's talked about. And it wasn't very detailed. This seems to be a trend. But — but what it did do is to — if you extrapolated how much money we're talking about, you'd look at cutting the education budget by up to 20 percent.

When it comes to community colleges, we are seeing great work done out there all over the country because we have the opportunity to train people for jobs that exist right now. And one of the things I suspect Governor Romney and I probably agree on is getting businesses to work with community colleges so that they're setting up their training programs —

212.) MR. LEHRER: Do you agree, Governor?

213.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Let — let — let me just finish the point.

214.) MR. ROMNEY: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah.

215.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: I suspect it'll be a small agreement.

216.) MR. ROMNEY: It's going over well in my state, by the way, yeah.

217.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: The — where their partnering so that — they're designing training programs, and people who are going through them know that there's a job waiting for them if they complete them. That makes a big difference. But that requires some federal support.

Let me just say one final example. When it comes to making college affordable — whether it's two-year or four-year — one of the things that I did as president was we were sending \$60 billion to banks and lenders as middle men for the student loan program,

even though the loans were guaranteed. So there was no risk for the banks or the lenders but they were taking billions out of the system.

And we said, why not cut out the middle man? And as a consequence, what we've been able to do is to provide millions more students assistance, lower or keep low interest rates on student loans. And this is an example of where our priorities make a difference. Governor Romney, I genuinely believe, cares about education. But when he tells a student that, you know, you should borrow money from your parents to go to college, you know, that indicates the degree to which, you know, there may not be as much of a focus on the fact that folks like myself, folks like Michelle, kids probably who attend University of Denver just don't have that option.

And for us to be able to make sure that they've got that opportunity and they can walk through that door, that is vitally important — not just to those kids. It's how we're going to grow this economy over the long term.

218.) MR. LEHRER: We're running out of time.

219.) MR. ROMNEY: Jim, Jim —

220.) MR. LEHRER: I'm certainly going give you a chance to respond to that. Yes, sir, Governor.

221.) MR. ROMNEY: Mr. — Mr. President, you're entitled, as the president, to your own airplane and to your own house, but not to your own facts — (laughter) — all right? I'm — I'm not going to cut education funding. I don't have any plan to cut education funding and grants that go to people going to college. I'm planning on continuing to grow, so I'm not planning on making changes there.

But you make a very good point, which is that the — the place you put your money makes a pretty clear indication of where your heart is. You put \$90 billion into — into green jobs. And — and I — look, I'm all in favor of green energy. Ninety billion (dollars) — that — that would have — that would have hired 2 million teachers. Ninety billion dollars. And these businesses — many of them have gone out of business. I think about half of them, of the ones have been invested in, they've gone out of business. A number of them happened to be owned by — by people who were contributors to your campaigns.

Look, the right course for — for America's government — we were talking about the role of government — is not to become the economic player picking winners and losers, telling people what kind of health treatment they can receive, taking over the health care system that — that has existed in this country for — for a long, long time and has produced the best health records in the world. The right answer for government is to say, how do we make the private sector become more efficient and more effective?

How do we get schools to be more competitive? Let's grade them. I propose we grade our schools so parents know which schools are succeeding and failing, so they can take their child to a — to a school that's being more successful. I don't — I don't want to cut our commitment to education; I wanted to make it more effective and efficient.

And by the way, I've had that experience. I don't just talk about it. I've been there. Massachusetts schools are ranked number one in the nation. This is not because I didn't have commitment to education. It's because I care about education for all of our kids.

222.) **MR. LEHRER:** All right, gentlemen, look —

223.) **PRESIDENT OBAMA:** Jim, I — (inaudible) —

224.) **MR. LEHRER:** Excuse me, one sec — excuse, me sir. (Laughter.) We've got — we've got — barely have three minutes left. I'm not going to grade the two of you and say you've — your answers have been too long or I've done a poor job —

225.) **PRESIDENT OBAMA:** You've done a great job, Jim.

226.) **MR. LEHRER:** Oh, well, no. But the fact is, government — the role of government and governing, we've lost a (pod ?), **in other words, so we only have three minutes left in the — in the debate before we go to your closing statements. And so I want to ask finally here** — and remember, we've got three minutes total time here.

And the question is this: **Many of the legislative functions of the federal government right now are in a state of paralysis as a result of partisan gridlock. If elected in your case, if re-elected in your case, what would you do about that?**

Governor?

227.) **MR. ROMNEY:** Jim, I had the great experience — it didn't seem like it at the time — of being elected in a state where my legislature was 87 percent Democrat, and that meant I figured out from day one I had to get along and I had to work across the aisle to get anything done. We drove our schools to be number one in the nation. We cut taxes 19 times.

228.) **MR. LEHRER:** Well, what would you do as president?

229.) **MR. ROMNEY:** We — as president, I will sit down on day one — actually the day after I get elected, I'll sit down with leaders — the Democratic leaders as well as Republican leaders and — as we did in my state. We met every Monday for a couple hours, talked about the issues and the challenges in the — in the — in our state, in that case. We have to work on a collaborative basis — not because we're going to compromise our principle(s), but because there's common ground.

And the challenges America faces right now — look, the reason I'm in this race is there are people that are really hurting today in this country, and we face — this deficit could crush the future generations. What's happening in the Middle East? There are developments around the world that are of real concern. And Republicans and Democrats both love America, but **we need to have leadership — leadership in Washington that will actually bring people together and get the job done and could not care less if it's a Republican or a Democrat. I've done it before. I'll do it again.**

230.) **MR. LEHRER:** Mr. President.

231.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, first of all, I think Governor Romney's going to have a busy first day, because he's also going to repeal "Obamacare," which will not be very popular among Democrats as you're sitting down with them.

(Laughter.)

But look, my philosophy has been I will take ideas from anybody, Democrat or Republican, as long as they're advancing the cause of making middle-class families stronger and giving ladders of opportunity into the middle class. That's how we cut taxes for middle-class families and small businesses. That's how we cut a trillion dollars of spending that wasn't advancing that cause. That's how we signed three trade deals into law that are helping us to double our exports and sell more American products around the world. That's how we repealed "don't ask, don't tell." That's how we ended the war in Iraq, as I promised, and that's how we're going to wind down the war in Afghanistan. That's how we went after al-Qaida and bin Laden.

So we've — we've seen progress even under Republican control of the House or Representatives. But ultimately, part of being principled, part of being a leader is, A, being able to describe exactly what it is that you intend to do, not just saying, I'll sit down, but you have to have a plan.

Number two, what's important is occasionally you've got to say now to — to — to folks both in your own party and in the other party. And you know, yes, have we had some fights between me and the Republicans when they fought back against us, reining in the excesses of Wall Street? Absolutely, because that was a fight that needed to be had. When — when we were fighting about whether or not we were going to make sure that Americans had more security with their health insurance and they said no, yes, that was a fight that we needed to have. And so part of leadership and governing is both saying what it is that you are for, but also being willing to say no to some things.

And I've got to tell you, Governor Romney, when it comes to his own party during the course of this campaign, has not displayed that willingness to say no to some of the more extreme parts of his party.

232.) MR. LEHRER: That brings us to closing statements. There was a coin toss. Governor Romney, you won the toss, and you elected to go last.

So you have a closing two minutes, Mr. President.

233.) PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, Jim, I want to thank you and I want to thank Governor Romney, because I think this was a terrific debate and I very much appreciate it.

And I want to thank the University of Denver.

You know, four years ago we were going through a major crisis, and yet my faith and confidence in the American future is undiminished. And the reason is because of its people. Because of the woman I met in North Carolina who decided at 55 to go back to school because she wanted to inspire her daughter, and now has a new job from that new

training that she's gotten. Because of the company in Minnesota who was willing to give up salaries and perks for their executives to make sure that they didn't lay off workers during a recession. The auto workers that you meet in Toledo or Detroit take such pride in building the best cars in the world — not just because of a paycheck, but because it gives them that sense of pride, that they're helping to build America.

And so the question now is, how do we build on those strengths? And everything that **I've tried to do** and everything that I'm now proposing for the next four years in terms of improving our education system, or developing American energy, or making sure that we're closing loopholes for companies that are shipping jobs overseas and focusing on small businesses and companies that are creating jobs here in the United States, or — or closing our deficit in a responsible, balanced way that allows us to invest in our future — all those things are designed to make sure that the American people, their genius, their grit, their determination is — is channeled, and — and — and they have an opportunity to succeed.

And everybody's getting a fair shot and everybody's getting a fair share. Everybody's doing a fair share and everybody's playing by the same rules.

You know, four years ago I said that I'm not a perfect man and I wouldn't be a perfect president. And that's probably a promise that Governor Romney thinks I've kept. But I also promised that I'd fight every single day on behalf of the American people and the middle class and all those who are striving to get in the middle class.

I've kept that promise and if you'll vote for me, then I promise I'll fight just as hard in a second term.

234.) MR. LEHRER: Governor Romney, your two-minute closing.

235.) MR. ROMNEY: Thank you, Jim and Mr. President. And thank you for tuning in this evening. This is a — this is an important election. And I'm concerned about America. I'm concerned about the direction America has been taking over the last four years. I know this is bigger than election about the two of us as individuals. It's bigger than our respective parties. It's an election about the course of America — what kind of America do you want to have for yourself and for your children.

And there really are two very different paths that we began speaking about this evening. And over the course of this month we're going to have two more presidential debates and vice presidential debate. We'll talk about those two paths. But they lead in very different directions. And it's not just looking to our words that you have to take in evidence of where they go; you can look at the record.

There's no question in my mind that if the president were to be re-elected you'll continue to see a middle-class squeeze with incomes going down and prices going up. I'll get incomes up again. You'll see chronic unemployment. We've had 43 straight months with unemployment above 8 percent. If I'm president, **I will create — help create 12 million new jobs in this country with rising incomes.**

If the president's re-elected, "Obamacare" will be fully installed. In my view, that's going to mean a whole different way of life for people who counted on the insurance plan they had in the past. Many will lose it. You're going to see health premiums go up by some \$2,500 per — per family. If I'm elected, we won't have "Obamacare." We'll put in place the kind of principles that I put in place in my own state and allow each state to craft their own programs to get people insured. And we'll focus on getting the cost of health care down.

If the president were to be re-elected, you're going to see a \$716 billion cut to Medicare. You'll have 4 million people who will lose Medicare advantage. You'll have hospitals and providers that'll no longer accept Medicare patients.

I'll restore that \$716 billion to Medicare.

And finally, military. If the president's re-elected, you'll see dramatic cuts to our military. The secretary of defense has said these would be even devastating. I will not cut our commitment to our military. I will keep America strong and get America's middle class working again.

Thank you, Jim.

236.) MR. LEHRER: Thank you, Governor.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The next debate will be the vice presidential event on Thursday, October 11th at Center College in Danville, Kentucky. For now, from the University of Denver, I'm Jim Lehrer. Thank you, and good night. (Cheers, applause.)