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ABSTRACT


This thesis is aimed at knowing the presupposition in 2012 American Presidential Debate between Barrack Obama and Mitt Romney based Yule’s presupposition theory. The writer uses the descriptive qualitative method to describe, identify and analyze conversation between Obama and Romney to find presupposition which emerges from the debate.

The writer analyzes this research through several steps. As the first step, the writer watche the presidential debate on you tube site. The second step, the writer analyzed the transcript of the debate as the unit of analysis. The method in this research is descriptive qualitative method. The writer also collected the data which indicate the existence of presupposition. The last, the compiled data was analyzed through discourse analysis.

From this research, the writer found several statements in the conversation of the debate that indicate the existence of presupposition. The presupposition comes out when the speakers have assumption about particular issue on their mind. What is presupposed, then is classified into their own types.
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CHAPTER I

A. Background of The Study

Whatever else people do when they come together—whether they play, fight, make love or make automobiles—they talk. We live in a world of language. We talk to our friends, our associates, our wives and husbands, our lovers, our teachers, our parents and in law. We talk to bus drivers and total strangers. We talk face-to-face and over the telephone, and everyone responds with more talk. Television and radio further swell this torrent of words. Hardly a moment of our waking lives is free from words, and even in our dreams we talk and are talked to. We also talk when there is no one to answer. Some of us talk in our sleep. We talk to our pets and sometimes to ourselves.¹

As communication has a very important role for people in their daily life, there must be a media that can deliver every thought, feeling, message and any other things to the other people whom they communicate with. The media that can help people communicate with one another is language. It is stated in Cambridge dictionary that language is a system of communication consisting of sounds, words, and grammar, or the system of communication used by the people of a particular country or profession. Based on the definition above, we know that language is exactly the media that can be used by people for communication.

Language is such a central and natural part of our lives that we tend to take it for granted until we come across the wonder of a tiny child becoming able to speak, or until we turn our attention to it as an object of scholarly inquiry. Language is intimately and intricately linked to our ability to think, to be aware of our own existence and of the perspectives of others, to share information and feelings – and to investigate its own nature. This, then, is what linguistics is: the scientific investigation into human language, in all its many forms and aspects.²

Due to the fact that language is so important in human life, as stated above, there is a special study that deals with language. The study of language is conducted within the field of linguistics³. There are many theories provided in linguistic that discuss every aspect of language. Some of them are morphology, phonology, syntax, semantic, and pragmatic. Each of the studies has its own concern, which is obviously related to language problems.

In this research, the writer would like to focus on pragmatic studies, especially on presupposition. As we know, briefly, pragmatic is the study of speaker’s meaning. Moreover, pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by speaker (or writer) and interpreted by listener (or reader). It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by

---

themselves. This branch of linguistics is so interesting that the writer is very interested to do a research about it.\(^4\)

As mentioned above, people always communicate with each other and, of course, they produce utterances in certain language. The utterances produced must consist of any meaning on the speaker’s mind. And the communication which the writer is going to analyze is a debate.

According to *Oxford advanced learner’s dictionary*, Debate is a formal argument or discussion, eg at a public meeting or in a parliament or congress with two or more opposing speakers and often ending with a vote.\(^5\) It is clear that in a debate, there are, generally, more than one participant involved who actively communicate with one another. So, based on that fact, there must be linguistic element that can be analyzed. The writer is very interested to analyze linguistic context which is related to a debate.

If we talk about debate, there is an annual debate which is performed to people all over the world. It is an American presidential debate. In this debate, we often see many crucial things that could affect American policy.

All people really pay attention to both of the candidate of the US President. They pay attention to how they speak, how they greet, how they say certain words, how they behave and even how they argue with each other. So if one of the candidates made even a little mistake, people all over the world would be thinking of something bad on the image of the candidate and there would be terrible problem that can affect the election.

As this kind of debate has a very important and crucial role on international issue, there must be various uses of language which are produced by the candidate in the debate. When the candidates try to argue, try to strengthen their opinion, try to blame the other candidate, try to correct the other candidate’s opinion, and even try to stop talking, they produce different vocabularies and utterances. So the writer thinks that there are many elements of linguistic that can be analyzed.

As the definition of debate above explains that there is a serious discussion among more than one participant, so the writer apparently can find many problems that are related to what the speakers mean by what they said. This kind of problem is very interesting to be discussed. Such a case is related to pragmatic study in linguistics.

In pragmatics there is a theory which is called presupposition. This kind of study is related to speaker’s assumption. As stated by Yule, presupposition is something the speaker assume to be the case prior to making utterance. Based on the definition taken from Yule’s book, we know that speakers have presupposition in certain condition when they want to respond something by making assumption before making utterances.

The following is the example of presupposition from the debate:

The Governor Romney said: “I know what it takes to get the economy going.”

---

This statement presupposes that there is something that can be taken to make the economy develop. This presupposition classified as factive presupposition because it uses the word “know” to imply presuppositional fact.

Barack Obama said: “the fact that you're going to college is great.”

This statement presupposes two things:

(a) There is fact that you are going to college.

(b) There is college.

The two presuppositions can be classified as existential presuppositions because it presupposes that there is something existing in the statement.

Since we know that there are obviously more than one participant making various sort of discussion, there will be any assumption in each speaker’s mind before saying, talking about something or even making arguments. Therefore, the writer decided to analyze some presuppositions existing in 2012 American presidential debate which got the spotlight from people all over the world.

The reason why the writer is really interested in analyzing the debate is because the writer really wants to know and understand everything the candidates assumed in the debate. Moreover, In this analysis, the writer conducts a research about discourse analysis by using pragmatic approach.

B. Focus of The Study

In the process of doing this research, the writer would like to restrict this research on a pragmatic study. According to the background of the study, this research only analyzes presupposition and its types theory existing in the
dialogue of 2012 american presidential debate between Barrack Obama and Mitt Romney. The writer is going to do this research by analyzing the script of the debate.

C. Research Question

In his research, the writer is eager to answer the following questions:

1. How do presupposition statements appear in 2012 American presidential debate?
2. What types of presupposition do appear in the American presidential debate?

D. Objective of The Study

Based on the research question above, as always, the objectives of study of this research are:

1. To find out statements which contain of presupposition in 2012 american presidential debate.
2. To discover types of presupposition existing in 2012 American Presidential Debate.

E. Significance of The Study

This research is going to provide positive and beneficial knowledge of language study, especially pragmatics. This analysis is also expected to be very advantageous for readers, especially linguistic
students, who are interested in learning presupposition and its types which usually can be found in a dialogue of certain debate. Its significances lay on how to understand the contextual meaning, the intentionality of communication, and to comprehend what addressee exactly means in communicating his/her ideas.

F. Research Methodology

1. Method of Study

Based on the research question and the objective of the study, the method implemented in this research is qualitative method. According to Subroto, cultural studies or humanity studies tends to use qualitative method to describe and interpret the phenomenon in order to catch the meaning of it. That is why the writer uses descriptive qualitative method in which the data of the selected dialogue on the debate is described and analyzed by using presupposition theory preposed by George Yule.

2. Data Collecting technique

Technique of data collection which the writer uses in this research is bibliographical one. Subroto defines it as “technique of using written sources in obtaining data”. The written sources which are used and chosen must reflect synchronical use of language. They could be

---

magazines, news, literary works, book-reading, journal, compilation of bill etc.\(^8\)

Linguistic data can be taken from sources of literature which its scope is limited according to its goal of research. Each datum which is taken with its linguistic context must be accompanied with its sources code in every end of line. The relevant data are written in data cards which have specific size.\(^9\)

3. **Data Analysis Technique**

In this research, qualitative method is used in which it means that non-statistical analysis is employed based on Goerge Yule’s theory of presupposition. The steps of data analysis are as below:

1. Analyzing the dialogue by determining and selecting presupposition and its types existing in the selected dialogue.
2. The data that contain presupposition in variety of types are entered in the table and given “double quotation mark.”
3. Determining each type of presupposition in the mentioned data.
4. Concluding the result of the analysis by mentioning how presupposition occur in the debate and what types of presupposition mostly appear in it.


\(^9\) Edi Subroto, *ibid*, p. 48
4. Unit Analysis

The data unit of this research is a transcript of dialogue taken from 2012 American presidential debate between Barrack Obama and Mitt Romney.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is written to convey several explanations and theories which are related and used for analyzing every single aspect about presupposition of pragmatic in this research. There are several parts which are going to be explained in this chapter.

Discourse analysis is the next element of this chapter which is written. The reason why the writer tries to talk about discourse analysis here is because the writer is going to analyze the script of 2012 American presidential debate, the second.

The second part is pragmatic which is absolutely involved in this research. The reason why the pragmatic study is included in this research is because the writer is going to talk about the conversation between both candidates in the debate and its context. Moreover, pragmatic is a branch of linguistic that focuses on the structure of a language as communication tool. The next one is presupposition. This part is the main point of this research since the writer is eager to analyze the presupposition existing in the presidential debate. There will also be several types of presupposition. Because of having similar concept between implicature and presupposition, it is better to explain the difference between
implicature and presupposition in which the research limits its self and take position.

**A. Relevant Research**

The research that has ever been done is about presupposition. This research was done by Dona Rivai from *Universitas Indonesia* in 2000 which is titled *Peranan Alat-Alat Kohesi dan Praanggapan dalam Mengikat Tema Lagu Cinta berbahasa Jerman*. The purpose of the research is to give cohesion tools to love song and to display coherence of love song from a singer Gaby Albrecht. The presupposition in this research is used to make the meaning of the text clearer and more obvious.\(^\text{10}\)

Different from the researches mentioned above, the writer of this research would like to analyze presupposition and its types in a transcript of 2012 American Presidential Debate between Barrack Obama and Mitt Romney.

**B. Discourse Analysis**

For at least ten years now, ‘discourse’ has been a fashionable term. In scientific texts and debates, it is used indiscriminately, often without being defined. The concept has become vague, either meaning almost nothing, or being used with more precise, but rather different, meanings in different contexts. But, in many cases, underlying the

\(^{10}\) Dona Rivai, *Peranan Alat-Alat Kohesi dan Praanggapan dalam Mengikat Tema Lagu Cinta berbahasa Jerman*, (Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia, 2000), p. 1
word ‘discourse’ is the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people’s utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life, familiar examples being medical discourse and political discourse. Discourse analysis is an analysis of these patterns.\(^{11}\)

The word *discourse* derived from the word discourses in latin which means ‘running to and ‘fro’\(^{12}\). Renkema, as quoted by Baryadi, states that “Discourse studies in the discipline devoted to the investigation of relationship between form and function in verbal communication.

Discourse analysis in the term of linguistic study is the form reaction of linguistic formal which focuses to a unit of word, phrase or sentence without paying attention to the relation among them.\(^{13}\)

Discourse analysis is often defined is the analysis of language beyond the sentence. This is over simple, but it has the merit of making clear how it differs from traditional linguistics centered around syntax, since the sentence is accepted as the maximum domain within which syntactic structure operate.\(^{14}\)

---


\(^{14}\) Siobhan Chapman and Christopher Routledge, *Key Ideas in Linguistics and the Philosophy of Language*, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2009), p.59
The focus of discourse analysis is any form of written and spoken language, such as a conversation or a newspaper article. The main topic of interest is the underlying social structures, which may be assumed or played out within the conversation or text. It concerns the sorts of tools and strategies people use when engaged in communication, such as slowing one’s speech for emphasis, use of metaphors, choices of particular words to display affect and so on.

Sara Mills states that the term discourse has become common currency in a variety of disciplines: critical theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology and many other fields, so much so that it is frequently left undefined, as if its usage were simply common knowledge. It is used widely in analysing literary and non-literary texts and it is often employed to signal a certain theoretical sophistication in ways which are vague and sometimes obfuscatory. It has perhaps the widest range of possible signification of any term in literary and cultural theory, and yet it is often the term within theoretical texts which is least defined. It is interesting therefore to trace the ways in which we try to make sense of the term. The most obvious way to track down its range of meanings is through consulting dictionary, but here the more general meanings of the term and its more theoretical usages seem to have become enmeshed, since the theoretical meanings always have an overlaying of the more general meanings. The history of the development of the general use of the
term has been chequered; if we take even the simplest route to its history we can see a shifting from the highlighting of one aspect of usage to another.¹⁵

Discourse analysis is the study about discourse, from the internal and external side. From the internal side, discourse is studied from the type, structure and the relation between all of the parts. From the external side, discourse is studied from the discourse complication with the speaker. What is said, and the listener.¹⁶

Due to the fact that the writer is going to conduct a research about discourse analysis using pragmatic approach, the writer also takes a note from Joan Cutting’s book. In his book, it is said that pragmatics and discourse analysis are approaches to studying language’s relation to the contextual background features. It means that in understanding a statement or utterance, listener or reader do not only pay their attention to the words or the meaning. They also have to focus on why and how the utterances are produced.¹⁷

Moreover, as discourse analysis in this research is so related to a context, the next explanation is about context.

C. Context

The notion of context is so central to pragmatic that most definition of the field make explicit reference to it. By its very nature, context is a

---

¹⁶ Praptomo Baryadi, *op cit*, pp. 3-4
broad concept that involves physical, linguistic, epistemic and social elements. Physical context includes features such as day and time in a conversation. Linguistic context includes some elements of it, one of them is implicature. The epistemic context describes the shared background knowledge and beliefs between speaker and listener in a conversation. Finally, it is a feature of social context, specifically some degree of social distance.  

Furthermore, according to Joan Cutting, contest is so related to discourse analysis and pragmatics study. In other words, both of them study the meaning of words in context, analyzing the part of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of the physical and social world, and the socio-psychological factors influencing communication, as well as the knowledge of the time and place in which the words are uttered or written.

**D. Pragmatic**

Pragmatic is concerned with the interpretation of linguistic meaning and context. Two kinds of contexts are relevant. The first is linguistic context—the discourse that precedes the phrase or sentence to be interpreted.

The second one is situational context. It includes the speaker, hearer, and any third parties present along with their beliefs and their

---

beliefs about what the other believe. It also includes the physical environment, the subject of conversation, the time of day, and so on, ad infinitum. Almost any imaginable extra-linguistic factor may, under appropriate circumstances, influence the way language is interpreted.

Pragmatic is also about language use. It tells that calling a man son of a bitch is not a zoological opinion, it’s an insult. It tells us that when a beggar on the street asks do you have any spare change? It is not a fiduciary inquiry, it is a request for money. It tells us that when a justice of the peace says, in the appropriate setting, I now pronounce you man and wife, an act of marrying is performed.\(^{20}\)

According to Philip Strazny, pragmatic is the study of language usage. Whereas the study of pragmatic focuses on the language system, pragmatic offers a complementary perspective on language, providing an insight into the linguistic choices that users make in social situation. Pragmatics is for instance, interested in how people pay compliments, engaged in small talk, or write e-mails. The communicative functions of utterances or texts and the speaker’s or writer’s intentions behind them, are of particular interest. Historically, the emphasis was on spoken language.\(^{21}\)

According to Yule, Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a


listener (or reader). It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances that what the words and phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of the speaker meaning.

The type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they’re talking to, when, where, and under what circumstances. Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.

This approach also necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning. This type of study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. We might say that it is the investigation of invisible meaning. Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said.22

Furthermore, there are several areas existing in pragmatics study. They are deixis, implicature, speech act and presupposition, reference, politeness and entailment. In this research, the writer deals with one of the pragmatics branches which is called presupposition.

---

E. Presupposition

According to Grundy, Presupposition is a field of pragmatic that is about the existing knowledge common to speaker and hearer that the speaker does not therefore need to assert. This presupposed knowledge is then taken together with the propositions asserted in the utterance and the addressee’s knowledge of the world as the basis on which an inference is drawn as to the implied meaning, or implicature, that the utterance conveys.\(^2\)

Based on Siobhan Chapman, presupposition is straightforwardly declarative sentence relating to a complete and grammatical sentence and spoken literally. It can also be used to communicate propositional meaning in more than one way.\(^3\)

According to Yan Huang, presupposition can be informally defined as an inference or proposition whose truth is taken for granted in the utterance of a sentence. Its main function is to act as a precondition of some sort for the appropriate use of that sentence. This background and assumption will remain in force when the sentence that contains it is negated. Presupposition is usually generated by the use of particular lexical items and/or linguistic construction. Lexical items and linguistic construction that engender presupposition are called presupposition trigger.\(^4\)


\(^3\)Siobhan Chapman, Pragmatics, (London: Palgrave Machmillan Publisher, 2011), p. 32

\(^4\)Yan Huang, Pragmatics, (New York: Oxford University press, 2007), p. 65
According to Louise Cummings, Presupposition are variously defined, but in general constitute assumptions or inferences that are implicit in in particular linguistic expressions. When we use referring expression like this, he, Shakespeare, we usually assume that our listeners can recognize which referent is intended. In a more general way, we design our linguistic messages on the basis of large-scale assumptions about what our listeners already know. Some of these assumptions may be mistaken, of course, but mostly they are appropriate. What a speaker (or writer) assumes is true or known by a listener (or reader) can be described as a presupposition.

If someone tells you your brother is waiting outside, there is an obvious presupposition that you have a brother. If you are asked why did you come late? , there is a presupposition that you did arrive late. And when you are asked the question when did you stop smoking? , there are at least two presuppositions involved in asking this question, the speaker presupposes that you used to smoke and that you no longer do so. Questions like this, with built-in presuppositions, are very useful devices for introgators or trial lawyers. If the defendant is asked by the prosecutor, Okay, Mr. Smith, how fast were you going when you ran the red light? , there is a presupposition that Mr. Smith did in fact run

---

26 Louise Cummings, Pragmatics A Multidisciplinary Perspectives, (Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2005),29
the red light. If he simply answers the *how fast* part of the question, by
giving the speed, he is behaving as if the presupposition is correct\(^\text{27}\).

Yule, in his book, states that presupposition is something the
speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance. Speakers,
not sentence, have presupposition.

In any discussion, of the concept, presupposition is treated as a
relationship between two propositions. If we say that sentence ‘*Mary’s
dog is cute*’ contains the proposition \(p\) and the sentence ‘*Mary has a
dog*’ contains proposition \(q\), then using the symbol \(\succ\) to mean
‘presuppose’, we can represent the relationship as in (1):

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \ a. \ & \text{Mary’s dog is cute} \quad (=p) \\
\quad b. \ & \text{Mary has a dog} \quad (=q) \\
\quad c. \ & p \succ q
\end{align*}
\]

interestingly, when we produce the opposite of the sentence in (1a)
above, by negating it (NOR \(p\)), as in sentence *Mary’s dog isn’t cute*,
we find that the relationship of the presupposition doesn’t change. This
is, the same proposition \(q\), repeated as *Mary has a dog*, continues to be
presupposed by NOT \(p\), as shown in (2c)

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) \ a. \ & \text{Mary’s dog isn’t cute} \quad (\text{NOR } p) \\
\quad b. \ & \text{Mary has a dog} \quad (q) \\
\quad c. \ & \text{NOT } p \succ q
\end{align*}
\]

this property of presupposition is generally described as constancy under negation. Basically, it means that the presupposition of statement will remain constant (i.e, still true) even when that statement was negated.

Yule states that there are six types of presupposition. They are existential presupposition, factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, non-factive presupposition and counter factual presupposition. The writer is going to show some explanations about each type of presupposition.²⁸

After understanding several definitions from several sources, the writer prefers a theory which is explained by Yule. It is because Yule’s theory is the most suitable theory that can be used in this research. The reason why the theory is suitable for the writer is that Yule devides presupposition more specifically. He devides it into six types. It makes the writer easier to answer the research question in chapter two.

1. Existential Presupposition

As illustrated in the previous passage, presupposition of existence is able to be formed by the possessive construction in English. The existential presupposition is not only assumed to be present in possessive constructions (for example, ‘your car’ >> ‘you have a car’), but more generally in any definite noun phrase. By using any of the

²⁸ George Yule, Pragmatics, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), PP. 26
expressions in (3), the speaker is assumed to be committed to the existence of the entities named

Example:

George’s car is new

Presuppositions in the utterance above show existence, which are:

a. There is a man called George

b. There is a car

Based on the explanation and the example above, we obviously know that the utterance describes that there is something existing in real life. The speaker who says the utterance above, before saying that, assumes that ‘there is a man called George’ and ‘there is a car’. So, we can conclude that this type of presupposition consist of existence of something which is assumed by speaker.  

According to Yan Huang, a presupposition is called existential presupposition if the presupposition triggers is a definite description. The class of the definite description may include proper nouns, possessives and certain wh-phrases.

According to Louise Cummings, definite description also takes place as a trigger for existential presupposition. It can be inferred from the following question:

---

29 George Yule, Ibid, P. 28

John trapped/didn’t trap the bird with a red beak

Based on the example above, the definite description ‘the bird with a red beak’ presupposes that there exists a bird with a red beak.\(^{31}\)

2. Factive Presupposition

This kind of presupposition appears from information which is intended to be delivered by speaker. This presupposition is stated by using words that is able to show any fact or information which is considered as a true fact. The words usually used in this kind of presupposition are know, realize, regret, be aware, odd and glad. The following sentences are some examples about how the presupposition appears in a sentence with some verbs above:

a. She didn’t realize that her son was exhausted  \(\rightarrow\) her son was exhausted

b. They regret moving to the place  \(\rightarrow\) they moved to the place

c. She wasn’t aware that she was married  \(\rightarrow\) she was married

d. It isn’t odd that he left early  \(\rightarrow\) he left early

e. We are glad that it’s over  \(\rightarrow\) it’s over

\(^{31}\) Louise Cummings, *Pragmatics A Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, (Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2005), p. 31
Each of the sentences has its own presupposition which conveys an information or a fact which is shown by the verbs mentioned in each sentence above. So, we can conclude that the main point in this kind of presupposition is the proposed information following verbs used in some sentences above. And the presupposition is also treated as a fact.\textsuperscript{32}

According to Yan Huang, it is also said that factive verbs like ‘know’ and ‘regret’ are the indicators of the factive presupposition. This type of presupposition can further be divided into two subtypes: those triggered by the use of cognitive or epistemic factive (which concern knowledge of fact) and those produced by emotional factives (which are concerned with emotional attitude toward fact). Occasionally, factive presupposition may arise from the use of factive NPs such as the fact/knowledge that\textsuperscript{33}.

In Louise Cummings book, based on the following statement: Jill regrets/doesn’t regret selling her house\textsuperscript{34}.

\textsuperscript{32} George Yule, \textit{Pragmatics}, P. 27
\textsuperscript{33} Yan Huang, \textit{Op Cit}, p.67
\textsuperscript{34} Louise Cummings, \textit{Op Cit}, p.32
3. Lexical Presupposition

This kind of presupposition comes from an utterance which is interpreted through an assertion of the utterance. The presupposition, here, is not understood from the asserted meaning in an utterance, but it is understood through the non-asserted element meaning in the utterance. So, the difference between lexical presupposition and factive presupposition is another meaning which is not asserted in the utterance which consist of this kind of presupposition. Each time we say that someone ‘managed’ to do something, the asserted meaning is that the person succeeded in some way. When we say that someone ‘didn’t manage’, the asserted meaning is that the person did not succeed. In both cases, however, there is a presupposition (non-asserted) that the person tried to do that something. So, ‘managed’ is conventionally interpreted as asserting ‘succeeded’ and presupposing ‘tried’. Other examples, involving the lexical items, ‘stop’, ‘start’ and ‘again’, are presented, with their presupposition in the following sentences:

a. He stopped playing football >> He used to play football
b. They started complaining >> They weren’t complaining before
c. You’re late again >> You were late before

In the case of lexical presupposition, the speaker’s use of particular expression is then to presuppose another (unstated) concept, whereas in the case of factive presupposition, the use of particular expression is taken to presuppose the truth of the information that is stated after it. So, we can conclude that the lexical presupposition, which is different with the other kinds of presupposition, taken from unstated meaning existing in an utterance. 35

4. Structural Presupposition

In this kind of presupposition, certain sentences structures have been analyzed as conventionally and regularly presupposing that part of the structure is already assumed to be true. We might say that speaker can use such structures to treat information as presupposed (i.e. assumed to be true) and hence to be accepted as true by the listener. For example, the wh-question construction in English, as shown in some examples below, is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that the information after the wh-form (i.e. ‘when’ and ‘where’) is already known to be the case.

a. When did he come? >> he came

b. Where did you find the dog? >> You found the dog

35 George Yule, Ibid, P. 28
The type of presupposition illustrated in the above examples can lead listener to believe that the information presented is necessarily true, rather than just the presupposition of the person asking the question. For example, let’s say that you were standing at an intersection one evening. You didn’t notice where the traffic signal had turned to red before a car went through the intersection the car was immediately involved in a crash. You were witness to the crash and later you are asked the following question below:

‘How far was the car going when it ran the red light?’

If you answer the question as asked (just answer the question!) and estimate the speed of the car, then you would appear to be accepting the truth of the presupposition (i.e. >> the car ran the red light) such structurally-based presupposition may represent subtle ways of making information that the speaker believes appear to be what the listener should believe.³⁶

5. Non-factive Presupposition

In the discussion of the four kinds of presupposition above, Yule has only considered contexts in which presuppositions are assumed to be true. There are, however, examples of non-factive presuppositions associated with a number of verbs in English. This kind of presupposition is one that is assumed not to be true. Verbs like

³⁶ George Yule, Op Cit, P. 29
‘dream’, ‘imagine’ and ‘pretend’, as shown in some sentences below, are used with the presupposition that what follows is not true.

a. I dreamed that I was rich >> I was not rich
b. We imagined we were in Hawai >> We were not in Hawai
c. He is pretending to be ill >> He is not ill

So, we can conclude that this kind of presupposition is actually not true and has different concept with the utterance produced by the speaker. The verbs, which are mentioned in the three sentences above, describe another idea which is different with the meaning of the utterance that the speaker produces.

6. Counter-factual Presupposition

If we find a sentence which is if-clause, we can consider that the presupposition existing in that sentence can be categorized as this kind of presupposition. Furthermore, counter-factual presupposition is a type of presupposition which means that what is presupposed is not only not true, but is the opposite of what is true, or ‘contrary to facts’. A conditional structure of the type shown in the sentence below, generally called a counterfactual conditional, presupposes that the information in the if-clause is not true at the same time of utterance.

‘If you were my friend, you would have helped me’

---

37 George Yule, ibid, P.29
The sentence above presupposes that ‘you are not my friend’, which actually means the opposite meaning with the real meaning in the sentence. The presupposition appears from contradiction of the sentence with *if-clause*. The use of *if-clause* makes the presupposition contrary to the utterance which is delivered.  

---

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. DATA DESCRIPTION

Before conducting this research, the writer tried to collect some data, which are going to be analyzed, by using a theory which is explained by Edi Subroto which is called as bibliography technique. The writer took the data from a transcript of 2012 American Presidential debate which was taken from internet. Afterwards, the writer selected some data existing in the dialogue. The data obviously must be related to this research.

After selecting some data from dialogue in the debate, the writer got forty data from the whole dialogue in the debate. However, due to the fact that the writer limits this research only the first thirty minutes of the whole debate, there are only 15 data which are going to be analyzed in this chapter.

As already explained in chapter 1, the writer uses qualitative method in conducting this research which means that statistical procedure is not used. The first step in doing the qualitative method is collecting the data. There are three steps which the writer did in collecting the data. The first step is reading the whole dialogue transcription of the Second 2014 American Presidential Debate meticulously. Secondly, the dialogues which are assumed containing presupposition or presupposing something
are bolded and underlined. Thirdly, the writer analyzed the selected dialogues.

Furthermore, in this chapter, the writer would like to analyze presupposition existing in each dialogue which has been selected and determine the type of the presupposition. The writer is also going to answer the research questions written in the first chapter by presenting the reason and the plot. But, because of the limited length of time, the writer restricted the analysis. The writer only analyzed the first three topic in the debate. The topics are unemployment, energy policies and taxes policies.

In this chapter, there are some sentences and phrases which are written bold and italic so that the reader can understand the analysis more easily. All propositions which appear on each data are written in italic form. Meanwhile, all presupposition and the type of the presupposition are written in bold form.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Types of Presupposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Romney: We keep our Pell Grant program growing</td>
<td>The Pell Grant has already grown</td>
<td>Lexical Presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Romney: I know what it takes to get this economy going</td>
<td>There is something to take to get the economy in the United States going</td>
<td>Factive presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obama: Number one, I want to build manufacturing jobs in this country again.</td>
<td>The manufacturing jobs has ever been built before</td>
<td>Lexical presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Romney: if you calculated that unemployment rate taking back the people who dropped out of the workforce, it would be 10.7 percent</td>
<td>You (the audiences) don’t calculated</td>
<td>Counter-factual presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Romney: I know he keeps saying, you wanted to take Detroit bankrupt</td>
<td>a. He (obama) keeps saying the statement</td>
<td>Factive presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Obama: We have increased oil production to the highest levels in 16 years</td>
<td>The oil production was in the lower level before</td>
<td>Lexical presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Obama: That's why we've doubled clean energy production like wind and solar and biofuel.</td>
<td>The clean energy production is singular before</td>
<td>Lexical presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Obama: we still continue to open up new areas for drilling</td>
<td>Obama has already opened areas for drilling</td>
<td>Lexical presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Romney; How much did you cut licences and permits on federal land and federal water?</td>
<td>You (Obama) cut the licences and permits on federal land and federal water</td>
<td>Structural presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Crowley: If your energy policy was working, the price of gasoline could not</td>
<td>Your (Obama) energy policy is not working</td>
<td>Counter-factual presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be $4 a gallon here</td>
<td>The manufacturing has existed in America before</td>
<td>Lexical presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Romney: that taking advantage of our energy resources will bring back manufacturing to America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Questioner: if you're elected president, you would plan to reduce the tax rates for all the tax brackets and that you would work with the Congress to eliminate some deductions in order to make up for the loss in revenue</td>
<td>You (Romney) are not elected or you (Romney) are not the president</td>
<td>Counter-factual presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Romney: The top 5 percent of the taxpayers will continue to pay 60 percent of the income tax the nation collects</td>
<td>The top 5 percent of the taxpayers has paid 60 percent of the income tax before</td>
<td>Lexical presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Obama: I want to continue those tax cuts for middle-class families and for small businesses.</td>
<td>Those tax cuts have existed before.</td>
<td>Lexical Presupposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Romney: I know how to make that(growth of small bussiness) happen</td>
<td>There is a way to make that(growth of small bussiness) happen</td>
<td>Factive presupposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. DATA ANALYSIS**

**Data 1**
Romney: “I want to make sure we keep our Pell Grant program growing”

The utterance of this data was produced by Romney to respond a question about availability of employment for fresh graduated students. At first, Romney tried to answer the question by telling the audience his past time in Philadelphia. It was when he took part time jobs and paid for some of his bills but he couldn’t pay back his student loans. Afterwards, he started to present two things he thought he had to do. The first was to make sure that he could make it easier for kids to afford education. The second one is that when the kids graduate, there are jobs available for them.

Then, he explained a scholarship program, which is called John and Abigail Adam Scholarship, when he was a governor in Mashachushets. He said that the scholarship could be taken if a student passed an exam and graduated in the top quarter of your class. The next utterance is the utterance in this data which consists of a presupposition. It is about another scholarship program that is called Pell Grant program. Romney, especially in this data, intended to make sure the program, which has already existed before, kept growing. This is also one of his several his programs he presented to overcome employment program. Just for information, Pell Grant program is a program that provides need-based grants to low-income undergraduate and certain postbaccalaureate students to promote access to postsecondary education. The financial need is determined by the U.S Department of Education using a standard formula, established by congress, to
evaluate the financial onformation reported on the Free Application for Federal Students Aid and to determine the family EFC.\footnote{http://www2.ed.gov/programs/fpg/index.html, accessed on June 25, 2015}

In this data, Romney, as explained before, tried to present several programs to overcome employment issue. However, he explained one of the programs with the word ‘keep….growing’ which means that the program had already existed before and he still wanted to make it grow. It means that when saying this utterance, Romney assumed that the program had existed. So in other word, it can be said that the speaker of this data presupposes that \textbf{the Pell Grant program had already existed}.

Furthermore, what Romney presupposed in this data is not asserted or mentioned directly in the utterance. The word ‘keep’ indicates another knowledge that is not stated literally. It is only understood by the speaker and the hearer who are involved in the conversation and understand the context of it. This kind of condition, where you can’t find the presupposition directly in the sentence, is classified as \textbf{lexical presupposition}.

Data 2

Video, minute: 02.26 / script: page 2

\textbf{Romney: I know what it takes to get this economy going}

At this part of the debate, still related to the previous data, Romney continued his arguments to respond the first question by one of the audiences. He
started the utterance in this data by saying that the key thing is to make sure that American youth get a job when they get out of school. And then, Romney tried to attack Obama by saying that what’s happened over the past four years had been very very hard for America’s young people and he wanted them to get a job.

After saying the statements above, Romney said the utterance in this data. Based on the previous statements, we know that Romney thought that Obama was not successful in dealing with unemployment issue and he had a desire to make it better. That is the reason why and the way how the utterance in this data was produced by Mitt Romney.

According to what Romney said at this part of debate, it can be said that the proposition of the speaker, who is Romney, is that there is something that can be taken to get economy in USA going. Romney knew it. As explained in chapter two, To find out presupposition in an utterance, we can use presupposition property which is called constancy under negation. It means that the proposition in an utterance will remain constang even though it was changed into negative sentence. So, it is necessary to find out the presupposition by using constancy under negation. The negative form of the utterance in this data is I don’t know what it takes to get this economy going. In the negative form, the proposition still remains constant and there is something that can be taken to get economy in USA going. So, it can be concluded that the speaker of utterance in this data presupposes that there is something that can be taken to get economy in USA going.
Moreover, there is a word ‘know’ in this data. It means that Romney as the speaker of the utterance in this data has something in his mind as knowledge. In addition, in his opinion, it is a fact. And also, according to Yule, the word ‘know’ can trigger factive presupposition.\(^40\) So, based on the both reasons, it is considered that the type of presupposition in this data is factive presupposition.

**Data 3**

**Video, minute: 03.48/ script: page 2**

Obama: “Number one, I want to build manufacturing jobs in this country again.”

The utterance in this data was produced by Obama after Romney had finished presenting his idea in responding unemployment issue. The moderator, Crowley, directly gave Obama chance to speak after Romney stopped speaking. In here, Obama was also going to respond and answer the question about unemployment issue.

Obama started his response by convincing the questioner that the questioner’s future, as a student is bright. Then, he said that the most important thing to do is that he and the other americans can create good paying jobs and he also said that he wanted to create the 5 million jobs that he has created over the past 30 months in private sector alone. Then he said that there were a bunch of things he can do to make the questioner’s future bright. At this point, the utterance in this data was produced. It is one of the several things that Obama was going to do to deal with unemployment issue. He wanted to build manufacturing jobs in

this country again as the first program. He said so because he thought that manufacturing jobs had ever existed before and this kind of jobs can support his will to create more jobs.

According to this data, it is understood that there is a proposition that appears. The proposition is that manufacturing jobs has ever existed before. In addition, when the main utterance in this data is changed like: Number one, I don’t want to build manufacturing jobs in this country again, the proposition mentioned before still remains constant. So, it can be concluded that Obama, as the speaker in this data, presupposes that manufacturing jobs had existed before.

There are two things that the writer is going to use as reasons to determine type of presupposition existing in this data. The first thing, In this data, there is word ‘again’ stated. It means that there is something that has already existed before. And the second, related to the previous paragraph, the presupposition existing in this data is not directly stated and not asserted. So based on the both reasons, the presupposition in this data is classified as lexical presupposition.

Data 4

Video, minute: 06.13/ script: page 3

Romney: “if you calculated that unemployment rate taking back the people who dropped out of the workforce, it would be 10.7 percent.”
Still talking about unemployment issue, firstly at this part of the debate, Romney was asked by the moderator what can he do to overcome a problem of long-term unemployed people who had been out of work and needed a job right at that time.

Romnet began this part by talking about the condition in America. he said that there were 23 million people struggling to find a job and a lot of them had been out of work for a long long long long time. Then, he tried to attack Obama by saying that the president’s policies hadn’t worked and hadn’t put Americans back to work. He also said that before Obama took office as a president, the rate of unemployed people was only 7.6 percent. At this point, at the same time the utterance in this data was produced, Romney invited the audience to calculate the rate number of unemployed people after obama became a president by expressing conditional sentence type two. The writer found a presupposition in the conditional sentence. By saying the statement in this data, Romney explained that the rate number of unemployed people in America when obama became president is higher than before. So, that is how the presuppositional statement in this data appear.

As explained in Yule’s book and chapter 2 of this analysis, *if-clause* can trigger a presupposition.\(^4^1\) We can also use the constancy under negation to prove that the utterance in this data is a presuppositional statement. As we know that there are two clauses in an conditional sentence, which are called dependent and independent clauses, it is important to know which clause which should be

\(^{41}\) George Yule, Op Cit p. 29
changed into negative. Based on Yule’s book it is the independent clause or main clause that should be changed into negative. The independent clause of the utterance of this data is *it would be 10.7 percent, so*, when changed into negative, it will be *it wouldn’t be 10.7 percent*.

Based on the utterance of this data, proposition that appears is that *you, the audience, did not calculate the unemployment rate*. And then, when we change the independent clause into negative sentence as stated in the previous paragraph, it does not affect the proposition. It is still understood that the proposition appearing above still remains constant. So, it can be concluded that the speaker of this data, who is Romney, presupposes that *you (or the audiences) did not calculate the unemployment rate*.

There are two reasons used by the writer in determining what type of presupposition existing in this data. Firstly, Based on explanation above, the presupposition existing in this data is not only not true, but is the opposite of what is true. And the second one, the utterance of this data is conditional sentence. So, according to the both reason, the presupposition existing in this data is classified as *counterfactual presupposition*.

**Data 5**

**Video, minute: 06.52/ script: page 3**

Romney: I know he keeps saying, you wanted to take Detroit bankrupt

---

42 George Yule, *Op Cit*, p.30
This part of the debate, Romney still responded the question about what he can do to deal with the long-term unemployment issue. After presenting the unemployment condition which is also stated in the previous data, he continued by presenting his program. He said that the unemployment condition in America is the reason why he put five point plan that gets America 12 million new jobs and it’s going to help American that are unemployed.

Afterwards, he evaluated Obama’s statement saying that he wanted Detroit bankrupt. He said that his plan was to have the company go through bankruptcy like other companies did. But he said that after that the companies came out stronger. And then right after that, the utterance in this data was produced and he continued to fight back by saying that Obama also took some companies bankrupt. So, that is how the utterance at this part was produced.

Like the other data, this data also has a proposition that could be taken as presupposition. In this case, the proposition is that *he (Obama) keeps saying you (Romney) wanted to take Detroit bankrupt*. It is a fact that is known by Romney. To know whether this proposition could be considered as presupposition or not, the whole sentence in this data needs to be changed into negative form. The negative form of the sentence is *I don’t know he keeps saying, you wanted to take Detroit bankrupt*. From the negative form, it is still understood that the proposition mentioned before still remains constant and was not affected. So, it can be concluded that the speaker (Romney) presupposes that *Obama keeps saying that he (Romney) wanted to take Detroit bankrupt*
To determine what type of presupposition existing in this data, the writer needs to find out lexical item that can be the presupposition trigger. In this utterance, it is word ‘know’ that can be the presupposition trigger. And, the word ‘know’.stated in the sentence can indicate knowledge thought by someone or a fact known by someone. As also explained in Yule’s book, the word ‘know’ can trigger factive presupposition. So, the writer concludes that what is presupposed in this data is classified as factive presupposition.

Data 6

Video, minute: 09.32/ script: page 4

Questioner: “Your energy secretary, Steven Chu, has now been on record three times stating it’s not policy of his department to help lower gas prices. Do you agree with Secretary Chu that this is not the job of the Energy Department?”

Obama: “……….We have increased oil production to the highest levels in 16 years…….”

At this point, Obama was asked by the questioner about policy which is related to energy department. Firstly, he said that the most important thing to do was to make sure American government control their own energy. Afterwards, the president directly answered the question by telling the audiences some statements before finally saying the utterance above. Obama tried to convince the audiences by explaining something he had done related to this issue.

43 George Yule, Op Cit, p 27
The writer thinks that there is a presupposition in this utterance. It is because the proposition, which is that *the oil production is never as high as it was before Obama became a president in 16 years*, in this sentence remains constant when the sentence above is changed into negative form like: *We haven’t increased oil production to the highest levels in 16 years*. The sentence above presupposes that **in 16 years, the oil production is not in the highest level.** The proposition is still the same with the positive one. So, the utterance above is considered presuppositional.

Moreover, the writer thinks that lexical presupposition is present in the utterance above. It is because what is presupposed in the utterance above is non-asserted. The proposition ‘**the oil production is never in the highest level in 16 years**’ which is presupposed by the utterance above is not stated or not asserted directly in the sentence. So the writer concludes it can be considered that the type of presupposition present in the utterance is lexical presupposition.

**Data 7**

*Video, minute: 09.54/ script: page 5*

Obama: That's why we've doubled clean energy production like wind and solar and biofuels.

Still talking about energy, Obama, here, is still trying to convince the audiences by presenting his programs he has done over the past four years. At the
beginning of this part, Obama tried to tell the audiences that he, for issue of energy, wanted to look to the future so that the American society is able to afford enough gas or another energy source easily for their daily life. So the president said the statement above.

In the statement above, there is a word ‘doubled’, more completely ‘we’ve doubled’ which means that before saying the statement, something which is doubled in the statement, is actually not double or only one. In the other words, the president didn’t make the energy production doubled before. Of course the amount of the production before is not as much as the amount at the time the president said the statement at the debate. The reason why the writer thinks that there is a presupposition in this statement is because when the statement is changed into negative like: That's not why we've doubled clean energy production like wind and solar and biofuels, there is a proposition which remains constant. The proposition is that the oil production is not as much as it was before it was doubled. It is also what is presupposed by the speaker, Obama.

As explained at the previous paragraph, the statement by Obama above presupposes that the amount of the clean energy production before is not as much as the current amount after the president said the statement above because there is word ‘doubled’ in the statement. Additionally, because the presupposition is not stated or not asserted on the statement, the type of presupposition in the statement above belongs to lexical presupposition.
Data 8

Video, minute: 10.20/ script: page 5

Obama: “we still continue to open up new areas for drilling”

At this part, Obama was still talking about energy and his point here is still related to data 7 at the previous paragraph. At this part Obama tried to present his real effort to lower Americans oil imports and to double clean energy production. The real effort is that he still continued to open up areas for drilling. It means that before having this debate, Obama had started his effort for more clean energy production by opening areas for drilling.

To find out what is presupposed in the utterance of this data, we need to find out proposition inside the utterance. The word ‘continue’ shows that something keeps happening. In this case, it is understood that the thing that keeps happening is the opening of new areas for drilling. From this point, we know that before the utterance was produced the process of the opening had started before. So, it can be concluded the proposition in this data is that Obama had already opened areas for drilling before speaking at this debate.

Now, the problem is whether the proposition can also be considered as what is presupposed by the speaker. To find it out, it is necessary to change the whole sentence into negative form and understand whether or not there is a change in the proposition. The negative form of the utterance is: we do not still continue to open up new areas for drilling. From the negative form of the whole sentence, it is known that the proposition doesn’t change. It is still understood that
before saying the statement, Obama had started opening areas for drilling. So, what is presupposed by the speaker (Obama) here is **Obama himself has already started opening areas for drilling before he produced the utterance.**

As we have seen in the previous paragraph, we know that what is presupposed in the utterance of this data is not directly stated in the statement. The proposition, which remains constant although the whole sentence is changed into negative form, can not be seen in the utterance. It is hidden or non-asserted. Based on the explanation, it can be conclude that the type of the presupposition in this data is **lexical presupposition.**

**Data 9**

**Video, minute: 16.02/ script: page 7**

Romney : “How much did you cut licences and permits on federal land and federal water?”

At this part of the debate, at the beginning, President Obama tried to respond a question about gas prices from Crowley as a moderator. The moderator asked the president if he can lower the gas prices up to normal. Then the president tried to respond by telling the audiences that, at first, Governor Romney was not totally true and the president had been doing several efforts to control the price. The first thing the president said is that he had been opening up more areas for drilling. The second effort was that he had been producing more coal for the last
four decades. And then, he said that the proof was their oil import was down to the lowest level in 20 years, oil production was up and the natural gas was up. And the last in this part is that Obama said that all of his efforts were creating more jobs.

Afterwards, suddenly Romney interrupted by saying that was not what Obama had done in the last four years. Then, Obama said that sure it was true. And finally Romney asked Obama “how much did you cut licenses and permits on federal land and federal waters?” Romney asked the question to make sure that the efforts made by Obama for the last four years were not true. Furthermore, the point here is that the writer thinks that the question consists of presupposition. That is how the utterance containing presupposition appear.

The question how much did you cut licenses and permits on federal land and federal waters by Governor Romney to President Obama means that Romney thought that Obama had cut permits and licenses on federal land and waters. It is also assumption which had been made by Romney. So the utterance produced by Romney presupposes that President Obama had ever cut permits and licenses on federal land and federal water. So, it can be said that what is presupposed by Romney as the speaker of the utterance is Obama cut licenses and permits on federal land and federal waters.

According to Yule, question form in English can trigger presupposition. And, this kind of presupposition trigger can cause a type of presupposition which
is called structural presupposition. So, in conclusion, what is presupposed by Romney as the speaker is **structural presupposition**.

**Data 10**

**Video, minute: 18.28/ script: page 9**

Crowley: “If your energy policy was working, the price of gasoline would not be $4 a gallon here”

Still talking about energy, this time the utterer is the moderator. But, before the utterance was produced, some statements were argued by the both candidates. When Obama was presenting his program related to energy, Romney kept interrupting. Romney said that what Obama said is not true and some energy productions made by Obama were down but Obama gave him chance to speak. He continued to say that if the president’s energy policies were working, the American people were going to see the cost of energy come down. In addition, he also said that he would fight to create more energy for the country. Then, he mentioned some of his programs to create more energy. Afterwards, the moderator interrupted and gave a question to Obama. At this point, the presuppositional statement came out. It is not the whole sentence spoken by the moderator but it is just a part of the whole question. So, it is not a question, but a statement, that is how the presuppositional statement occur.

---

44 George Yule, *Op Cit*, p. 28
Before analyzing what is presupposed by the speaker in this data, firstly, it is important to find out proposition contained in this statement. Proposition in this data is that Obama’s energy policies was not working. Because of the use of the if-clause and past form in the dependent clause, it is understood that the fact is the policies implemented by Obama was not working. Now, to know whether the proposition can also be considered as presupposition, it must be proved that it will remain constant when we change the whole sentence into negative form.

In the utterance of this data, there is a form of conditional sentence. It means that there are two clauses in a conditional sentence, they are dependent and independent clause. However, the clause, that needs to be changed into negative to find out what is presupposed by the speaker, is the independent clause. In contrast, as the independent clause of this sentence is in negative form, we can change it into the opposite form which is positive form as following: the price of gasoline should be $4 a gallon here. The change of the independent clause doesn’t affect the meaning of the dependent clause. It is still understood that the policy was not working even though the dependent clause is changed into the opposite form. So, it can be concluded that the proposition in the previous paragraph can be taken as presupposition in this data. In conclusion, it can be said that the moderator, as the speaker of this data, presupposes that Obama’s energy policies were not working.

Moreover, because the presupposition explained in the previous paragraph is not true and is the opposite of what is true, the type of the presupposition is classified as counterfactual presupposition.
Data 11

Video, minute: 20.35/ script: page10

Romney: that taking advantage of our energy resources will bring back manufacturing to America

The utterance in this data needs to be related to a few moments before it is produced. A few minutes before Romney produced the utterance, Obama was asked a question about gas price. Then, Obama Answered it by telling the audience condition of America when recession. He also said that he wanted to overcome the recession by building pipeline for the purpose of oil production. Not only talking about what he wanted to do, Obama also attacked Romney by saying that Governor Romney was opposed to wind jobs in Lowa and Collorado and said that it is imaginary jobs. Just for information, wind jobs is a manufacturing jobs that create wind power for energy.

At this point, the moderator interrupted Obama to move to another question. However, before the moderator asked the next question, Romney interrupted to argue that what Obama said was not true. He said that he didn’t have a policy of stopping the wind jobs in Lowa and they’re real jobs. Moreover, he appreciated it. Right after that, Romney said the statement in this data to support his statement before. he thought that American can take advantage of their own energy resource and it can bring back manufacturing to their country. So, Romney produced the utterance of this data to defend himself from what Obama said about him before.
Because of the word ‘back’ in the sentence, we can understand that there is something coming back to the previous place in another time. The thing coming back here is ‘manufacturing’ that can be reached by taking the advantage of energy resources in this case. In other word, the speaker of the utterance thought that if American can take advantage from their own energy resources, they will bring back manufacturing to America. From what the speaker thought, it is understood that there is proposition that can be taken. It is manufacturing has ever existed in America before.

Furthermore, the writer tries to find out what is presupposed by the speaker by negating the whole sentence and analyzing whether the proposition is going to remain constant. The negative form of the whole sentence is: that taking advantage of our energy resources will not bring back manufacturing to America. From the negative form, the proposition explained in the previous paragraph still remains constant. It is still understood that manufacturing has ever existed in America before. So, it can be said that Romney, as the speaker of the utterance, presupposes Manufacturing sector has ever existed in America before.

From the utterance in this data, what is presupposed by the speaker can not be seen directly. It is hidden and non-asserted. In addition, there is lexical item ‘back’ that trigger the presupposition. Therefore, the writer classifies the presupposition as Lexical Presupposition.
Data 12

Video, minute: 21.05/ script: page 10

Questioner: “if you’re elected president, you would plan to reduce the tax rates for all the tax brackets and that you would work with the Congress to eliminate some deductions in order to make up for the loss in revenue”

After guiding the two candidates talking about energy sources, the moderator directly interrupted President Obama to move on to the other topic which was opened by a questioner asking Romney a question about reducing some taxes and eliminating some deductions in order to make up for the loss in revenue. This question is the opening of the next discussion which is about taxes and the other financial issues. That is how the presuppositional statement occurs.

To find out what is presupposed by the speaker in this data, the writer would like to analyze the proposition contained in the utterance. From the dependent clause, which is if you(Romney)’re elected president, it can be understood that the speaker thought that Romney is not a president. The knowledge can be considered as a proposition because it is inside the speaker’s mind.

Now, as in conditional sentence there are two clauses called dependent and independent clause, the writer would like to change the independent clause into negative to find out whether the proposition above can be considered as presupposition or not. As stated in Yule’s book, it is the independent clause that is
changed into negative to find out whether the proposition will remain constant or not. The negative form of the independent clause of the sentence is: *if you’re elected president, you would not plan to reduce...*. From the change it is still understood that Romney is not a president at the time of speaking. It means that the proposition which is understood before is not affected by the change and still remains constant under negation. So we can conclude that the proposition can be considered as presupposition. In other word, what is presupposed by the third questioner, as the speaker of the utterance, presupposes that you (or Romney) are not a president at that time.

In addition, what is presupposed in this data is classified as **counterfactual presupposition** based on two reasons. First, the linguistic construction, which stands as the presupposition trigger, is conditional sentence. Moreover, what is presupposed is contrary to the fact.

**Data 13**

Video, minute: 22.48/ script: page 11

Romney: “The top 5 percent of the taxpayers will continue to pay 60 percent of the income tax the nation”

The utterance in this data is produced by Romney to respond the previous question in data 12. At first, Romney responded the question in the previous data by talking about his desire of bringing the rates down and getting middle income taxpayers to have lower taxes. The reason is that the middle income taxpayers had

\[\text{George Yule, *ibid*}\]
been buried over the past four years. He said that their income went down $4,300 a family but the prices of gasoline, health insurance premium, food and utility had gone up.

As Romney wanted to bring the tax rates down, he was going to limit deduction and exemption. The reason is that he didn’t want the rich people in the country pay less that they’re paying at that time. Right after that, he said the utterance in this data. He wanted the top five percent of the taxpayers, who are classified as rich people, keeps paying sixty percent of the income tax that the nation collected so far.. that is how the utterance was produced.

In this sentence there is word ‘continue’ which means that there is a condition that has started before. Continue also means that the condition having started before still keeps happening. So, in the sentence above, it can be concluded that the top 5 percent of the taxpayers. Who had ever paid 60 percent, will continuously pay the same amount of money. It can also be taken as proposition in this utterance. The problem, now, is whether the proposition remains constant when the whole sentence is changed to negative form.

The negative for of the whole sentence is: the top 5 percent of the taxpayers will not continue to pay 60 percent of the income tax the nation. From the negative form of the sentence, also because of the word ‘continue’, it is still understood that the proposition is not affected and still remains constant. The top five percent of the taxpayers had already paid sixty percent of income tax in America. So because the proposition remains constant, it can be considered as
what is presupposed by the speaker in this data. In other words, Romney, as the speaker of this data, presupposes that **The top five percent of taxpayers had started paid sixty percent of income tax the USA had collected so far.**

In determining the type of the presupposition, the writer consideres it based on two reasons. First, the existence of word ‘continue’ that triggers another meaning behind the utterance. Second. What is presupposed in this utterance is not directly stated in this utterance. It is non-asserted. So, based on the both reasons, the writer consideres that the type of presupposition in this data is **lexical presupposition.**

Data 14

Video, minute: 25.19/ script: page 12

Obama: Obama: I want to continue those tax cuts for middle-class families and for small businesses.

After Romney had answered the question about taxes, Obama was also given a chance to respond it. At this part, he presented what he has done for taxes so far. He said that his philosophy for taxes was that he wanted to give middle class families, and folks, who are striving to get in the middle class, some relief, because they had been hit hard over the last decades. He also said that he had cut taxes for small businesses, who were the driver and engines of growth, for 18
times. Then, utterance in this data was produced. Obama continued to say that he wanted to continue those cuts for middle class families and for small business.

To find what is presupposed in utterance in this data, the writer tried\'s to find proposition that can remain constant or was not affected when the whole sentence is changed into negative form. The proposition which is understood from this sentence is that tax cuts for middle class families and small businesses had been implemented by Obama before. The problem now is whether it can be constant under negation. The negative form of the whole sentence is:  

\[ \text{I don't want to continue those tax cuts for middle-class families and for small businesses.} \]

According to the negative form, it is still understood that the tax cuts have been implemented before. The negative form only affects the verb \text{\`want\}', but it does not affect the word \text{\`continue\}'. So, because the proposition stated above still remains constant, we can take it as presupposition in this data. In other word, Obama, as the speaker of this data, presupposes that tax cuts for middle class families and small business had been implemented by him before.

The writer concludes that the type of presupposition of this data is **Lexical Presupposition**. The conclusion is taken because what is presupposed by the speaker is not directly stated in the utterance. The meaning or the proposition from the utterance is not asserted.

**Data 15**

**Video, minute: 29.17/ script: page 13**
Romney: I know how to make that happen.

After Obama presented what he had done for the last four years, he explained that what Romney planed in case of tax cuts would not work for economy in America. Especially, it would not work if America want a strong middle class and an economy that’s striving for everybody. He also said that Romney would give tax cuts, not tax rates cuts. That kind of cuts tax would be also for the top two percent. So, Obama thought that what Romney would do is not fair.

Afterwards, right after Obama stopped talking, Romney took his turn to talk and defend himself. He said that the reason why he wanted to bring rates down and at the same time lower exemption and deduction particularly for the wealthy people is it can make it easier for small bussiness to keep more of their capital and hire people. So, it is related to the way how create more jobs. Moreover, to support his idea about creating more jobs, he mentioned his five points plans and said that he wanted to help small bussiness and grow and thrive. In addition, the utterance in this data was produced. He said the utterance above to convince the audience that there is something he could do to help small business and he knew it. That is how the utterance appears.

According to the utterance in this data, the writer considers that there is proposition that can be inferred here. It is there is a way to make that (helping small business grow and thrive) happen. This proposition can be considered as what is presupposed by the speaker if it can remain constant under negation form.
Negative form of the whole sentence is: *I don’t know how to make that happen.*

Based on the negative form, it is still understood that the proposition is still the same. The meaning of the utterance still remains constant because the negative form only affects the verb ‘know’. Because it still remains constant, it can be considered the proposition as the presupposition in this data. So, in conclusion, Romney, as the speaker, presupposes that **there is something to make that (helping small business grow and thrive) happen.**

Furthermore, to determine the type of presupposition in this data, the writer uses two reasons. The first reason is the existence of word ‘know’. The word is the presupposition trigger in this data. the second reason is that what is presupposed by the speaker is a fact because the word ‘know’ indicates existence of knowledge that can also be regarded as a fact. so, based on the both reason, the writer concludes that the type of presupposition in this data is **Factive presupposition**
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on research questions in the first chapter and research findings of some data which are presented in the third chapter, the writer gets several conclusions. The conclusions are described as follows:

The first conclusion is related to the first research question. It is about how the presuppositional statements in *The 2012 American Presidential Debate* occur. Firstly, besides question and statement coming from moderator and questioner, all of the presuppositional statements occur because the speakers in the debate have assumption on their mind that is meant to convince the audiences attending the debate. In other words, when the speakers of the debate intend to persuade the audiences to vote for them in the 2012 election, they have various assumption which is related to several topics discussed in the debate.

Furthermore, the assumption in presuppositional statements in this research appears after the speakers present some of their programs to respond the questions which are given by moderator and audiences. The assumption is not expressed directly. It means that the speaker of the presuppositional statements do not express the assumption at the first time they respond every question and interruption. The speakers respond every single question and
interruption by telling the audiences their story, their programs and even what they have ever made for their country.

The second conclusion is related to the second research question of this research. It is about the type of presupposition that exist in the presidential debate. Based on the research findings in chapter three, the writer does not find and analyze several types of presupposition. The type which the writer does not find is non-factive presupposition. It is because non-factive presupposition is the type of presupposition that indicates something that is not true. In other word, the assumption in this type is contrary to the fact. Meanwhile, a presidential debate is a debate that requires the speaker to present fact that is related to their program to persuade citizens in America to vote for them.

In addition, the type of presupposition that the writer does not analyze is existential presupposition. It is because there are too many utterances indicating this type of presupposition. Moreover, this type of presupposition is too simple to be analyzed because to find the type it only needs existence of a thing.

Nevertheless, the writer finds some types of presuppositional statement in this debate. They are factive presupposition (3 items), lexical presupposition (8 items), structural presupposition (1 item) and counterfactual presupposition (3 items). Lexical presupposition is the most presupposition that appears in this research. Each of the type comes out in different way and different reason.
However, all of them were presupposed to convince the audience that they deserve to be a president.

Factive presupposition appears when when the speaker assumes a fact they know to convince the audience. Lexical presupposition appears when the speakers want to present what they have done, and what they want to continue to do. The only structural presupposition which is assumed by Romney appears when he wants to prove something about Obama. The last one, counterfactual presupposition appears when there is something related to the debate contrary to fact.

B. Suggestion

Because the writer restricts this research by analyzing the 2012 American Presidential Debate only for the first thirty minutes only, the writer suggests another student who is interested in presupposition to continue analyzing this debate. This research is very interesting because by analyzing the debate, we are going to know many aspects in the debate. Furthermore, we are going to know what is assumed by candidates of US presidential election in a very crucial debate.

Furthermore, the writer would like to suggest students who are interested in analyzing presupposition to do a research about it using another theory written by another author. Yule’s theotu only focuses on the division of types
of presupposition. So, the students can explore the research more widely and analyze it in different way.
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APPENDICES

THE SECOND 2012 PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE BETWEEN BARRACK OBAMA AND MITT ROMNEY (Only the first thirty minutes)

CANDY CROWLEY: Good evening from Hofstra University in Hempstead, New York. I'm Candy Crowley from CNN's State of the Union. We are here for the second presidential debate, a town hall sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates.

The Gallup Organization chose 82 uncommitted voters from the New York area. Their questions will drive the night. My goal is to give the conversation direction and to ensure questions get answered.

The questions are known to me and my team only. Neither the commission nor the candidates have seen them. I hope to get to as many questions as possible. And because I am the optimistic sort, I'm sure the candidates will oblige by keeping their answers concise and on point. Each candidate has as much as two minutes to respond to a common question, and there will be a two-minute follow-up.

The audience here in the hall has agreed to be polite and attentive; no cheering or booing or outbursts of any sort. We will set aside that agreement just this once to welcome President Barack Obama and Governor Mitt Romney. (Cheers, sustained applause.)

Gentlemen, thank you both for joining us here tonight. We have a lot of folks who've been waiting all day to talk to you, so I want to get right to it. Governor Romney, as you know, you won the coin toss, so the first question will go to you. And I want to turn to a first-time voter, Jeremy Epstein, who has a question for you.

Q: Mr. President, Governor Romney, as a 20-year-old college student, all I hear from professors, neighbors and others is that when I graduate, I will have little chance to get employment. Can — what can you say to reassure me, but more importantly my parents, that I will be able to sufficiently support myself after I graduate?

NPR Post-Debate Coverage

MITT ROMNEY: Thank you, Jeremy. I appreciate your — your question, and — and thank you for being here this evening. And to all of those from Nassau County here that have come, thank you for your time. Thank you to Hofstra University and to Candy Crowley for organizing and leading this — this event. Thank you, Mr. President, also for being part of this — this debate.

Yours question — your question is one that's being asked by college kids all over this country.

I was in Pennsylvania with someone who'd just graduated. This was in Philadelphia, and she said, I — I — I got my degree. I can't find a job. I've got three part-time jobs. They're just barely enough to pay for my food and pay for an apartment. I can't begin to pay back my student loans.
So what we have to do is two things: we have to make sure that we make it easier for kids to afford college and also make sure that when they get out of college, there's a job. When I was governor of Massachusetts, to get a high school degree, you had to pass an exam. If you graduated in the top quarter of your class, we gave you a John and Abigail Adams Scholarship, four years tuition-free to the college of your choice in Massachusetts. It's a public institution. I want to make sure we keep our Pell—Pell Grant program growing. We're also going to have our loan program so that people are able to afford school.

But the key thing is to make sure you can get a job when you get out of school. And what's happened over the last four years has been very, very hard for America's young people. I want you to be able to get a job. I know what it takes to get this economy going. With half of college kids graduating this year without a college—or excuse me, without a job and without a college-level job, that's just unacceptable. And likewise, you got more and more debt on your back. So more debt and less jobs.

I'm going to change that. I know what it takes to create good jobs again. I know what it takes to make sure that you have the kind of opportunity you deserve. And kids across this country are going to recognize we're bringing back an economy. It's not going to be like the last four years. The middle class has been crushed over the last four years, and jobs have been too scarce. I know what it takes to bring them back, and I'm going to do that and make sure when you graduate—when do you graduate?

Q: (Off mic.)

MR. ROMNEY: 2014. When you come out in 2014—I presume I'm going to be president—I'm going to make sure you get a job. (Chuckles.) Thanks, Jeremy. Yeah, you bet.

MS. CROWLEY: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA: Jeremy, first of all, your future is bright, and the fact that you're making investment in higher education is critical, not just to you but to the entire nation.

Now, the most important thing we can do is to make sure that we are creating jobs in this country, but not just jobs, good-paying jobs, ones that can support a family. And what I want to do is build on the 5 million jobs that we've created over the last 30 months in the private sector alone. And there are a bunch of things that we can do to make sure your future is bright.

Number one, I want to build manufacturing jobs in this country again. You know, when Governor Romney said we should let Detroit go bankrupt, I said, we're going to bet on American workers and the American auto industry, and it's come surging back. I want to do that in industries, not just in Detroit but all across the country. And that means we change our tax code so we're giving incentives to companies that are investing here in the United States and creating jobs here. It also means we're helping them and small businesses to export all around the world in new markets.
Number two, we've got to make sure that we have the best education system in the world. And the fact that you're going to college is great, but I want everybody to get a great education. And we worked hard to make sure that student loans are available for folks like you, but I also want to make sure that community colleges are offering slots for workers to get retrained for the jobs that are out there right now and the jobs of the future.

Number three, we've got to control our own energy, you know, not only oil and natural gas, which we've been investing in, but also we've got to make sure we're building the energy sources of the future, not just thinking about next year, but 10 years from now, 20 years from now. That's why we've invested in solar and wind and biofuels, energy-efficient cars.

We've got to reduce our deficit, but we've got to do it in a balanced way — asking the wealthy to pay a little bit more, along with cuts, so that we can invest in education like yours. And let's take the money that we've been spending on war over the last decade to rebuild America — roads, bridges, schools. If we do those things, not only is your future going to be bright, but America's future's going to be bright as well.

MS. CROWLEY: Let me ask you for a more immediate answer, beginning with Mr. Romley (sic).

Just quickly, what can you do — we're looking at a situation where 40 percent of the unemployed have been unemployed for six months or more. They don't have the two years that Jeremy has. What about those long-term unemployed who need a job right now?

MR. ROMNEY: Well, what you're seeing in this country is 23 million people struggling to find a job, and a lot of them, as you say, Candy, have been out of work for a long, long, long, long time.

The president's policies have been exercised over the last four years, and they haven't put Americans back to work. We have fewer people working today than we had when the president took office. If the — the unemployment rate was 7.8 percent when he took office. It's 7.8 percent now. But if you calculated that unemployment rate taking back the people who dropped out of the workforce, it would be 10.7 percent. We have not made the progress we need to make to put people back to work.

That's why I put out a five-point plan that gets America 12 million new jobs in four years and rising take-home pay. It's going to help Jeremy get a job when he comes out of school. It's going to help people across the country that are unemployed right now.

And one thing that the — the president said which I want to make sure that we understand — he — he said that I said we should take Detroit bankrupt, and — and that's right. My plan was to have the company go through bankruptcy like 7-Eleven did and Macy's and — and — and Continental Airlines and come out stronger. And — and I know he keeps saying, you wanted to take Detroit bankrupt. Well, the president took Detroit bankrupt. You took General Motors bankrupt. You took Chrysler bankrupt. So when you say that I wanted to take the auto industry bankrupt, you actually did. And — and I think it's important to know that that was a process that was necessary to get those
companies back on their feet, so they could start hiring more people. That was precisely what I recommend and ultimately what happened.

**MS. CROWLEY:** Let me — let me give the president a chance. Go ahead.

**PRESIDENT OBAMA:** Candy, what Governor Romney said just isn't true. He wanted to take them into bankruptcy without providing them any way to stay open, and we would have lost a million jobs.

And that — don't take my word for it; take the executives at GM and Chrysler, some of whom are Republicans, may even support Governor Romney. But they'll tell you his prescription wasn't going to work.

And Governor Romney says he's got a five-point plan. Governor Romney doesn't have a five-point plan; he has a one-point plan. And that plan is to make sure that folks at the top play by a different set of rules. That's been his philosophy in the private sector; that's been his philosophy as governor; that's been his philosophy as a presidential candidate. You can make a lot of money and pay lower tax rates than somebody who makes a lot less. You can ship jobs overseas and get tax breaks for it. You can invest in a company, bankrupt it, lay off the workers, strip away their pensions, and you still make money.

That's exactly the philosophy that we've seen in place for the last decade. That's what's been squeezing middle-class families. And we have fought back for four years to get out of that mess, and the last thing we need to do is to go back to the very same policies that got us there.

**MS. CROWLEY:** Mr. President, the next question is going to be for you here.

And Mr. Romney — Governor Romney, there'll be plenty of chances to go on, but I want to — we have all these folks —

**MR. ROMNEY:** That — that Detroit — that Detroit answer — that Detroit answer and the rest of the answer — way off the mark.

**MS. CROWLEY:** I — OK. We'll — you certainly will have lots of time here coming up. I — because I want to move you on to something that — sort of connected to cars here, and go over — and we want to get a question from Philip Tricolla.

Q: Your energy secretary, Steven Chu, has now been on record three times stating it's not policy of his department to help lower gas prices. Do you agree with Secretary Chu that this is not the job of the Energy Department?

**PRESIDENT OBAMA:** The most important thing we can do is to make sure we control our own energy.

So here's what I've done since I've been president. **We have increased oil production to the highest levels in 16 years.** Natural gas production is the highest it's been in decades. We have seen increases in coal production and coal employment.
But what I've also said is we can't just produce traditional sources of energy; we've also got to look to the future. That's why we doubled fuel efficiency standards on cars. That means that in the middle of the next decade, any car you buy, you're going to end up going twice as far on a gallon of gas. That's why we've doubled clean energy production like wind and solar and biofuels. And all these things have contributed to us lowering our oil imports to the lowest levels in 16 years.

Now, I want to build on that. And that means, yes, we still continue to open up new areas for drilling. We continue to make a — it a priority for us to go after natural gas. We've got potentially 600,000 jobs and a hundred years' worth of energy right beneath our feet with natural gas. And we can do it in an environmentally sound way. But we've also got to continue to figure out how we have efficient energy, because ultimately that's how we're going to reduce demand, and that's what's going to keep gas prices lower.

Now, Governor Romney will say he's got an all-of-the-above plan, but basically his plan is to let the oil companies write the energy policies. So he's got the oil and gas part, but he doesn't have the clean energy part. And if we are only thinking about tomorrow or the next day and not thinking about 10 years from now, we're not going to control our own economic future, because China, Germany — they're making these investments. And I'm not going to cede those jobs of the future to those countries. I expect those new energy sources to be built right here in the United States.

So that's going to help Jeremy get a job, it's also going to make sure that you're not paying as much for gas.

MS. CROWLEY: Governor, on the subject of gas prices.

MR. ROMNEY: Well, let's look at the president's policies, all right, as opposed to the rhetoric, because we've had four years of policies being played out. And the president's right in terms of the additional oil production, but none of it came on federal land. As a matter of fact, oil production is down 14 percent this year on federal land, and gas production is down 9 percent. Why? Because the president cut in half the number of licenses and permits for drilling on federal lands and in federal waters. So where'd the increase come from? Well, a lot of it came from the Bakken Range in North Dakota. What was his participation there? The administration brought a criminal action against the people drilling up there for oil, this massive new resource we have. And what was the cost? Twenty or 25 birds were killed, and they brought out a migratory bird act to go after them on a criminal basis.

Look, I want to make sure we use our oil, our coal, our gas, our nuclear, our renewables. I believe very much in our renewable capabilities — ethanol, wind, solar will be an important part of our energy mix. But what we don't need is to have the president keeping us from taking advantage of oil, coal and gas. This has not been Mr. Oil or Mr. Gas or Mr. Coal. Talk to the people that are working in those industries. I was in coal country. People grabbed my arms and say, please, save my job. The head of the EPA said, you can't build a coal plant. You'll virtually — it's virtually impossible, given our regulations. When the president ran for office, he said, if you build a coal plant, you can go ahead, but you'll go bankrupt. That's not the right course for America. Let's take advantage of the energy resources we have, as well as the energy sources for the future. And if we do that, if we do what I am planning on doing, which is getting us energy-independent,
North American energy independence within eight years, you're going to see manufacturing come back jobs because our energy is low-cost.

They're already beginning to come back because of our abundant energy.

I'll get America and North America energy-independent. I'll do it by more drilling, more permits and licenses. We're going to bring that pipeline in from Canada. How in the world the president said no to that pipeline, I will never know. This is about bringing good jobs back for the middle class of America, and that's what I'm going to do.

MS. CROWLEY: Mr. President, let me just see if I can move you to the gist of this question, which is are we looking at the new normal? I can tell you that tomorrow morning, a lot of people in Hempstead will wake up and fill up, and they will find that the price of gas is over $4 a gallon. Is it within the purview of the government to bring those prices down, or are we looking at the new normal?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Candy, there's no doubt that world demand's gone up. But our production is going up, and we're using oil more efficiently.

And very little of what Governor Romney just said is true. We've opened up public lands. We're actually drilling more on public lands than in the previous administration. And my — the previous president was an oilman. And natural gas isn't just appearing magically; we're encouraging it and working with the industry.

And when I hear Governor Romney say he's a big coal guy — and keep in mind when — Governor, when you were governor of Massachusetts, you stood in front of a coal plant and pointed at it and said, this plant kills, and took great pride in shutting it down. And now suddenly you're a big champion of coal.

So what I've tried to do is be consistent. With respect to something like coal, we made the largest investment in clean coal technology to make sure that even as we're producing more coal, we're producing it cleaner and smarter. Same thing with oil; same thing with natural gas.

And the proof is our oil imports are down to the lowest levels in 20 years, oil production is up, natural gas production is up, and most importantly, we're also starting to build cars that are more efficient.

And that's creating jobs. That means those cars can be exported, because that's the demand around the world. And it also means that it'll save money in your pocketbook. That's the strategy you need, an all-of-the-above strategy, and that's what we're going to do in the next four years.

MR. ROMNEY: But that's not what you done in the last four years. That's the problem.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Sure it is.

MR. ROMNEY: In the last four years, you cut permits and licenses on federal land and federal waters in half.
PRESIDENT OBAMA: Not true, Governor Romney.

MR. ROMNEY: So how much did you cut them by?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: It's not true.

MR. ROMNEY: By how much did you cut them by, then?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Governor, we have actually produced more oil on —

MR. ROMNEY: No, no, how much did you cut licenses and permits on federal land and federal waters?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Governor Romney, here’s what we did. There were a whole bunch of oil companies —

MR. ROMNEY: No, I had a — I had a — I had a question —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: No, you — no, you — you — you want —

MR. ROMNEY: — and the question was how much did you cut them by?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: — you want me to answer a question, I'm —

MR. ROMNEY: How much did you cut them by?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: — I'm happy to answer the question.

MR. ROMNEY: All right, and it is?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Here's what happened. You had a whole bunch of oil companies who had leases on public lands that they weren't using. So what we said was, you can’t just sit on this for 10, 20, 30 years, decide when you want to drill, when you want to produce, when it's most profitable for you. These are public lands. So if you want to drill on public lands, you use it or you lose it.

MR. ROMNEY: OK — (inaudible) —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: And so what we did was take away —

MR. ROMNEY: That's —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: — those leases, and we are now reletting them so that we can actually make a profit.
MR. ROMNEY: And — and — and production on private — on government lands is down.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: And the production is up. No it isn't.

MR. ROMNEY: Production on government land of oil is down 14 percent.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Governor —

MR. ROMNEY: And production of gas is down 9 percent.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: What you're saying is just not true. It's just not true.

MR. ROMNEY: I — it's absolutely true. Look, there's no question but that the people recognize that we have not produced more oil —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: I'll give you your time. Go ahead.

MR. ROMNEY: — and gas on federal lands and in federal waters. And coal — coal production is not up, coal jobs are not up. I was just at a coal facility where some 1,200 people lost their jobs. The right course for America is to have a true all-of-the-above policy. I don't think anyone really believes that you're a person who's going to be pushing for oil and gas and coal.

You'll get your chance in a moment. I'm still speaking.

(Chuckles.)

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, Governor, if — if you're asking me a question, I'm going to answer it.

MR. ROMNEY: My — and the answer is I don't believe people think that's the case, because I — I'm — that wasn't a question.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: OK. All right.

MR. ROMNEY: That was a statement. I don't think — (chuckles) — the American people believe that. I will fight for oil, coal and natural gas. And the proof — the proof of whether a strategy is working or not is what the price is that you're paying at the pump. If you're paying less than you paid a year or two ago, why, then the strategy is working. But you're paying more. When the president took office, the price of gasoline here in Nassau County was about a buck eighty-six a gallon. Now it's four bucks a gallon. Price of electricity is up.

If the president's energy policies are working, you're going to see the cost of energy come down. I will fight to create more energy in this country to get America energy-secure. And part of that is bringing in a pipeline of oil from Canada, taking advantage of the oil and coal we have here, drilling offshore in Alaska, drilling offshore in Virginia where the people want it.
MS. CROWLEY: Let me —

MR. ROMNEY: Those things will get us the energy we need.

MS. CROWLEY: Mr. President, could you address — because we did finally get to gas prices here — could you address what the governor said, which is: If your energy policy was working, the price of gasoline would not be $4 a gallon here. Is that true?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well, think about what the governor — think about what the governor just said. He said when I took office, the price of gasoline was 1.80 (dollars), 1.86 (dollars). Why is that? Because the economy was on the verge of collapse; because we were about to go through the worst recession since the Great Depression as a consequence of some of the same policies that Governor Romney is now promoting. So it's conceivable that Governor Romney could bring down gas prices, because with his policies we might be back in that same mess. (Audience murmurs.)

What I want to do is to create an economy that is strong and at the same time produce energy. And with respect to this pipeline that Governor Romney keeps on talking about, we've — we've built enough pipeline to wrap around the entire Earth once. So I'm all for pipelines; I'm all for oil production.

What I'm not for is us ignoring the other half of the quotation. So for example, on wind energy, when Governor Romney says these are imaginary jobs, when you've got thousands of people right now in Iowa, right now in Colorado who are working, creating wind power, with good-paying manufacturing jobs, and the Republican senator in that — in Iowa is all for it, providing tax credits to help this work and Governor Romney says, I'm opposed, I'd get rid of it, that's not an energy strategy for the future. And we need to win that future, and I intend to win it as president of the United States.

MS. CROWLEY: Mr. President, I got to — I got to move you along. And the next question is for you —

MR. ROMNEY: No, he — he gets the first — he actually got — he actually got the first question. So I get the last question — last answer on that one.

MS. CROWLEY: If — actually, in the follow-up. It doesn't quite work like that.

MR. ROMNEY: Actually —

MS. CROWLEY: But I'm going to give you a chance here. (Laughter.) I promise you I'm going to.

And the next question is for you, so if you want to, you know, continue on, but I don't want to leave all these guys sitting here and — because —

MR. ROMNEY: Candy, Candy, Candy, I don't have a policy of — of stopping wind jobs in Iowa and that — they're not phantom jobs. They're real jobs.

MS. CROWLEY: OK.
MR. ROMNEY: I appreciate wind jobs in Iowa and across our country. I appreciate the jobs in coal and oil and gas. I'm going to make sure —

MS. CROWLEY: So you're — OK. Thank you, Governor.

MR. ROMNEY: — that taking advantage of our energy resources will bring back manufacturing to America. We're going to get through a very aggressive energy policy, 3.5 million more jobs in this country. It's critical to our future.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Candy, it's OK.

MS. CROWLEY: We're going to move you along to taxes —

PRESIDENT OBAMA: I'm used — I'm used to being interrupted. You know, the —

MS. CROWLEY: (Chuckles.) We're going to move you both along to taxes over here and all these folks that have been waiting.

Governor, this question is for you. It comes from Mary Pollano — Follano. Sorry.

MR. ROMNEY: Hi, Mary.

Q: Governor Romney, you have stated that if you're elected president, you would plan to reduce the tax rates for all the tax brackets and that you would work with the Congress to eliminate some deductions in order to make up for the loss in revenue. Concerning the — these various deductions — the mortgage deduction, the charitable deductions, the child tax credit and also the — oh, what's that other credit?

I forgot. (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT OBAMA: You're doing great.

Q: Oh, I remember. The education credits, which are important to me because I have children in college. What would be your position on those things, which are important for the middle class?

MR. ROMNEY: Thank you very much. And — and let me tell you, you — you're absolutely right about part of that, which is I want to bring the rates down, I want to simplify the tax code, and I want to get middle-income taxpayers to have lower taxes.

And — and the reason I want middle-income taxpayers to have lower taxes is because middle-income taxpayers have been buried over the past four years. You've seen, as middle-income people in this country, incomes go down $4,300 a family even as gasoline prices have gone up $2,000. Health insurance premiums — up $2,500. Food prices up, utility prices up. The middle-income families in America have been crushed over the last four years. So I want to get some relief to middle-income families. That's part — that's part one.
Now, how about deductions? Because I'm going to bring rates down across the board for everybody, but I'm going to limit deductions and exemptions and credits, particularly for people at the high end, because I am not going to have people at the high end pay less than they're paying now. The top 5 percent of taxpayers will continue to pay 60 percent of the income tax the nation collects. So that'll stay the same. Middle-income people are going to get a tax break.

And so in terms of bringing down deductions, one way of doing that would be to say everybody gets — I'll pick a number — $25,000 of deductions and credits. And you can decide which ones to use, your home mortgage interest deduction, charity, child tax credit and so forth. You can use those as part of filling that bucket, if you will, of deductions. But your rate comes down, and the burden also comes down on you for one more reason.

And that is every middle-income taxpayer no longer will pay any tax on interest, dividends or capital gains, no tax on your savings.

That makes life a lot easier. If you're getting interest from a bank, if you're getting a statement from a mutual fund or any other kind of investments you have, you don't have to worry about filing taxes on that, because there will be no taxes for anybody making $200,000 a year and less on your interest, dividends and capital gains.

Why am I lowering taxes on the middle class? Because under the last four years, they've been buried, and I want to help people in the middle class. And I will not — I will not under any circumstances — reduce the share that's being paid by the highest-income taxpayers, and I will not under any circumstances increase taxes on the middle class. The president's spending, the president's borrowing will cost this nation to have to raise taxes on the American people, not just at the high end.

A recent study has shown that people in the middle class will see $4,000 a year higher taxes as a result of the spending and borrowing of this administration. I will not let that happen. I'll get us on track to a balanced budget, and I'm going to reduce the tax burden on middle-income families. And what's that going to do? It's going to help those families, and it's going to create incentives to start growing jobs again in this country.

MS. CROWLEY: Thanks, Governor.

PRESIDENT OBAMA: My philosophy on taxes has been simple, and that is, I want to give middle-class families, and folks who are striving to get in the middle class, some relief, because they have been hit hard over the last decade, over the last 15, over the last 20 years. So four years ago I stood on a stage just like this one — actually, it was a town hall — and I said I would cut taxes for middle-class families, and that's what I've done by $3,600. I said I would cut taxes for small businesses, who are the drivers and engines of growth, and we've cut them 18 times. And I want to continue those tax cuts for middle-class families and for small businesses.

But what I've also said is if we're serious about reducing the deficit, if this is genuinely a moral obligation to the next generation, then in addition to some tough spending cuts, we've also got to make sure that the wealthy do a little bit more.
So what I've said is your first $250,000 worth of income, no change. And that means 98 percent of American families, 97 percent of small businesses, they will not see a tax increase. I'm ready to sign that bill right now. The only reason it's not happening is because Governor Romney's allies in Congress have held the 98 percent hostage because they want tax breaks for the top 2 percent.

But what I've also said is for above 250,000 (dollars), we can go back to the tax rates we had when Bill Clinton was president, we created 23 million new jobs. That's part of what took us from deficits to surplus. It will be good for our economy, and it will be good for job creation.

Now, Governor Romney has a different philosophy. He was on "60 Minutes" just two weeks ago, and he was asked, is it fair for somebody like you, making $20 million a year, to pay a lower tax rate than a nurse or a bus driver, somebody making $50,000 a year? And he said, yes, I think that's fair. Not only that, he said, I think that's what grows the economy.

Well, I fundamentally disagree with that. I think what grows the economy is when you get that tax credit that we put in place for your kids going to college. I think that grows the economy. I think what grows the economy is when we make sure small businesses are getting a tax credit for hiring veterans who fought for our country. That grows our economy.

So we just have a different theory. And when Governor Romney stands here after a year of campaigning, when during a Republican primary, he stood onstage and said, I'm going to give tax cuts — he didn't say tax rate cuts; he said tax cuts — to everybody, including the top 1 percent, you should believe him, because that's been his history.

And that's exactly the kind of top-down economics that is not going to work if we want a strong middle class and an economy that's thriving for everybody.

MS. CROWLEY: Governor Romney, I'm sure you've got a reply there. (Laughter.)

MR. ROMNEY: (Chuckles.) You're absolutely right. You heard what I said about my tax plan. The top 5 percent will continue to pay 60 percent, as they do today. I'm not looking to cut taxes for wealthy people. I am looking to cut taxes for middle-income people.

And why do I want to bring rates down and at the same time lower exemptions and deductions, particularly for people at the high end? Because if you bring rates down, it makes it easier for small business to keep more of their capital and hire people. And for me, this is about jobs. I want to get America's economy going again.

Fifty-four percent of America's workers work in businesses that are taxed as individuals. So when you bring those rates down, those small businesses are able to keep more money and hire more people.

For me, I look at what's happened in the last four years and say, this has been a disappointment. We can do better than this. We don't have to settle for how many months,
43 months with unemployment above 8 percent, 23 million Americans struggling to find a good job right now. There are 3 1/2 million more women living in poverty today than when the president took office. We don't have to live like this. We can get this economy going again.

My five-point plan does it: energy independence for North America in five years; opening up more trade, particularly in Latin America, cracking down on China when they cheat; getting us to a balanced budget; fixing our training programs for our workers; and finally, championing small business. I want to help small businesses grow and thrive. I know how to make that happen. I spent my life in the private sector. I know why jobs come and why they go.

And they're going now because of the policies of this administration.

MS. CROWLEY: Governor, let me ask the president something about what you just said. The governor says that he is not going to allow the top 5 percent — I believe is what he said — to have a tax cut, that it will all even out, that what he wants to do is give that tax cut to the middle class. Settled?