



Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Grado en Traducción e Interpretación

Trabajo Fin de Grado

Análisis del debate electoral de 2024 entre Donald Trump y Kamala Harris

Estudiante: Ainoa Almansa Martínez

Titulación: Traducción e Interpretación

Director: María Victoria Troyano Fernández

Madrid, abril de 2025

Resumen

Este trabajo de investigación tiene como objetivo conocer cuáles son las estrategias discursivas empleadas por los políticos Donald Trump y Kamala Harris en el debate electoral de 2024, así como analizar el estilo de discurso de ambos candidatos. Para ello se ha realizado un análisis del debate, centrándose en el uso de las figuras retóricas empleadas por los candidatos, en las funciones del lenguaje de Jakobson, y por último en la estrategia de argumentación utilizada establecida en la retórica clásica: *pathos*, *ethos* y *logos*. Para la realización del análisis se ha llevado a cabo la elaboración de tablas con todos los elementos ya mencionados, y con posterioridad se han identificado las tendencias observadas en ambos oradores. Finalmente, se han desarrollado las conclusiones gracias a la comparación de los oradores, en las que en primer lugar se mencionan las diferencias observadas entre los estilos retóricos de ambos candidatos, pero también se hace referencia a las posibles similitudes encontradas con la intención de aportar conclusiones más completas; y en segundo lugar se dedica la otra parte de las conclusiones a las posibles dificultades que pueden surgir a la hora de interpretar este debate, tanto en la modalidad consecutiva como en la simultánea.

Palabras clave

Análisis del debate; Donald Trump; Kamala Harris; funciones del lenguaje de Jakobson; retórica; discurso político; hipérbole y anáfora.

Abstract

The aim of this research is to identify the discursive strategies used by politicians Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the 2024 election debate, as well as to analyse the discourse style of both candidates. To this end, an analysis of the debate has been carried out, focusing on the use of rhetorical figures of speech employed by the candidates, on Jakobson's functions of language, and finally on the argumentation strategy used, established in classical rhetoric: *pathos*, *ethos* and *logos*. To carry out the analysis, tables were drawn up with all the above-mentioned elements and then the inclinations observed in both speakers were identified. Finally, conclusions have been drawn thanks to the comparison of the speakers, in which, on the one hand, the differences observed between the rhetorical styles of the two candidates are mentioned, but also the possible similarities found with the intention of providing more complete conclusions; on the other hand, a part of the conclusions is dedicated to the possible difficulties that may arise in when interpreting this debate, both in consecutive and simultaneous mode.

Key words

Analysis of the debate; Donald Trump; Kamala Harris; Jakobson's language functions; rhetoric; political discourse; hyperbole and anaphora.

Índice

1.	INTRODUCCIÓN	2
1.1.	MOTIVACIONES.....	3
2.	ESTADO DE LA CUESTIÓN.....	4
2.1.	PERSPECTIVA HISTÓRICA DEL ANÁLISIS DEL DISCURSO POLÍTICO: LA RETÓRICA.....	4
2.2.	INVESTIGACIONES ACTUALES SOBRE DISCURSO POLÍTICO	4
2.3.	DEBATES PRESIDENCIALES COMO OBJETO DE ESTUDIO.....	5
2.4.	PROBLEMAS DE DELIMITACIÓN DEL DISCURSO POLÍTICO	6
2.5.	EL LENGUAJE POLÍTICO COMO LENGUAJE DE ESPECIALIDAD	7
2.6.	ANÁLISIS POLÍTICO DEL DISCURSO	9
3.	MARCO TEÓRICO.....	10
3.1.	RETÓRICA CLÁSICA Y NUEVA RETÓRICA	10
3.2.	MÉTODOS DE PERSUASIÓN EN EL DISCURSO.....	12
3.3.	FIGURAS RETÓRICAS COMO ESTRATEGIAS DISCURSIVAS	13
3.4.	FUNCIONES DEL LENGUAJE EN EL ANÁLISIS DEL DISCURSO	14
4.	METODOLOGÍA	15
5.	ANÁLISIS Y DISCUSIÓN	16
5.1.	ANÁLISIS DE TRUMP	16
5.1.1.	TABLA DE ANÁLISIS – DONALD TRUMP.....	17
5.1.2.	USO DE FIGURAS RETÓRICAS.....	23
5.1.3.	USO DE FUNCIONES DEL LENGUAJE.....	24
5.1.4.	MÉTODOS DE ARGUMENTACIÓN	25
5.2.	ANÁLISIS DE KAMALA HARRIS.....	25
5.2.2.	USO DE FIGURAS RETÓRICAS.....	32
5.2.3.	USO DE FUNCIONES DEL LENGUAJE.....	33
5.2.4.	MÉTODOS DE ARGUMENTACIÓN	34
6.	CONCLUSIONES	34
6.1.	COMPARACIÓN DE LOS ORADORES	34
6.2.	POSIBLES DIFICULTADES PARA LA INTERPRETACIÓN	36
	REFERENCIAS	38
	ANEXO	41

1. INTRODUCCIÓN

En la actualidad, Estados Unidos es una de las mayores potencias que existen a nivel global, y esto ha sido posible gracias a una serie de factores históricos, económicos y, por supuesto, políticos. En los últimos siglos, Estados Unidos ha sido uno de los países que más cambios ha experimentado, desde la guerra por su independencia, la posterior expansión territorial que derivó de esta, su rápido desarrollo industrial y tecnológico, gracias a su amplia cantidad de recursos naturales, y el papel que desempeñó en ambas Guerras Mundiales, que lo posicionaron como uno de los países líderes en el ámbito militar. Asimismo, la lucha de este país contra el comunismo y su ferviente defensa del capitalismo, lo cual acabó siendo un detonante de la Guerra Fría, ha sido crucial para el desarrollo de su identidad actual. En las últimas décadas, Estados Unidos ha podido consolidar su posición y ha ejercido su influencia en el resto del mundo gracias a los medios de comunicación y a la industria del cine y del entretenimiento, gracias a la cual ha conseguido trasladar su modelo cultural a muchos países. Debido a su gran influencia y su papel como potencia mundial, la política estadounidense es de extrema relevancia a nivel global. Algunas de las razones de esta gran relevancia son económicas, por un lado, Estados Unidos es un país con muchos acuerdos comerciales, además la mayoría de estos flujos de comercio se facturan en dólares; y es que es de crucial importancia recordar que el dólar es la moneda de reserva mundial actualmente, y juega un papel vital en el mercado de consumo, y en las organizaciones de defensa. Además, es un país con una larga tradición intervencionista (se entiende por intervencionismo como inmiscuirse en los asuntos político o bélicos de otros países de manera directa o indirecta para conseguir algo en su propio beneficio), así mismo como su intervención en la Segunda Guerra Mundial para poder defender sus intereses económicos y geopolíticos, ya que una victoria de Alemania, Italia y Japón habría tenido consecuencias nefastas; o más recientemente sus intervenciones en Oriente Medio en guerras como la de Irak o la de Siria. Su presencia a lo largo de la historia en estos conflictos ha reafirmado su posición, y asimismo ha hecho posible que tengan roles de gran importancia en organizaciones como la ONU o la OTAN. Es por estos motivos que la forma en la que Estados Unidos aborde los retos que se le presenten tanto en política externa como en política interna influye en el resto de las economías y acuerdos con el resto de los países. Además, durante los últimos años las ideologías políticas han sufrido una gran polarización en todo el mundo, y por lo tanto también en Estados Unidos. Esto ha tenido como consecuencia un mayor distanciamiento entre republicanos y

demócratas, siendo la prueba actual Donald Trump y Kamala Harris, reflejando estos en sus discursos las dinámicas internas del país.

1.1.MOTIVACIONES

En la actualidad, estamos siendo testigos de cómo es cada vez más común que las ideas más cercanas a los extremos triunfen en política, dejando de lado las posiciones más centrales; especialmente con el auge de la extrema derecha en gran parte del mundo y los demás grupos políticos intentando hacerle frente. A pesar de que no es exactamente la misma situación, ya que en Estados Unidos solo hay dos grupos políticos, este cambio en la ideología política se ha visto reflejado en el programa electoral de ambos candidatos en caso de salir electos, siendo sus preocupaciones o promesas completamente distintas, especialmente en temas ya de por sí controvertidos como son el aborto, la inmigración o los derechos reproductivos de las mujeres. Por un lado, Donald Trump, candidato del partido Republicano, quiere dejar la cuestión del derecho al aborto en manos de los gobiernos de los estados, adoptar medidas más estrictas respecto a la inmigración o subir los aranceles. Estas medidas han suscitado bastante preocupación entre algunos ciudadanos y han generado mucha polémica. Además, se suma a esta controversia el hecho de que el candidato ha sido declarado culpable de 34 delitos, entre los que se encuentran falsificación de registros y abuso sexual a la columnista E. Jean Carroll. Por otro lado, y con políticas completamente opuestas se encuentra la candidata Kamala Harris, quien destaca por su extensa trayectoria profesional: comenzó ejerciendo como abogada, sin embargo, un giro en su vida profesional la llevó a ocupar un puesto en el Senado y finalmente como candidata a la presidencia ya que tuvo que sustituir a Joe Biden. Harris es la candidata del partido Demócrata, y entre su propuesta se encuentra la restauración de las protecciones del *Row vs Wade* para que las mujeres tengan derecho a un aborto legal y seguro, además de crear nuevas políticas de inmigración en la que se reconozca la contribución de los migrantes al país.

Teniendo estos hechos en cuenta, es evidente que ambos candidatos tienen objetivos distintos y durante sus respectivos turnos de palabra intentarán apelar a distintas emociones en el público para conseguir nuevos votantes. Todos los hechos mencionados anteriormente son los que nos llevan a preguntarnos en que diferirán sus estrategias discursivas; ya que siendo ambos candidatos tan diferentes y prometiendo futuros bastantes diferentes, quizá deban utilizar estrategias discursivas diferentes para llegar a su público objetivo, ya que este quizá responda mejor a ciertos estímulos, por ejemplo un uso de figuras completamente distintas y o presencia de distintas funciones del lenguaje durante sus respectivas intervenciones.

2. ESTADO DE LA CUESTIÓN

2.1. PERSPECTIVA HISTÓRICA DEL ANÁLISIS DEL DISCURSO POLÍTICO: LA RETÓRICA

El análisis del discurso político ha sido objeto de estudio desde distintos enfoques tanto teóricos como metodológicos, poniendo en el punto de mira el uso de la retórica u otras estrategias usadas por los políticos con el fin de persuadir. Aristóteles, desde Grecia, ya catalogó a la retórica como un arte fundamental para la persuasión y la buena argumentación; además creó tres tipos de apelaciones: la credibilidad del orador o *ethos*, la emoción del público o *pathos* y el razonamiento lógico o *logos* (Aristóteles, 2004). A pesar de que el estudio de la retórica ha evolucionado, los conocimientos asentados por Aristóteles sirvieron como punto de partida, y asimismo también son la base de muchos de los estudios lingüísticos actuales.

No obstante, ha sufrido una notable evolución a lo largo del tiempo, especialmente a partir siglo XX, como se detallará a continuación; pero antes se deben mencionar los matices de dicha transformación: según Carmona Tinoco, Jorge Ulises (2019) la diferencia más destacable sobre la retórica actual es que se trata de un sinónimo de argumentación, mientras que en sus inicios estaba asociada por algunos autores como Platón a la adulación política, y para Aristóteles era un medio para la persuasión. Es decir, que con su evolución también ha cambiado lo que es la retórica, pasando de ser un medio usado con el fin de persuadir a ser la propia argumentación.

2.2. INVESTIGACIONES ACTUALES SOBRE DISCURSO POLÍTICO

Como ya se ha expuesto en el apartado anterior, la retórica ha sido sujeto de una gran evolución, en concreto durante el siglo XX, y uno de los factores más relevantes para algunos investigadores es el uso de figuras retóricas en política, dedicándose numerosos estudios a ello. Investigaciones recientes han demostrado que algunas de las figuras retóricas pueden ser elementos clave a la hora de argumentar o de crear una conexión con el público, generando así un impacto emocional en la audiencia (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1989).

Asimismo, autores como van Dijk (2000) han estudiado la relación que existe entre el poder y el discurso, llegando a la conclusión de que la estructura del lenguaje político influye en cómo percibimos la realidad y en la construcción de nuevas ideologías o narrativas políticas.

De igual manera el modelo de las funciones del lenguaje de Jakobson (1960) también ha sido muy utilizado para estudiar el discurso político, ya que como afirma el autor, la función poética no se limita simplemente a campos como la literatura o la poesía, sino que forma parte del lenguaje de manera íntegra. Sus funciones (referencial, estética, metalingüística, fática, emotiva o apelativa) nos permiten categorizar los usos del lenguaje según la intención que tenga el emisor y según la reacción que se provoque receptor. En sus investigaciones recientes Chilton (2004) ha usado este modelo para analizar como en ocasiones los políticos manipulan la información o acentúan determinados mensajes con el fin de influenciar a los votantes.

2.3. DEBATES PRESIDENCIALES COMO OBJETO DE ESTUDIO

Si nos adentramos en el contexto de los debates presidenciales, numerosos investigadores han estudiado la manera en la que los políticos utilizan el lenguaje como un elemento diferenciador, con el fin de movilizar a sus posibles electores o embestir contra sus oponentes. Es así como se ha observado que, más allá de tener una función estética y estilística, las figuras retóricas también desempeñan una función estratégica en la argumentación política (Charteris-Black, 2018). A pesar de que entre los recursos más populares en política se encuentran las figuras retóricas, este análisis pondrá el foco de estudio en la anáfora y la hipérbole, ya que se ha detectado una clara tendencia de los candidatos a estas.

Igualmente, es importante destacar cómo en las últimas décadas, el uso de la retórica en los debates presidenciales ha tenido una evolución significativa. Esto se ha visto reflejado especialmente en lo que respecta a la polarización del lenguaje a causa de una mayor polarización entre los candidatos respectivamente, y como consecuencia hay una mayor presencia de estrategias de ataque personal, cambios en la estructura y dinámica durante los debates, y la necesidad de adaptar estos eventos a los nuevos formatos mediáticos. Esta adaptación a los nuevos medios de comunicación se ha convertido en un factor clave en los últimos años y ha cambiado el uso de la retórica, ya que tener una buena presencia televisiva puede cambiar por completo los resultados electorales. Un claro ejemplo de ello es el primer debate televisado de la historia de Estados Unidos (1960, Kennedy-Nixon). Este causó una gran disparidad de opiniones entre el público: aquellos que habían visto el debate televisado pensaban que Kennedy había dominado la situación, sin embargo, el público que había escuchado el debate en la radio estaba convencido de que Nixon era el claro vencedor (Engage The Onero Institute, 2024).

Es de vital importancia, asimismo, que recordemos brevemente la evolución que ha tenido el estudio de la retórica a lo largo de los siglos: desde la visión clásica centrada en adornar el lenguaje, hacia la retórica actual que tiene como fin un enfoque más integral y es sinónimo de argumentar.

En el presente análisis del debate presidencial de 2024 entre Kamala Harris y Donald Trump el estudio de estos factores es muy relevante para determinar el estilo discursivo de cada candidato y las estrategias que emplea. Haciendo referencia a estudios previos, algunos investigadores han determinado que Trump tiene tendencia a recurrir a la hipérbole y utiliza un lenguaje más directo y beligerante con el objetivo de movilizar a sus votantes. Esta información también ha llegado a prensa, encontrándose numerosos artículos relacionando este uso de la hipérbole del candidato con su estilo de discurso, entre ellos el artículo escrito por Espino (2025), en el que el autor relaciona esta hipérbole con el tono agresivo que caracteriza los discursos de Trump. Sin embargo, por lo que se ha podido observar a priori durante el visionado del debate, Harris destaca por un mayor uso de la anáfora y un lenguaje más estructurado con el objetivo de reforzar el mensaje. El análisis de estas diferencias no solo nos permitirá ver las semejanzas estratégicas y discursivas de los candidatos, sino también identificar cuáles son dichas estrategias y cómo reacciona el público a ellas, especialmente en un momento en el que la polarización política está a la orden del día.

2.4. PROBLEMAS DE DELIMITACIÓN DEL DISCURSO POLÍTICO

Si bien es cierto que pueden existir tantas definiciones de discurso político como personas hay en el mundo con su idea ya previamente concebida de lo que es o no es esta tipología discursiva y textual, es de vital importancia para este trabajo tener claro que se entiende por discurso político y que es necesario para poder realizar un buen análisis del mismo.

El discurso político es «un instrumento por medio del cual se ejerce el poder en dos dimensiones: una, a través de la dominación en el texto y el habla en contextos específicos; y dos, mediante la influencia del discurso en las mentes de otros» (Martins, 2022).

Actualmente se ha podido observar cómo se han dejado de lado las teorías «globalizadas» sobre el lenguaje, y por lo tanto el discurso, y es que han surgido corrientes y autores completamente distintos, como puede ser Chomsky. Esto ha tenido mucha influencia en autores españoles como Albaladejo y otros teóricos, quienes defendieron la retórica clásica como un elemento clave para poder crear una teoría del discurso moderna. Sin embargo, estos autores no querían tomar de manera literal las nociones de esta retórica clásica, sino que creían

que debían reinterpretar los elementos de esta para poder analizar la poética. Posteriormente, a finales del siglo XX, los nuevos teóricos, como van Dijk, se posicionaron a favor de la creación de teorías basadas en enfoques más empíricos. Esto es relevante porque la situación del discurso político es muy pareja: a pesar de que existen análisis de discursos completos, debates o campañas, no hay hasta el momento ninguna teoría sólida que delimite bien de qué trata, ni sus características (De Cervantes, s.f.).

Sin embargo, algunos autores han seguido avanzando en esta investigación, como Gutiérrez (2006), quien afirma que no es una tarea sencilla delimitar los rasgos que caracterizan a los discursos políticos, ya que comparten estos con otras tipologías discursivas. Además, Verón (1987) ya señaló la problemática que surge al tratar de definir el concepto de discurso político, y por lo tanto el autor sugirió una serie de niveles o pasos que se deben tener en cuenta de igual manera a la hora de tratar de caracterizar un discurso de esta índole: se parte de la base de que cuando se trata de conceptualizar, nunca se debe tener en mente que el objeto de esta conceptualización debe ser un discurso en concreto, sino que el objetivo debe ser un campo discursivo; es decir «una tipología de juegos de discurso». Es decir, que no debe limitarse al estudio de un solo discurso. Asimismo, no podemos limitarnos a definir una clase de discurso en específico, ya que en ese caso deberíamos atribuirle una serie de «variantes» específicas asociadas al mismo, y esto no es posible, puesto que dichas variantes no existen porque en realidad son las distintas estrategias discursivas que podemos emplear. Es decir, no existe una única tipología de discurso político, sino que habrá múltiples maneras de expresarlo y esta variará en función de las estrategias utilizadas, adaptándose al público y al contexto comunicativo. Otro factor para tener en cuenta es la diacronía. Esto es de vital importancia ya que la descripción de estos discursos implica que ocurren en un momento determinado, y por lo tanto una estrategia puede evolucionar con el paso del tiempo. Por este motivo debemos de ser capaces de diferenciar el «núcleo» de dicha estrategia, que será lo invariable a pesar del paso del tiempo, mientras que su forma de aplicarse o de expresión será la parte cambiante.

2.5. EL LENGUAJE POLÍTICO COMO LENGUAJE DE ESPECIALIDAD

En relación con lo expuesto en el apartado anterior, hay distintas formas o medios en los que se pueden plasmar los distintos «tipos» de discursos, y es que los que se clasifican como sociales llegan al público a través de distintos medios de comunicación que determinarán del mismo modo cuáles son las condiciones en las que circulan: la televisión, la prensa escrita, la radio, etc. Esto es un factor clave, ya que no se deben analizar de igual manera los discursos

que han sido difundidos por medios distintos, y estos afectan a la construcción del propio discurso.

Sin embargo, otros autores afirman que, al tratarse el lenguaje político de un lenguaje de especialidad, pueden atribuírsele ciertas características que le aportan un carácter propio e identificable.

Según Messina Fajardo (2016) este lenguaje de especialidad se diferencia de los demás principalmente en su sintaxis, el uso del léxico y las «palabras testigo». A pesar de que el estudio se centra en el uso que hacen los políticos de este lenguaje y cómo modifican los elementos mencionados anteriormente, las características debido al uso son las siguientes:

La sintaxis utilizada por los políticos destaca por la gran presencia que hay de coordinación y yuxtaposición, y es que se emplea como un recurso para dotar al discurso de un mayor grado de decoración, siendo los elementos más afectados tanto los sustantivos como los adjetivos, teniendo como consecuencia que pueda resultar algo repetitivo; sin embargo, la repetición es un recurso buscado por los políticos habitualmente para captar la atención de su público (Messina Fajardo, 2016).

De igual manera, cabe mencionar la gran abundancia de marcas axiológicas presentes en el léxico utilizado en este lenguaje de especialidad. El lenguaje político está repleto de ellas ya que es muy común que los oradores hagan uso de ellas con el fin de desprestigiar o injuriar la imagen de su oponente y sus ideales (Messina Fajardo, 2016).

En último lugar, la presencia de «palabras testigo» es muy habitual en el lenguaje político. Se trata de un fenómeno lingüístico por el cual palabras del lenguaje de uso cotidiano y sin connotaciones políticas pasan a formar parte del lenguaje político en un breve espacio de tiempo (Martoré, 1973, como se citó en Messina Fajardo, 2016). Según la autora, un ejemplo reciente de este fenómeno ya mencionado es el término «*globalización*».

Sin embargo, para van Dijk (1999), el discurso político puede ser algo más complejo de definir, ya que un discurso puede considerarse político dependiendo del contexto. Por ejemplo, el discurso político no se limitará a los políticos, sino a todos aquellos afectados por la política: desde ciudadanos, votantes, grupos sociales, etc, siempre y cuando en el acto comunicativo se estén tratando temas que les afecten y por lo tanto actúen como actores políticos en materia de legislación, protestas, o el hecho de ser ciudadanos. Es decir, que para que un discurso sea considerado político debe tener como objetivo principal, pero no exclusivo, fines políticos.

Además, van Dijk (1999) también establece algunos de los elementos que pueden ser útiles a la hora de realizar un análisis del discurso político (ADP), y afirma que uno de los objetivos

de este análisis debe ser «contestar preguntas políticas genuinas y relevantes y tratar sobre temas que se discuten en la ciencia política». Es por ello por lo que, durante gran parte del ensayo, el autor remarca la importancia de establecer los límites sobre lo que es o no es el discurso político, ya que esta es una fase previa vital para poder realizar un buen análisis.

Algunos de los elementos mencionados por van Dijk (1999) que podemos encontrar en esta tipología discursiva de manera frecuente es una actitud o una percepción negativa del presente y una descripción del futuro positiva, por lo que se aplicarán las políticas descritas por el propio orador. Por otro lado, en lo que respecta a las alusiones a tiempos pasados podemos encontrar dos tendencias: por un lado, los políticos o partidos con tendencias progresistas lo suelen ver como una época en la que la brecha entre clases era muy amplia y había una gran diferenciación social; sin embargo, los sectores políticos con tendencias más conservadoras los recuerdan como «buenos tiempos», con anhelo.

Por último, van Dijk (1999) también menciona la dicotomía que tanto destaca en política: nosotros vs ellos. El autor hace alusión a la tendencia que existe en este tipo de discurso a agravar la brecha que existe entre dos grupos. Es muy común el uso de o la ilustración de nosotros asociado a características positivas, por lo tanto, también a sus propias políticas o decisiones; mientras que los otros o ellos son retratados como enemigos de la democracia y sus políticas como algo que arruinará el país. Este fenómeno por supuesto queda reflejado en la semántica propia de esta tipología de discurso. Junto a esta estrategia también es muy común que se dé la minimización de algunos aspectos o «des tematización» como pueden ser los aspectos negativos propios vs la minimización de los aspectos o temas positivos de los adversarios.

2.6. ANÁLISIS POLÍTICO DEL DISCURSO

A pesar de tratarse de un trabajo no muy extenso y por lo tanto no se podrán analizar tantos elementos como sería deseado para sacar unas conclusiones con un mayor grado de complejidad, cabe mencionar para una mayor comprensión del análisis político – a pesar de limitarse el objeto de estudio de este trabajo a las figuras retóricas, las funciones del lenguaje y la estrategia de argumentación – que hay otros elementos que son vitales para poder realizar un correcto análisis y comprender el significado del discurso completamente. En lo que respecta al análisis político del discurso, según las conclusiones obtenidas por Vega-Ramírez (2023), este tipo de análisis no debe poner el foco solo en las palabras, sino que también son de gran importancia elementos como los silencios, el simbolismo implícito y las omisiones, ya que estos discursos no pueden ser concebidos como una narración o una exposición de

ideas que se ponen de manifiesto de manera ordenada y lógica, sino que se trata de declaraciones que se dan en distintos contextos y de manera intencionada, además estar caracterizadas por la necesidad de imponerse sobre otras manifestaciones o juicios considerados de menor valor. Por este mismo motivo, a pesar de que un discurso puede influir en una realidad, no será el responsable de crearla; en su lugar será una propuesta de visualización de esta realidad, y su significado y validación quedan en manos del público. Es decir, para el autor, todo acto político o relacionado con la política tiene un valor, ya que todo acto discursivo tendrá estas implicaciones; afirmando así que el análisis político del discurso es un enfoque que continúa desarrollándose.

3. MARCO TEÓRICO

3.1. RETÓRICA CLÁSICA Y NUEVA RETÓRICA

La Real Academia Española define la retórica como el «arte de bien decir, de dar al lenguaje escrito o hablado eficacia bastante para deleitar, persuadir o conmover»; y el Centro Virtual Cervantes como una disciplina, tanto teórica como aplicada. En lo que respecta a la parte teórica, la retórica sirve para la elaboración de discursos persuasivos, y la parte práctica trata la teorización del cómo se hacen estos mismos.

Además, cómo bien afirma Cervantes (s.f.), el interés sobre el estudio de esta disciplina se remonta a la antigüedad, cuando varios filósofos clásicos y otras figuras comenzaron a interesarse por el poder de la palabra. Entre ellos destacan Sócrates, Platón y Aristóteles, Cicerón o Quintiliano. Es por ello por lo que la retórica es una de las primeras reflexiones que se hicieron sobre el lenguaje y el uso de este, y cómo el discurso puede tener la capacidad de convencer y de servir una intención comunicativa.

En la retórica clásica se distinguen las siguientes funciones según Cervantes (s.f.):

1. Retórica judicial: aquella que tiene como propósito o fin juzgar lo que es justo o lo contrario ante un tribunal basándose en la acusación y la defensa.
2. Retórica deliberativa: aquella que tiene como propósito decidir entre aquello que es útil y lo que es nocivo en lo referente a los asuntos gubernamentales basándose en exhortar y disuadir.
3. Retórica demostrativa o epidíctica: aquella que tiene como objetivo o fin valorar lo que es bello o contrariamente feo basándose en el elogio o en la reprobación.

Cervantes (s.f.) también distingue cuatro partes en la retórica, estas fueron introducidas por Aristóteles, y posteriormente Cicerón y Quintiliano añadieron a este listado la etapa de

memorización. Dichas partes sirven para definir las cinco fases que son necesarias para la creación de un buen discurso. Estas consisten en:

1. *Inventio*: Es la primera etapa, en la que el objetivo es encontrar el tema del discurso y descartar toda aquella información que no sea de utilidad o no tenga relevancia; y elaborar argumentos acordes al fin del discurso y las circunstancias comunicativas (Cervantes, s.f.).
2. *Dispositio*: Segunda etapa en la que el discurso comienza a tomar forma. Al elaborar el discurso es importante recordar las cuatro partes que lo componen: el exordio consiste en hacer una breve introducción al público o tratar de llamar la atención de este con el fin de indicar que vamos a comenzar el discurso; la fase de narración tiene como fin hacer una breve introducción sobre el tema del discurso y exponer al público cual es la conclusión a la que se quiere llegar; la argumentación es el momento en el que se trata de convencer al público a través de diferentes argumentos o pruebas, el objetivo puede ser la confirmación (convencer al público de la idea del orador) o la refutación (disuadir al público); y la peroración es la última parte del discurso en la que el orador dará su conclusión e intentará conmover al público y terminar de convencer a alguien en casa de que no lo hubiera conseguido anteriormente (Cervantes, s.f.).
3. *Elocutio*: es el momento de puesta en escena o expresión del discurso a través del lenguaje y adoptando un estilo concreto, y es necesario que tenga las siguientes características: corrección claridad, elegancia y decoro (Cervantes, s.f.).
4. *Memoria*: es la etapa como su propio nombre indica de memorización del discurso, para posteriormente comunicárselo a un público (Cervantes, s.f.).
5. *Pronuntiatio*: es la puesta en escena del discurso, el momento en el que se expresa a través del lenguaje oral, y entran en juego otras técnicas propias de la retórica relacionadas con la gestualidad, la modulación de la voz y la pose del orador (Cervantes, s.f.).

Posteriormente, durante el siglo XX surgió la nueva retórica, cómo indican Torres Hernández, N. H. y Velandia Pedraza, Z. Y. (2008), basándose en los trabajos de C. Perelman y L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958).

Torres Hernández, N. H. y Velandia Pedraza, Z. Y. (2008) mencionan que para Perelman (1997) la nueva retórica es una ampliación de la visión que tenía Aristóteles, ya que considera que la nueva retórica «cubre todo el campo del discurso» sin importar si el objetivo de este es persuadir o conmover, y tampoco tiene relevancia alguna por quién este compuesto el público o cuál sea el tema del que va a tratar dicho discurso. Por lo tanto, como afirma este autor, la nueva retórica no tiene como objetivo la discusión de «hechos incuestionables», sino que se trata de una discusión en la que las diferentes soluciones pueden llegar a ser

contradictorias, y por lo tanto es necesaria una conversación para llegar a una conclusión. Agregando a lo anterior, en la obra *Tratado de la Argumentación* de Peleman y Olbrechts-Tyteca los autores proporcionan una definición de lo que es para ellos la nueva retórica, enunciado lo siguiente:

La nueva retórica consiste, por tanto, en una teoría de la argumentación, complementaria de la teoría de la demostración objeto de la lógica formal. Mientras que la ciencia se basa en la razón teórica, con sus categorías de verdad y evidencia y su método demostrativo, la retórica, la dialéctica y la filosofía se basan en la razón práctica, con sus categorías de lo verosímil y la decisión razonable y su método argumentativo, justificado. (1989: 17). De Torres Hernández, N. H. y Velandia Pedraza, Z. Y. (2008).

Por lo tanto, podemos concluir afirmando que esta nueva visión de la retórica argumenta que la retórica clásica es el precedente de todas las ciencias del lenguaje; y la nueva retórica considera al lenguaje como algo persuasivo en sí mismo.

3.2. MÉTODOS DE PERSUASIÓN EN EL DISCURSO

En este apartado se tratan otros de los elementos necesarios para la elaboración de un buen discurso, sumándose estos al proceso ya mencionado con anterioridad y las nuevas teorías en lo que a una buena retórica respecta. Estos elementos son los métodos de persuasión, establecidos ya en los inicios de la retórica como disciplina por Aristóteles. Además, son fundamentales para una buena pronunciación del discurso según Rodríguez Porras, J.M., (2002). El autor ofrece la siguiente definición de estos:

En primer lugar, encontramos el *ethos*, es decir la honestidad de quien da el discurso (Rodríguez Porras, J.M., 2002).

En segundo lugar, encontramos el *pathos*, es decir la apelación a las emociones. Esta se transmite a través del tono de voz del orador y de su lenguaje no verbal (Rodríguez Porras, J.M., 2002).

En tercer lugar, encontramos con el *logos*, es decir la argumentación. Puede haber dos formas de argumentar, y es que por un lado el *logos* puede apelar a los valores humanos como pueden ser la igualdad, la libertad o el respeto; y por otro lado puede apelar a la relación existente causa-efecto de ciertos fenómenos en los que se haya comprobado que esta relación es cierta (Rodríguez Porras, J.M., 2002).

Por lo tanto, podemos afirmar de esta manera que el *ethos* es una apelación a una autoridad superior o con más experiencia, el *pathos* es la apelación a los sentimientos y emociones del público, y finalmente el *logos* es una apelación a la lógica.

Finalmente, cabe mencionar que la totalidad de los ya mencionados factores son de gran significación para la elaboración y puesta en escena de un buen discurso, ya que, al fin y al cabo, el fin u escopo de un discurso político es convencer a sus oyentes; por lo que es muy frecuente que los oradores recurran al uso del *ethos*, *logos* o *pathos*. Sin embargo, teóricos recientes como Bitzer (1968) argumentan que la elaboración de discursos y el lenguaje en sí mismo nacen siempre en respuesta a una situación en la que se emplea la retórica; pero que sin embargo nace de la necesidad de encontrar una respuesta para el público. Por este motivo el escopo de los discursos políticos es principalmente la persuasión, además de informar de la situación y generar un sentimiento de unión entre los oyentes. Asimismo, para que un orador tenga la confianza del público y poder cumplir con el escopo del discurso político, debe contar con los tres pilares que representan los ya mencionados métodos de persuasión, y encontrar un equilibrio óptimo de los tres, ya que si el discurso carece de alguno puede ser percibido como pobre o vacío; o por el contrario si se hace un uso excesivo de alguno de ellos puede cambiar negativamente la percepción del público, ya que por ejemplo un uso excesivo de *pathos* puede parecer manipulación, un uso excesivo de *logos* puede resultar en frialdad y un uso excesivo de *ethos* puede causar una sensación de deficiencia.

3.3. FIGURAS RETÓRICAS COMO ESTRATEGIAS DISCURSIVAS

La retórica y política están estrechamente unidas, ya que desde la antigüedad se ha considerado que las figuras retóricas son una gran arma de convicción.

A pesar de que desde la antigüedad la retórica ha ido evolucionando y dando lugar a nuevas teorías lingüísticas, aún puede ser sujeto de estudio, especialmente en política. A través de los discursos, los políticos buscan influir en la opinión de los ciudadanos para así conseguir sus apoyos. Asimismo, en política la retórica no solo tiene el objetivo de persuadir, sino que también juega un papel fundamental en la legitimación del orador y por lo tanto la deslegitimación del oponente. Debemos recordar que el lenguaje es muy poderoso cuando se usa correctamente; tiene la capacidad de modelar la percepción de la realidad, por lo que con él se pueden establecer algunos marcos interpretativos que benefician ciertas agendas políticas.

Para conseguir su objetivo es esencial que utilicen figuras retóricas en sus discursos, ya que estas no solo tienen el poder de embellecer el lenguaje, además juegan un papel en la capacidad de persuasión que este tenga. Existen distintas figuras retóricas, como la metáfora, la metonimia o la elipsis, pero en este caso vamos a poner el foco de atención en la anáfora «figura de dicción consistente en la repetición de una o más palabras al comienzo de enunciados sucesivos» (*Anáfora. Figura Retórica | Diccionari De Lingüística on Line*, s.f.) y en la hipérbole «figura que consiste en aumentar o disminuir exageradamente aquello de que se trata» (Asale & Rae, s.f.). Se han escogido estas figuras retóricas porque son las más utilizadas por los candidatos, y serán objeto de análisis para posteriormente determinar si estas diferencias son el reflejo de sus distintos estilos discursivos y si son consecuencia de que los candidatos quieren conseguir tener distintos efectos en el público.

3.4. FUNCIONES DEL LENGUAJE EN EL ANÁLISIS DEL DISCURSO

Cómo ya se ha ido desarrollando a lo largo del marco teórico, las funciones del lenguaje han sido estudiadas desde la antigüedad, pero en la lingüística moderna numerosos autores han encontrado interés en ellas, surgiendo así distintos modelos. Cómo señalan Fossa, P y Araya-Velez, C, (2017) algunos teóricos elaboraron modelos para explicar la comunicación de los seres humanos, entre ellos Bühler (1934), quien basándose en la teoría de la lingüística clásica y comprensión del lenguaje como un fenómeno de asociación entre palabra y objeto o fenómeno. Basándose en esto llegó a la conclusión de que había tres funciones principales: referencial, apelativa, y expresiva.

Posteriormente, fue Roman Jakobson quien revisando el modelo de Bühler llegó a la conclusión de que existen seis funciones que se pueden dar en el acto comunicativo. Aguirre Fernández Bravo (s.f.) indica cómo cada función corresponde o se centra en un elemento clave de la comunicación, siendo estas las siguientes:

1. Función representativa o referencial: aquella que gira en torno al referente y al contexto. Esta función tiene como fin informar sobre la realidad de manera objetiva.
2. Poética o estética: la importancia en este caso gira en torno a la forma del mensaje en sí misma, sin tener tanta importancia el contenido de este. El objetivo es usar el lenguaje para crear belleza, por lo que es muy habitual encontrar estilos estilísticos como la metáfora, referencias o juegos de palabras.

3. Metalingüística: se refiere al código utilizado, es una función que analiza y describe al propio lenguaje.
4. Fática: está relacionada con el propio canal de comunicación y la regulación de la interacción; ya sea bien para iniciar o terminar el proceso comunicativo o comprobar que el canal continúa abierto.
5. Emotiva o expresiva: corresponde al emisor permitiendo la expresión de emociones, sentimientos, deseos o actitudes; y por ello también expresa la subjetividad del orador.
6. Apelativa o conativa: es aquella que interpela directamente al receptor, y su objetivo es emplear el lenguaje para influir en el receptor de manera emocional, para convencerle o para provocar una reacción determinada.

Habiéndose establecido cuales son todas las funciones del lenguaje, en el presente trabajo cabe mencionar la estrecha relación entre la función poética y el uso de figuras retóricas, así como la gran presencia de esta función durante el acto comunicativo político, ya que son los principales recursos usados por los oradores para no solo embellecer el discurso (de ahí la estrecha relación con la función poética) sino también para como ya se ha mencionado con anterioridad, captar la atención del público o facilitar la memorización del discurso. De hecho, es posible afirmar que la función poética está presente en todo momento junto a las otras funciones durante la puesta en escena de un discurso, especialmente uno político ya que juega un papel fundamental, potenciando el efecto de esta tipología discursiva gracias a la facilitación de la memorización y la catalización del efecto de otras funciones como pueden ser la emotiva o la referencial.

4. METODOLOGÍA

Este estudio se enmarca en el análisis del discurso político. El enfoque es el uso de figuras retóricas, como la anáfora o la hipérbole, por parte de los candidatos en el debate presidencial de 2024, así como las funciones del lenguaje de Jakobson, las cuales son esenciales para poder comprender en profundidad como Trump y Harris estructuran sus mensajes con el fin de tener una mayor influencia en el público, y por último que estrategia de argumentación utilizan los oradores en sus respectivas intervenciones. El enfoque del trabajo tiene múltiples objetivos. Por un lado, busca comprender los aspectos lingüísticos del discurso de cada candidato, así como la interrelación de estos elementos en lo que respecta a la persuasión. Esto se debe a que estos discursos no solo tienen como fin la comunicación de información, sino que también buscan generar respuestas emocionales y cognitivas en su público. Por otro lado, la metodología combina un análisis cualitativo y descriptivo para examinar con mayor precisión

las estrategias empleadas por cada candidato, así como sus patrones lingüísticos. Este enfoque cualitativo nos permite realizar una interpretación en profundidad de la capacidad de persuasión de los discursos políticos.

El método de investigación se basará en la selección de fragmentos para la posterior elaboración de tablas en las que se evidencie el uso de estas figuras retóricas, funciones del lenguaje y estrategias o métodos de argumentación de acuerdo con el marco teórico. El objetivo es poder realizar un análisis basándonos en ejemplos obtenidos de distintos fragmentos del debate. Mediante estos ejemplos se pretende observar las figuras retóricas, y cuáles de ellas son usadas más habitualmente por los respectivos candidatos. Posteriormente, analizaremos en el caso de haber detectado una preferencia de uso clara, cuál puede ser el motivo de esto, como, por ejemplo, si se debe a que buscan provocar emociones distintas en los posibles votantes y por ello hacen uso de distintas figuras retóricas y si hay una mayor presencia de ciertas funciones del lenguaje frente a otras, estableciendo también una relación con el método de argumentación utilizado. Además, se realizará finalmente una comparación entre ambos oradores basándonos en los análisis anteriores, y finalmente se determinará las posibles dificultades que pueden surgir durante la interpretación del estilo retórico de cada orador.

Para llevar a cabo esta comparación entre Trump y Harris, la metodología que se aplicará a lo largo de todo el trabajo, tanto para la elaboración de tablas con fragmentos de las respectivas intervenciones de los oradores a lo largo del debate, como para el posterior análisis y las posibles dificultades en la interpretación en el apartado de conclusiones, se pondrá el foco en primer lugar en uno de los oradores, en este caso Trump, y posteriormente se llevará a cabo el mismo proceso con Harris.

5. ANÁLISIS Y DISCUSIÓN

5.1. ANÁLISIS DE TRUMP

A continuación, se llevará a cabo la parte del análisis que corresponde al actual presidente de Estados Unidos, a pesar de que en el momento del debate aún no había salido electo y por lo tanto sería expresidente, Donald Trump. Para ello, se seguirán los pasos establecidos previamente en el apartado de metodología con la correspondiente elaboración de una tabla en la que se incluirán fragmentos de las intervenciones de Trump durante el debate, que además ejemplificará el uso de figuras retóricas, también contará con un apartado en el que

se especifique la función del lenguaje que más destaca en cada intervención y finalmente con el método de argumentación empleado.

Una vez se cuente con estos datos, se desarrollará en los siguientes tres apartados un análisis sobre el motivo del uso de la figura retórica detectada, otro similar sobre el uso de las funciones del lenguaje del orador y por último una breve mención a los métodos de argumentación utilizados.

5.1.1. TABLA DE ANÁLISIS – DONALD TRUMP

Fragmento del debate (inglés)	Figura retórica	Función del lenguaje	Método de argumentación
«We have inflation like very few people have ever seen before. Probably the worst in our nation's history.» Párrafo 18.	Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que informa de la realidad económica del país a través de datos; y emotiva, ya que busca generar un impacto emocional en el público generando miedo o preocupación por la situación económica actual.	Pathos, ya que busca generar una respuesta emocional en el público; y en este caso el uso de la hipérbole también contribuye a este mismo fin.
«We have millions of people pouring into our country from prisons and jails, from mental institutions and insane asylums.» Párrafo 18.	Hipérbole	Apelativa y emotiva, ya que se dirige de manera directa al público (we), aunque también busca generar emociones como el miedo, por lo que también podría	Pathos, ya que busca generar emociones tal que el miedo o temor en su público en lo que a su seguridad respecta.

		considerarse emotiva.	
«I created one of the greatest economies in the history of our country.» Párrafo 18.	Hipérbole	Emotiva, ya que se trata de un dato completamente subjetivo en este caso y refleja cómo se siente él sobre su mandato, a pesar de que intenta ser referencial.	Ethos, ya que se sitúa a sí mismo como un gran líder y en las consecuencias económicas que tuvo su anterior etapa como presidente.
«And they're destroying our country. They're dangerous. They're at the highest level of criminality.» Párrafo 18	Hipérbole	Apelativa, ya que habla directamente a su público sobre lo que ciertos colectivos están haciendo al país, haciendo referencia a que no pueden permitir que la situación continúe así.	Pathos, ya que busca generar en su audiencia un sentimiento de rechazo hacia su oponente a través del lenguaje; además de temor o incertidumbre sobre el futuro.
«You look at Springfield, Ohio. Look at Aurora in Colorado. They are taking over the towns.» Párrafo 18	Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que usa datos y hace referencia a lugares; y emotiva ya que busca generar sentimientos tales como el miedo o el temor ante la amenaza de la invasión de ciertas ciudades.	Pathos, ya que busca generar temor en su público; y logos, ya que hace uso de lugares reales para dar veracidad a su discurso.

«I had no inflation, virtually no inflation, they had the highest inflation, perhaps in the history of our country because I've never seen a worse period of time.» Párrafo 27	Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que usa datos económicos para reforzar su argumento.	Logos, ya que hace uso de cifras y comparaciones con otros momentos pasados para fundamentar su argumento de forma racional; y ethos, ya que se pone a sí mismo como referente en tema económico para ganar credibilidad haciendo uso de los datos de su mandato presidencial.
«In Springfield, they're eating the dogs. The people that came in. They're eating the cats. They're eating -- they're eating the pets of the people that live there.» Párrafo 65	Hipérbole	Emotiva, ya que está usando datos que pueden generar emociones como pena, rechazo o indignación entre su público.	Pathos, ya que busca generar miedo y demás sentimientos negativos pintando una imagen grotesca a través del lenguaje.
«Our country is being lost. We're a failing nation. And it happened three and a half years ago.» Párrafo 65	Hipérbole	Apelativa, ya que se dirige directamente al público (uso de nosotros) y le intenta convencer de la gravedad de la crisis. Aunque también podría ser emotiva, ya que intenta convencer a través de emociones como la	Pathos, ya que hace una exageración u busca despertar el sentimiento de nación en su público, y asimismo culpa a sus oponentes haciendo uso de esa referencia temporal.

		nostalgia o el sentimiento de pertenencia a la nación.	
«We have the biggest rallies, the most incredible rallies in the history of politics.» Párrafo 65	Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que usa datos para informar sobre la realidad, y así reforzar su argumento basado en datos objetivos; es decir, hacer ver a su público que cuenta con un gran apoyo.	Logos, ya que, a pesar de hacer uso de la hipérbole, se apoya en datos cuantificables para aportar veracidad a su argumento.
«And if she becomes president, this country doesn't have a chance of success. Not only success. We'll end up being Venezuela on steroids.» Párrafo 65	Hipérbole	Apelativa, ya que hace una referencia directa a su público, incluso futuro que les espera si amenazándoles sobre su oponente sale las consecuencias electa, haciendo uso de que habrá si permiten una comparación con que su oponente Venezuela. salga electa.	Pathos, ya que busca generar en los oyentes temor y alarma ante el futuro que les espera si su oponente sale electa, haciendo uso de una comparación con Venezuela.
«We are gonna take in billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars.» Párrafo 27	Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que usa datos económicos para dar veracidad a su postura.	Logos, ya que la argumentación en este fragmento del discurso está basada en cifras cuantificables.
«They allowed criminals. Many, many, millions of criminals. They allowed terrorists. They allowed common street criminals. They allowed people to come	Hipérbole – Anáfora	Apelativa, ya que se dirige de manera directa al público, de nuevo, para mostrar	Pathos, ya que busca generar sentimientos en los posibles votantes como la

in, drug dealers, to come into our country, and they're now in the United States.» Párrafo 81		las consecuencias de las acciones de su oponente; también puede ser emotiva, ya que expresa indignación.	desconfianza en su oponente o el temor a que la situación en el futuro empeore si él no sale electo.
«They're coming in and they're taking jobs that are occupied right now by African Americans and Hispanics.» Párrafo 18	Hipérbole	Emotiva, ya que apela a los sentimientos de la audiencia, buscando generar emociones como rechazo hacia ciertos colectivos.	Pathos ya que, busca provocar un sentimiento de miedo o rechazo en su audiencia hacia ciertos sectores de la sociedad, haciendo énfasis en que incluso otros sectores de la población migrante se quedarán también sin trabajo.
«They've destroyed the economy and all you have to do is look at a poll.» Párrafo 27	Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que usa datos objetivos como son las encuestas para reflejar la realidad.	Logos, ya que basa su argumentación en datos, y ethos, ya que busca generar un sentimiento negativo hacia el plan económico de su oponente.
«Well, there she goes again. It's a lie. I'm not signing a ban. And there's no reason to sign a ban.» Párrafo 42	Hipérbole - Anáfora	Metalingüística, ya que habla del propio lenguaje de su oponente.	Pathos, ya que busca generar entre los oyentes una desconfianza hacia su oponente, especialmente con el

			uso del sustantivo mentira (« <i>lie</i> »).
«People can't go out and buy cereal, bacon, or eggs or anything else. The people of our country are absolutely dying.» Párrafo 27	Hipérbole	Emotiva, ya que está tratando de generar un impacto emocional en la audiencia.	Logos, ya que a pesar de ser una exageración de la realidad aporta datos verídicos sobre la situación de la nación.
«That was one of the most incompetently handled situations anybody has ever seen.» (Sobre Irán) Párrafo 77	Hipérbole	Emotiva, ya que está expresando sus propios sentimientos sobre cómo se gestionó la situación, y a su vez intenta provocar los mismos en el público.	Pathos, ya que busca provocar un sentimiento de rechazo o duda de las capacidades de gestión de su oponente.
«Iran was broke under Donald Trump. Now Iran has \$300 billion because they took off all the sanctions that I had. Iran had no money for Hamas or Hezbollah or any of the 28 different spheres of terror.» Párrafo 141	Hipérbole - Anáfora	Referencial, ya que usa datos objetivos para argumentar una realidad y desmentir a su oponente.	Logos, ya que usa datos y cifras para respaldar su argumento.
«...millions and millions of people that are pouring into our country monthly..., bigger than New York state.» Párrafo 31	Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que usa datos objetivos como la comparación del número de inmigrantes con el estado de Nueva York.	Logos, ya que, a pesar de estar caracterizado el discurso por un tono hiperbólico, hace uso de cifras para dar veracidad a su argumento; aunque también puede ser pathos, ya que busca

			generar miedo con la mención de esas cantidades.
«We are playing with World War 3.» (Sobre Ucrania) Párrafo 151	Hipérbole	Emotiva, ya que está buscando generar emociones como miedo o temor en su público.	Pathos, ya que con la mención de una posible tercera Mundial busca sembrar el miedo o terror entre su público.

Tabla 1¹

5.1.2. USO DE FIGURAS RETÓRICAS

Como se puede observar en la Tabla 1, la cual contienen fragmentos del debate con oraciones o frases de momentos en los que intervenía Donald Trump, la figura retórica a la que más recurre el candidato es la hipérbole. Esto se debe a que tiene una tendencia a exagerar los datos. Esto puede deberse a dos motivos:

Por un lado, busca engrandecer sus logros pasados para hacer ver que en el caso del volver a salir electo rescataría al país de la situación en la que se encuentra devolviéndole a la posición hegemónica que, según su punto de vista, puede llegar a alcanzar e incluso se merece. Esto se puede ver reflejado en su eslogan que tanto le caracteriza «Make America great again», que se puede traducir por «Devolver la grandeza a América»²; sin embargo, esta oración utilizada por primera vez durante su campaña electoral en 2016 puede ser percibida por muchos como un sentimiento de nostalgia, concretamente de los tiempos imperialistas.

Por otro lado, el uso de la hipérbole a lo largo de un discurso de carácter político también puede deberse a la intención del orador de agravar los errores de su oponente, y de esta misma manera mermar su credibilidad. A través del uso de esta figura, desacredita los logros del oponente, dejando en evidencia solo las políticas con las que no está de acuerdo, y de esta manera aumenta la polarización o la distancia entre ambos candidatos, destacando él por sus increíbles logros frente a su oponente, destacando por sus errores.

¹ Los fragmentos han sido tomados de la transcripción del debate presidencial 2024 (ABC News, 2024).

² Traducción propia. Se ha tomado la decisión de utilizar *América* en lugar de *Estados Unidos* porque se ha considerado que hay que ser fiel a la ideología implícita del mensaje original.

Sin embargo, a lo largo del debate, Trump también hace uso de la anáfora en distintas intervenciones, ya que es un recurso extremadamente útil, especialmente en política para aportar ritmo a sus intervenciones y recordar la memorización, además de captar la atención del público.

Por último, cabe mencionar que a pesar de no haber sido analizadas hay presencia de otras figuras retóricas en menor medida, como puede ser la metáfora al hacer una comparación con Venezuela o la antítesis al contrastar la inflación.

5.1.3. USO DE FUNCIONES DEL LENGUAJE

Como se puede observar en la Tabla 1 Trump hace un mayor uso de tres funciones del lenguaje, y estas son la emotiva (muy ligada a la hipérbole) y la apelativa; esto pueda ser fruto de distintas estrategias:

En primer lugar, cabe mencionar a pesar de no ser la función más presente a lo largo del debate que hay bastante presencia de la función referencial, ya que esta tiene como objetivo informar sobre la realidad de manera objetiva. Es decir, el uso de la función referencial aporta veracidad a su discurso, y es que aportar datos objetivos servirá para que su público confíe en él. Este uso recurrente de esta función se puede observar en numerosas ocasiones, sin embargo, como se ha desarrollado en el apartado anterior todo su discurso está caracterizado por un tono hiperbólico, por lo que los datos que el candidato toma como objetivos, no tienen porque realmente serlo.

En segundo lugar, se puede observar también una abundante presencia de la función emotiva, ya que está muy relacionada con el uso de la hipérbole. Esto se debe a que Trump, en muchas de sus intervenciones busca influenciar a su público, especialmente a aquellos votantes que aún no saben por quién optar. Además, el uso de la función emotiva denota que quiere provocar determinados sentimientos en los oyentes; por ejemplo, al tratar el tema de la inmigración ilegal, deja clara su posición en contra, y afirma que estos migrantes quitan el trabajo a otras comunidades o que vienen al país a delinquir, quedando retratados como sujetos peligrosos. Esta estrategia se puede ver a lo largo de todo el debate, cuando trata temas como la Guerra de Ucrania y una posible Tercera Guerra Mundial o la necesidad de internar a los inmigrantes en instituciones mentales. Sin embargo, se puede observar que, en la mayoría de las ocasiones, Trump hace uso de esta función para generar en su público sentimientos considerados tradicionalmente como negativos, siendo estos el miedo, temor o rechazo hacia ciertos colectivos,

Finalmente, se puede percibir una presencia notoria de la función apelativa, y es que en varias ocasiones intercepta directamente a su público. Esto también queda reflejado en el uso de los pronombres de los que hace uso, cambiando del *I* (primera persona del singular) a *we* (primera persona del plural) o *you* (segunda persona del plural o singular). Tras haber realizado el análisis, se puede afirmar que en muchas ocasiones en las que el candidato hace alusión directa al público es con la intención de recalcar que son parte de la nación y de su futuro, teniendo así una responsabilidad sobre el futuro de la misma.

5.1.4. MÉTODOS DE ARGUMENTACIÓN

Como se puede observar en el análisis realizado en la Tabla 1, el método de argumentación más recurrente en Trump es el *pathos*, es decir aquel que apela a las emociones. Esto no resulta sorprendente, ya que se ha podido observar mediante el análisis de los demás elementos de la tabla que tiene una tendencia a buscar la reacción emocional de su audiencia, ya que es uno de los métodos más eficaces para influenciar. Aun así, también hace uso del *ethos*, aunque en lugar de mencionar a otras figuras de autoridad, se menciona así mismo haciendo uso de todos sus logros pasados; y del *logos*, ya que es muy común en discursos políticos invitar al público a la reflexión.

5.2. ANÁLISIS DE KAMALA HARRIS

Como ya se ha explicado en el primer apartado del punto anterior, para realizar este análisis se seguirán los pasos establecidos previamente en el apartado de metodología.

En primer lugar, se creará una tabla en la que se hayan tomado como referencia distintas intervenciones de Harris a lo largo del debate. Sin embargo, a diferencia de la tabla anterior, en algunas ocasiones las intervenciones de Harris han sido agrupadas en la misma celda a pesar de que algunas de ellas no se hayan dicho seguidas durante el evento. Esta decisión se ha tomado, ya que al tratarse de un Trabajo de Fin de Grado no es posible realizar un análisis de todo el debate, y en el caso de Harris se puede llegar a perder la esencia de su estilo si no se ve el debate completo. Esto queda indicado con la separación de las frases u oraciones con puntos suspensivos.

5.2.1. TABLA DE ANÁLISIS – KAMALA HARRIS

Fragmento del debate (inglés)	Figura retórica	Función del lenguaje	Método de argumentación
-------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------

«Donald Trump left us the worst unemployment since the Great Depression. Donald Trump left us the worst public health epidemic in a century. Donald Trump left us the worst attack on our democracy since the Civil War.» Párrafo 20	Anáfora - Hipérbole	Referencial, ya que utiliza datos objetivos sobre las políticas económicas de su oponente; y emotiva, ya que apela a emociones como el miedo en el público, asociándolas a las políticas económicas de su oponente.	Logos, ya que se presenta datos históricos para para apoyar su argumento a través de la objetividad.
«We know that we have a shortage of homes and housing, and the cost of housing is too expensive for far too many people. We know that young families need support to raise their children.» Párrafo 16	Anáfora	Apelativa, ya que está respondiendo directamente a su público.	Logos, ya que se utilizan afirmaciones conocidas por el público general para apoyar la lógica de su argumentación; aunque también puede considerarse pathos, ya que es un tema que puede ser sensible para algunos sectores del público que se vean afectados.
«The reality is, it has been about standing as America always should, <u>as a leader</u> upholding international rules and norms. <u>As a leader</u> who shows strength, understanding...» Párrafo 169	Anáfora	Referencial, ya que se puede observar una descripción idealizada sobre su rol en la nación, defendiendo lo que se espera de su mandato y de esta	Ethos, ya que el objetivo es reforzar su autoridad, especialmente la moral, al presentarse a sí misma como una buena líder en materia internacional.

		manera enmarcando el argumento en hechos.	
«Let's turn the page on this. Let's not go back. Let's chart a course for the future and not go backwards to the past..» Párrafo 115	Anáfora	Emotiva , ya que está buscando generar una respuesta emocional en los oyentes ante una promesa de un nuevo futuro.	Pathos , ya que tiene como intención apelar a la esperanza, tomando acción y cambiando el futuro que promete su oponente.
«And an attempt to take us backward. But we're not going back. <u>And</u> I do believe that the American people know we all have so much more in common than what separates us and we can chart a new way forward. <u>And</u> a vision of...» Párrafo 217	Anáfora	Se pueden detectar las funciones emotiva y apelativa , ya que la repetición pone énfasis en la idea de cambio y de unión, invitando de este modo a la audiencia a identificarse con su proyecto y superar así aquello que les divide.	Pathos , ya que busca generar en la audiencia un sentimiento de unión, apelando al deseo conjunto de no volver a tiempos pasados, llevando esto la pérdida de algunos derechos y la división de la sociedad.
«I'll tell you, I started my career as a prosecutor. I was a D.A. I was an attorney general.» Párrafo 217	Anáfora	Referencial , ya que enuncia de manera repetitiva hechos que constituyen su vida profesional, aportando así legitimidad política a su imagen.	Ethos , ya que usa su carrear profesional para dotarse así misma de autoridad y por ende reforzar su credibilidad.

«And I am actually the only person on this stage who has a plan...And that is why I imagine and have actually a plan to build what I call an opportunity economy... And I intend on extending a tax cut for those families of \$6,000...» Párrafo 16	Anáfora	Referencial, ya que aporta datos objetivos sobre sus propuesta y planes de política económica para que el público pueda evaluarlos.	Logos, ya que se presenta como la única con propuestas económicas concretas que llevan detrás un trabajo de análisis y preparación; por lo tanto, funcionales.
«And that's not who we are as Americans... And that is another one» Párrafo 159 y 169	Anáfora	Emotiva, ya que apela al sentimiento de identidad de la nación.	Pathos, ya que apela al sentimiento de orgullo nacional.
«She didn't want that. Her husband didn't want that... They don't want that.» Párrafo 40	Anáfora	Emotiva, ya que apela a las emociones hablando de una situación injusta en la que nadie quiere una situación, pero no tienen poder de decisión sobre la misma.	Pathos, ya que hace uso de experiencias de personas reales para buscar la empatía del público.
«... I travel our country, we see in each other a friend. We see in each other a neighbor.» Párrafo 188	Anáfora	Apelativa, ya que se dirige directamente a la audiencia hablándoles de manera directa (uso de segunda persona del plural) y emotiva, ya que busca generar un	Pathos, ya que busca generar en el público un sentimiento de hermandad y cercanía, quedando la oradora como una igual.

		sentimiento de cercanía.	
« Understand in his Project 2025 there would be a national abortion ban. Understand in his Project 2025 there would be a national abortion abortion - - a monitor that would be monitoring your pregnancies, your miscarriages.» Párrafo 40	Anáfora - Hipérbole	Apelativa, ya que se dirige a la audiencia de manera directa y les invita a que reflexionen las implicaciones políticas del plan de su oponente; aunque también hay uso de la emotiva por el tema del que se trata y en su defecto por la eliminación de derechos de un colectivo.	Pathos, ya que busca generar en la audiencia una reacción emocional, advirtiéndole sobre las consecuencias del plan de su oponente; y las consecuencias tanto físicas como emocionales que conllevaría para la población afectada.
«...we need a cease-fire deal and we need the hostages out.» Párrafo 139	Anáfora	Apelativa, ya que habla al público de manera directa; y también emotiva ya que el tema en sí genera una reacción sentimental.	Pathos, ya que busca la empatía de la audiencia, especialmente con la mención de los rehenes (<i>hostages</i>).
«...I have a plan. Let's talk about our plans. And, and let's compare the plans...I have a plan. \$6,000 for young families for the first year of your child's life. To help you in that most critical stage of your child's development. I have a plan that is about...»	Anáfora	Referencia, ya que aporta datos objetivos sobre su plan y lo detalla a lo largo de su intervención; y apelativa, ya que también invita al	Logos, ya que detalla los datos objetivos de su plan para sustentar su argumento de manera racional.

Párrafo 193		público a comprar ambas propuestas.	
«Work around the clock also understanding that we must chart.... But we must have a two-state solution...» Párrafo 139	Anáfora	Apelativa , ya que se dirige de manera directa al público con el uso de la primera persona del plural invitándoles así a trabajar con ella para solucionar un conflicto, además de invitar a la reflexión para tener un mejor entendimiento de la situación.	Logos , ya que presenta un plan ordenado y que tienen un trabajo de análisis y elaboración.
«And I think the American people want better than that. Want better than this..» Párrafo 188	Anáfora	Emotiva , ya que busca inspirar y generar ese sentimiento de grandeza, aunque también apela de manera directa ya que incluye a los oyentes en el grupo.	Pathos , ya que vuelve a hacer uso de la identidad y orgullo nacional, esta vez buscando en la audiencia un deseo de mejora.
«I have a plan to give startup businesses \$50,000 tax deduction, to pursue their ambitions, their innovation, their ideas, their hard work.» Párrafo 193	Anáfora	Referencial , ya que usa datos objetivos sobre su propuesta para estimular la economía.	Logos , ya que vuelve a detallar sus planes con datos concretos y objetivos para generar confianza en la audiencia.

«So my values have not changed... As it relates to my values.... My values have not changed.» Párrafo 96	Anáfora	Emotiva y referencial, ya que por un lado apela a sus valores, considerándolos positivos para provocar una reacción emocional en el público; pero también los utiliza dando datos objetivos sobre cómo no han cambiado en el tiempo para aportar fiabilidad.	Ethos, ya que se presenta a sí misma como una persona que ha mantenido sus valores y postura con el paso del tiempo, es decir, como una persona en la que se puede confiar.
«But the one thing I will assure you always, I will always give Israel the ability...» Párrafo 139	Anáfora	Apelativa, ya que se dirige a la audiencia de manera directa a través del uso de la segunda persona del plural.	Ethos, ya que se presenta a sí misma como una figura de autoridad con la capacidad para mediar en los conflictos internacionales de manera coherente.
«I will never forget the early morning hours when it was up for a vote in the United States Senate and the late great John McCain, who you have disparaged as being – uh, you don't like him, you said at the time because he got caught, he was an American hero. The late great John McCain, I will never forget that night. Walked onto the	Anáfora	Emotiva, ya que habla de un hito histórico para la nación, evocando así valores heroicos y fundamentales; aunque también se puede considerar la presencia de	Pathos, ya que recurre a hechos pasados de su vida que tuvieron un impacto emocional; además de ser algo que afecta a toda la población.

Senate floor and said no, you don't. No, you don't. No, you don't get rid of the Affordable Care Act.» Párrafo 204		referencial, ya que usa hechos objetivos.	
«I believe in what we can do to strengthen our small businesses... I believe, David, that people really want.... I believe in what we can do together that is about sustaining America's standing in the world.» Párrafo 193 y 217	Anáfora	Emotiva , ya que habla de sus esperanzas buscando generar un sentimiento de optimismo, esperanza y cohesión entre la población.	Pathos , ya que la repetición reiterada de « <i>I believe</i> » busca generar en el público un sentimiento de esperanza y mejoría; asimismo como compartir la fe que tiene en el pueblo americano para construir un futuro mejor.

Tabla 2³

5.2.2. USO DE FIGURAS RETÓRICAS

Como se puede observar en los fragmentos del discurso presentes en la Tabla 2, la figura más utilizada a lo largo del debate por Harris es la anáfora. Este recurso se utiliza habitualmente con el fin u objetivo de enfatizar una idea; y tras haber seleccionado los distintos fragmentos de las intervenciones de Harris en el debate se puede confirmar esta teoría, ya que se puede apreciar que repite el inicio de las oraciones y luego cambia el contenido de esta, de tal manera que en conjunto refuerzan una misma idea.

Además, la figura de la anáfora también se utiliza en los discursos políticos con la intención de que el mensaje sea memorizado más fácilmente por el público que si se tratase de otra construcción gramatical. En el caso de Harris se puede apreciar que lo más habitual es que utilice los sujetos como figura de repetición, ya sea la primera persona del singular, la primera del plural o la tercera del plural. El uso de uno u otro sujeto dependerá de lo que quiera

³ Los fragmentos han sido tomados de la transcripción del debate presidencial 2024 (ABC News, 2024).

transmitir y hacer sentir al público, poniendo asimismo el foco de responsabilidad dependiendo del tema tratado en sí misma, en todos los ciudadanos o en su oponente político.

A pesar de que Harris usa mayoritariamente la anáfora, se ha podido observar el uso de otras figuras retóricas, como puede ser la hipérbole en algunos momentos como cuando menciona la tasa de desempleo o al control que habría sobre los embarazos.

Finalmente, también cabe mencionar que hace uso de la personificación a pesar de no estar mencionada en la tabla, ya que atribuye a *América* capacidades humanas, como la toma de decisiones o la lucha por su futuro.

5.2.3. USO DE FUNCIONES DEL LENGUAJE

Como se puede apreciar según lo ejemplificado en la Tabla 2, las funciones del lenguaje utilizadas por Harris basándonos en los fragmentos del debate que se han seleccionado, hace un mayor uso de la apelativa, emotiva y referencial.

En primer lugar, Harris hace uso de la función apelativa en las ocasiones que se dirige a sus oyentes, creando más cercanía («*I have listened to your stories...*»), creando así una conversación, y por ende dejando claro que ella escucha sus problemas. También hace uso de la apelación en las ocasiones en las que se dirige al público para recordarles o comunicarles que está en sus manos la posibilidad de hacer cambios y que tienen una responsabilidad, pero en esta ocasión, ella también se incluye en el grupo, haciendo uso de la primera persona del plural, para mandar el mensaje de que tienen una responsabilidad sobre temas como los derechos reproductivos de las mujeres, sobre la decisión de quien dirige el país y sobre el futuro de este.

En segundo lugar, se observa de igual manera un uso frecuente de la función emotiva. En la gran mayoría de ocasiones en las que Harris hace uso de esta función, se puede observar que busca generar un impacto emocional en el público, suscitando una respuesta positiva con sentimientos como la esperanza, el refuerzo de derechos universales básicos para cualquier persona o buscar esa conexión emocional mencionada con anterioridad. Sin embargo, es cierto que hay momentos o intervenciones en los que busca suscitar emociones consideradas negativas como el temor o la angustia, pero con la intención de asociarlos a su oponente y por ende al futuro que les depara si sale electo; poniendo sobre ellos la responsabilidad de conseguir un buen futuro para la nación y para los ciudadanos a través de sus votos.

Por último, en algunas ocasiones Harris recurre a la función referencial con el propósito de reforzar sus argumentos con datos empíricos. Sin embargo, en la Tabla 2 se puede advertir que sólo hace uso de esta función cuando quiere poner en evidencia los errores o efectos negativos que se dieron durante el anterior mandato de su oponente, mostrando que no es un buen presidente, y por lo tanto es ella quien debería salir electa.

5.2.4. MÉTODOS DE ARGUMENTACIÓN

Si se observa el análisis realizado en la Tabla 2, se puede confirmar que el método al que más recurre Harris es el *pathos*. Esto no es una conclusión que resulte sorprendente, ya que la función del lenguaje más presente a lo largo de todo el discurso de Harris es la emotiva, y por lo tanto el *pathos* está estrechamente ligado a ella, ya que ambos tienen como objetivo provocar sentimientos o convencer a través de las emociones. Sin embargo, también hay presencia del *logos*, que suele estar relacionado al uso de la función referencial ya que invita a la reflexión sobre la realidad gracias al uso de datos empíricos y objetivos; y aunque en menor medida también hace uso del *ethos*, pero al igual que Trump, no utiliza otras figuras de autoridad si no que utiliza su trayectoria profesional para dotarse así misma de fiabilidad o conocimientos.

6. CONCLUSIONES

A pesar de que la corta naturaleza de un Trabajo Fin de Grado no permite realizar un análisis tan exhaustivo como en otros casos, a través del análisis de 20 fragmentos de cada orador tomados del debate electoral, se han podido observar ciertas tendencias a la hora de elaborar sus discurso e intervenciones, siendo posible asimismo junto con el apoyo de otros trabajos sacar ciertas conclusiones sobre el por qué puede haber esta diferencia en los estilos de ambos políticos y como difiere el uso que hacen de los recursos retóricos que tienen a su disposición.

6.1. COMPARACIÓN DE LOS ORADORES

Como se ha podido observar en el análisis elaborado a través de la selección de fragmentos del debate electoral de 2024 entre Donald Trump y Kamala Harris ambos oradores tienen objetivos distintos con sus discursos u intervenciones.

Por un lado, Trump tiene un estilo que se podría calificar con una tendencia a la agresividad y es que es muy directo. Además, tiene una inclinación notoria a la exageración de los hechos; gracias al análisis previo y la tabla 1 es posible apreciar cómo según los ejemplos seleccionados en numerosas intervenciones el orador intensifica sus logros dotándoles de más mérito o con más grandeza de la que quizá objetivamente tengan, situándose de tal manera por encima de su

oponente, y por lo tanto mandando el mensaje al público de que votarle es la opción correcta. Sin embargo, también se puede percibir esta tendencia a la hipérbole con otro fin, y es que también hace uso de esta figura retórica tan común en política para agravar los problemas que preocupan a los ciudadanos. Esta ponderación excesiva de los hechos se puede considerar como incluso exagerada, ya que a pesar de que el uso de este recurso es muy común en el discurso político como ya se ha mencionado con anterioridad, podemos afirmar que en el caso de Donald Trump es llevado al extremo, pudiendo preguntarnos incluso si lo que dice pierde veracidad a causa de esta exageración de los hechos.

Por otro lado, Harris tiene un estilo más sencillo, por lo que el hilo conductor de su discurso es más fácil de seguir. Esto puede deberse a la influencia de la retórica femenina que hasta hace poco quedaba relegada a papeles como el de primera dama. Así lo afirma Jiménez García (2021), evidenciando que los discursos de Harris están marcados por las características de la retórica femenina, como por ejemplo el uso de un tono personal, o el trato a su público como iguales; aunque del mismo modo hay características de la retórica que tradicionalmente se han considerado masculinos. No obstante, esta dualidad en su discurso tiene como resultado que la oradora tenga una tendencia de querer generar emociones positivas en el público, como así se puede apreciar en el análisis previamente elaborado.

Ahora bien, se puede apreciar una similitud entre ambos oradores, y es que tanto Trump como Harris quieren crear esa dicotomía tan común en política de «nosotros vs. ellos». Esto se puede apreciar durante todo el debate, y también en los fragmentos seleccionados, ya que ambos oradores en múltiples ocasiones se incluyen como parte del grupo, acercándose a los votantes, para después a través de argumentos o el relato de fracasos del oponente crear ese sentimiento de rechazo o rivalidad.

No obstante, a pesar de la gran distancia entre ambos estilos de discurso, es posible advertir como tanto en los discursos de Trump como de Harris están presentes mayoritariamente las mismas tres funciones del lenguaje de Jakobson: referencial, emotiva y apelativa. Sin embargo, esto no es algo inusual, ya que si recordamos el objetivo o fin del discurso político es tratar de convencer al público. Ahora bien, queda reflejado que al hacer uso de ellas buscan distintos objetivos, como es en el caso de la función emocional, mencionado previamente, Trump busca generar en su público sentimientos que se consideran tradicionalmente negativos tales que miedo, temor o rechazo a ciertos colectivos ya que los culpa de algunos de los problemas que sufre actualmente la nación. Harris por otro lado busca generar sentimientos considerados positivos habitualmente, tales que esperanza o un sentido del deber en su público para avanzar hacia el futuro y no retroceder al pasado, concretamente en tema de derechos. Solo apela al

miedo según lo visto en la tabla cuando se trata de asociar un sentimiento hacia su oponente político.

En referencia a lo establecido anteriormente, también es notorio que ambos oradores comparten la tendencia establecida por van Dijk (1999) a presentar el presente como algo positivo en caso de salir ellos electos. Sin embargo, esto no es siempre así ya que en numerosas ocasiones los oradores hacen alusión e incluso énfasis en un terrible futuro si saliera su oponente electo.

Por último, es de vital importancia recalcar que, a pesar de no haber sido mencionado o analizado de manera explícita en el análisis, la función poética tiene una gran presencia en este debate, y en política en general. Esto se debe a que los discursos políticos como ya se ha establecido a lo largo de todo el trabajo, buscan convencer, y por lo tanto es una parte fundamental de la retórica el uso de esta función, ya que además de embellecer el discurso, ayuda a persuadir ya que puede ayudar a captar la atención de los oyentes de esta manera invitar a la reflexión o reforzar la persuasión, como ya se ha visto a lo largo de todo el trabajo.

6.2. POSIBLES DIFICULTADES PARA LA INTERPRETACIÓN

Para concluir con el trabajo, cabe mencionar en último lugar algunas de las posibles dificultades o retos a los que puede tener que enfrentarse un intérprete profesional si fuera contratado para este trabajo. A continuación, se mencionarán algunos de estos desafíos, pero como se ha desarrollado el análisis a lo largo de todo el trabajo, se abordarán primero las dificultades que puede presentar un orador y posteriormente el otro, continuando así con la metodología establecida.

En primer lugar, realizar una interpretación sobre el discurso de Trump puede resultar algo complejo, ya que su discurso está muy marcado por el uso de la hipérbole, esto puede resultar complejo para el intérprete, ya que puede ser difícil encontrar ese equilibrio y transmitir el mensaje con la misma intención del orador sin caer en exageraciones que quiten credibilidad o, por otro lado, darle una menor importancia de la que Trump quiere transmitir.

Asimismo, el estilo discursivo de Trump tiene un ritmo acelerado y está notablemente fragmentado, ya que salta de manera muy dinámica de un tema a otro sin una necesidad de introducción previa o aviso. Esto puede ser un reto para el intérprete, ya que se debe de estar constantemente preparado para el cambio de tema, y los datos que este pueda aportar. Por un lado, esto puede crear la dificultad de la pérdida de matices, especialmente en consecutiva ya que quizá no se pueda retener toda la información con el tono exacto; y en simultánea puede ser difícil seguir el ritmo al orador y encontrar el equilibrio de separación entre el original y nuestra interpretación para no caer en vacíos.

Además, la variación de ideas, contenido y cambios en la estrategia argumentativa puede hacer sea una tarea difícil ver el discurso como un todo y organizar mentalmente la información que aporta el orador.

En segundo lugar y en caso de realizar una interpretación a Harris durante el debate, pueden surgir otro tipo de retos. A pesar de que como se ha mencionado con anterioridad la extensión de un Trabajo de Fin de Grado no permite realizar un análisis muy extenso, es un hecho que la oradora tiene tendencia a hablar de sus experiencias personales en sus discursos para presentarse como parte del grupo y crear una cercanía con el público, por lo tanto el intérprete debería tener conocimientos sobre los últimos acontecimientos que han ocurrido en su vida en el caso de que sean de dominio público o porque formen parte de su campaña electoral o plan político.

Asimismo, puede ser complejo ser fiel al tono del discurso de Harris, ya que es de vital importancia ser capaz de encontrar ese equilibrio entre la cercanía que quiere encontrar con el público y querer transmitir que es una líder fuerte y capacitada para el puesto; ya que, si se cae en una amabilidad o cercanía excesiva, de manera inconsciente los votantes pueden omitir su carácter de líder debido a sesgos individuales.

De igual manera, es importante mantener la estructura de su discurso, ya que esta caracterizado por la anáfora con un objetivo, y puede resultar complicado ya que en la interpretación simultánea se tiende a las frases cortas y concisas, e intentar mantener la repetición puede causar que el intérprete tenga que recurrir a oraciones más larga y complejas.

Finalmente, hay una estructura progresiva que caracteriza el discurso, y puede resultar complicado para el intérprete no perderla al tratarse de un discurso o debate de tal duración.

REFERENCIAS

- Aguirre Fernández Bravo, E. [Elena]. (s.f.). *Interpretación I: Comunicación oral y análisis del discurso* [recurso de aprendizaje]. Universidad Pontificia de Comillas.
- Anáfora. Figura retórica | Diccionari de lingüística on line. (s.f.). <http://www.ub.edu/diccionarilinguistica/content/an%c3%a1fora-figura-ret%c3%b3rica>
- Aristóteles. (2004). *Retórica*. Gredos.
- Asale, R.-., & Rae. (s.f.). *hipérbole* | *Diccionario de la lengua española*. «Diccionario De La Lengua Española» - Edición Del Tricentenario. <https://dle.rae.es/hip%C3%A9rbole>
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). "The Rhetorical Situation". *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Carmona Tinoco, Jorge Ulises (2019). Panorama breve sobre la retórica, su naturaleza y su evolución histórica. *Disputatio. Philosophical Research Bulletin* 8, no. 10: pp. 00–00. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7421761>
- Centro Virtual Cervantes. (s.f.). Retórica. En *Diccionario de términos clave de ELE*. Instituto Cervantes. https://cvc.cervantes.es/ensenanza/biblioteca_ele/diccio_ele/diccionario/retrica.htm
- Cervantes, C. C. V. (s.f.). *CVC. Diccionario de términos clave de ELE. Funciones del lenguaje*. https://cvc.cervantes.es/ensenanza/biblioteca_ele/diccio_ele/diccionario/funcioneslenguaje.htm
- Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing Political Speech: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. https://books.google.es/books?id=1fhGEAAQBAJ&pg=PT5&hl=es&source=gbs_selected_pages&cad=1#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. <https://voidnetwork.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Analysing-political-discourse-Theory-and-Practice-by-Paul-Chilton.pdf>
- De Cervantes, B. V. M. (s. f.). *El discurso político como discurso retórico. Estado de la cuestión*. Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes. https://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra-visor/el-discurso-politico-como-discurso-retorico-estado-de-la-cuestion/html/d5d5c331-4944-44d8-b789-98bf05049eb2_2.html

Espino, L. A. (21 de enero de 2025). El segundo discurso inaugural de Trump: el método en la locura. *Letras Libres*. <https://letraslibres.com/politica/espino-segundo-discurso-inaugural-donald-trump/>

Fossa, P y Araya-Velez, C. (2017). La teoría de la expresión: Una aproximación holística al fenómeno del lenguaje humano. *Summa Psicológica UST*, Vol. 14 (Nº 1), 56-60. <file:///C:/Users/ainoa/Downloads/Dialnet-LaTeoriaDeLaExpresion-6068357.pdf>

Gendebien, M. (28 de agosto de 2024). An analysis of the evolution of rhetoric in American political debate. Onero Institute. <https://www.oneroinstitute.org/content/evolution-of-rhetoric-in-american-political-debate>

Hoffman, R. (23 de noviembre de 2024). Harris-Trump presidential debate transcript. ABC News. <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/harris-trump-presidential-debate-transcript/story?id=113560542>

Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. En T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (350-377). The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. London.

Jiménez García, J. (2021). *Análisis de la retórica y los discursos de Kamala Harris* [Trabajo Fin de Grado, Universidad Pontificia de Comillas]. Repositorio Comillas. <https://repositorio.comillas.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11531/57451/TFM001583.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Martins, I. (13 de julio de 2022). *Aproximación al discurso político (parte I)*. Universidad De Piura. <https://www.udep.edu.pe/castellanoactual/aproximacion-al-discurso-politico-parte-i/>

Messina Fajardo, L. (2016). Los lenguajes especiales. El lenguaje político. En Editor (Ed.), *El lenguaje político. Características y análisis del discurso político con ejercicios y clave* (1-18). Maggioli Editore.

Rodríguez Porras, J.M. (2002). Cómo pronunciar una conferencia. Logos, Pathos, Ethos. *Revista de Antiguos Alumnos* Sitio web: https://www.academia.edu/14715697/ETHOS_PATHOS_LOGOS

Torres Hernández, N H. Velandia Pedraza, Z Y. (2008). De la antigua a la nueva retórica *Cuadernos de Lingüística Hispánica*, (Núm. 11), 119-130
<file:///C:/Users/ainoa/Downloads/Dialnet-DeLaAntiguaALaNuevaRetorica-3324354.pdf>

Van Dijk, T. A. (1999). ¿Qué es análisis de discurso político?. En D. Jiménez (Ed.), *Análisis del discurso social y político* (9-102). Abya Yala.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *El discurso como interacción social*. Gedisa editorial.

Vega-Ramírez, J. (2023). Análisis político del discurso. Propuesta metodológica para su uso como herramienta. *Universitas-XXI. Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas*, Universitas-XXI, 38, pp. 191-209. <http://scielo.senescyt.gob.ec/pdf/uni/n38/1390-3837-uni-38-00191.pdf>

ANEXO

Leyenda:

Hipérboles de Donald Trump

Anáforas de Donald Trump

Anáforas de Kamala Harris

Hipérboles de Harris: no han sido subrayadas en la transcripción ya que no se ha considerado que haya las suficientes y muy marcadas o evidentes.

TRANSCRIPCIÓN

1. DAVID MUIR: Tonight, the high-stakes showdown here in Philadelphia between Vice President Kamala Harris and former president Donald Trump. Their first face-to-face meeting in this presidential election. Their first face-to-face meeting ever.
2. LINSEY DAVIS: A historic race for president upended just weeks ago. President Biden withdrawing after his last debate. Donald Trump is now up against a new opponent.
3. DAVID MUIR: The candidates separated by the smallest of margins. Essentially tied in the polls nationally. And in the key battlegrounds, including right here in Pennsylvania, all still very much in play. The ABC News Presidential Debate starts right now.
4. DAVID MUIR: Good evening, I'm David Muir. And thank you for joining us for tonight's ABC News Presidential Debate. We want to welcome viewers watching on ABC and around the world tonight. Vice President Kamala Harris and President Donald Trump are just moments away from taking the stage in this unprecedented race for president.
5. LINSEY DAVIS: And I'm Linsey Davis. Tonight's meeting could be the most consequential event of their campaigns, with Election Day now less than two months away. For Vice President Kamala Harris, this is her first debate since President Biden withdrew from the race on July 21st. Of course, that decision followed his debate against President Donald Trump in June. Since then, this race has taken on an entirely new dynamic.
6. DAVID MUIR: And that brings us to the rules of tonight's debate: 90 minutes with two commercial breaks. No topics or questions have been shared with the campaigns. The candidates will have two minutes to answer questions. And this is the clock. That's what they'll be seeing. Two minutes for rebuttals and one minute for follow-ups, clarifications or responses. Their microphones will only be turned on when it's their turn to speak. No prewritten notes allowed. There is no audience here tonight in this hall at the National Constitution Center. This is an intimate setting for two candidates who have never met.
7. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump won the coin toss. He chose to deliver the final closing statement of the evening. Vice President Harris selected the podium to the right.
8. DAVID MUIR: So let's now welcome the candidates to the stage. Vice President Kamala Harris and President Donald Trump.
9. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Kamala Harris. Let's have a good debate.

10. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Nice to see you. Have fun.

11. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Thank you.

12. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Thank you.

13. DAVID MUIR: Welcome to you both. It's wonderful to have you. It's an honor to have you both here tonight.

14. LINSEY DAVIS: Good evening, we are looking forward to a spirited and thoughtful debate.

15. DAVID MUIR: So let's get started. I want to begin tonight with the issue voters repeatedly say is their number one issue, and that is the economy and the cost of living in this country. Vice President Harris, you and President Trump were elected four years ago and your opponent on the stage here tonight often asks his supporters, are you better off than you were four years ago? When it comes to the economy, do you believe Americans are better off than they were four years ago?

16. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: So, I was raised as a middle-class kid. And I am actually the only person on this stage who has a plan that is about lifting up the middle class and working people of America. I believe in the ambition, the aspirations, the dreams of the American people. And that is why I imagine and have actually a plan to build what I call an opportunity economy. Because here's the thing. We know that we have a shortage of homes and housing, and the cost of housing is too expensive for far too many people. We know that young families need support to raise their children. And I intend on extending a tax cut for those families of \$6,000, which is the largest child tax credit that we have given in a long time. So that those young families can afford to buy a crib, buy a car seat, buy clothes for their children. My passion, one of them, is small businesses. I was actually -- my mother raised my sister and me but there was a woman who helped raise us. We call her our second mother. She was a small business owner. I love our small businesses. My plan is to give a \$50,000 tax deduction to start-up small businesses, knowing they are part of the backbone of America's economy. My opponent, on the other hand, his plan is to do what he has done before, which is to provide a tax cut for billionaires and big corporations, which will result in \$5 trillion to America's deficit. My opponent has a plan that I call the Trump sales tax, which would be a 20% tax on everyday goods that you rely on to get through the month. Economists have said that Trump's sales tax would actually result for middle-class families in about \$4,000 more a year because of his policies and his ideas about what should be the backs of middle-class people paying for tax cuts for billionaires.

17. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, I'll give you two minutes.

18. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: First of all, I have no sales tax. That's an incorrect statement. She knows that. We're doing tariffs on other countries. Other countries are going to finally, after 75 years, pay us back for all that we've done for the world. And the tariff will be substantial in some cases. I took in billions and billions of dollars, as you know, from China. In fact, they never took the tariff off because it was so much money, they can't. It would totally destroy everything that they've set out to do. They've taken in billions of dollars from China and other places. They've left the tariffs on. When I had it, I had tariffs and yet I had no inflation. Look, we've had a terrible economy because inflation has -- which is really known as a country buster. It breaks up countries. We have inflation like very few people have ever seen

before. Probably the worst in our nation's history. We were at 21%. But that's being generous because many things are 50, 60, 70, and 80% higher than they were just a few years ago. This has been a disaster for people, for the middle class, but for every class. On top of that, we have millions of people pouring into our country from prisons and jails, from mental institutions and insane asylums. And they're coming in and they're taking jobs that are occupied right now by African Americans and Hispanics and also unions. Unions are going to be affected very soon. And you see what's happening. You see what's happening with towns throughout the United States. You look at Springfield, Ohio. You look at Aurora in Colorado. They are taking over the towns. They're taking over buildings. They're going in violently. These are the people that she and Biden let into our country. And they're destroying our country. They're dangerous. They're at the highest level of criminality. And we have to get them out. We have to get them out fast. I created one of the greatest economies in the history of our country. I'll do it again and even better.

19. DAVID MUIR: We are going to get to immigration and border security during this debate. But I would like to let Vice President Harris respond on the economy here.

20. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, I would love to. Let's talk about what Donald Trump left us. Donald Trump left us the worst unemployment since the Great Depression. Donald Trump left us the worst public health epidemic in a century. Donald Trump left us the worst attack on our democracy since the Civil War. And what we have done is clean up Donald Trump's mess. What we have done and what I intend to do is build on what we know are the aspirations and the hopes of the American people. But I'm going to tell you all, in this debate tonight, you're going to hear from the same old, tired playbook, a bunch of lies, grievances and name-calling. What you're going to hear tonight is a detailed and dangerous plan called Project 2025 that the former president intends on implementing if he were elected again. I believe very strongly that the American people want a president who understands the importance of bringing us together knowing we have so much more in common than what separates us. And I pledge to you to be a president for all Americans.

21. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, I'll give you a minute here to respond.

22. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Number one, I have nothing to do, as you know and as she knows better than anyone, I have nothing to do with Project 2025. That's out there. I haven't read it. I don't want to read it, purposely. I'm not going to read it. This was a group of people that got together, they came up with some ideas. I guess some good, some bad. But it makes no difference. I have nothing to do -- everybody knows I'm an open book. Everybody knows what I'm going to do. Cut taxes very substantially. And create a great economy like I did before. We had the greatest economy. We got hit with a pandemic. And the pandemic was, not since 1917 where 100 million people died has there been anything like it? We did a phenomenal job with the pandemic. We handed them over a country where the economy and where the stock market was higher than it was before the pandemic came in. Nobody's ever seen anything like it. We made ventilators for the entire world. We got gowns. We got masks. We did things that nobody thought possible. And people give me credit for rebuilding the military. They give me credit for a lot of things. But not enough credit for the great job we did with the pandemic. But the only jobs they got were bounce-back jobs. These were jobs, bounce back. And it bounced back and it went to their benefit. But I was the one that created them. They know it and so does everybody else.

23. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, I'll let you respond.

24. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: So, Donald Trump has no plan for you. And when you look at his economic plan, it's all about tax breaks for the richest people. I am offering what I describe as an opportunity economy, and the best economists in our country, if not the world, have reviewed our relative plans for the future of America. What Goldman Sachs has said is that Donald Trump's plan would make the economy worse. Mine would strengthen the economy. What the Wharton School has said is Donald Trump's plan would actually explode the deficit. Sixteen Nobel laureates have described his economic plan as something that would increase inflation and by the middle of next year would invite a recession. You just have to look at where we are and where we stand on the issues. And I'd invite you to know that Donald Trump actually has no plan for you, because he is more interested in defending himself than he is in looking out for you.

25. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: That's just a sound bite. They gave her that to say. Look, I went to the Wharton School of Finance and many of those professors, the top professors, think my plan is a brilliant plan, it's a great plan. It's a plan that's going to bring up our worth, our value as a country. It's going to make people want to be able to go and work and create jobs and create a lot of good, solid money for our -- for our country. And just to finish off, she doesn't have a plan. She copied Biden's plan. And it's like four sentences, like run-Spot-run. Four sentences that are just oh, we'll try and lower taxes. She doesn't have a plan. Take a look at her plan. She doesn't have a plan.

26. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, I do want to drill down on something you both brought up. The vice president brought up your tariffs you responded and let's drill down on this because your plan is what she calls is a essentially a national sales tax. Your proposal calls for tariffs as you pointed out here, on foreign imports across the board. You recently said that you might double your plan, imposing tariffs up to 20% on good coming into this country. As you know many economists say that with tariffs at that level costs are then passed onto the consumer. Vice President Harris has argued it'll mean higher prices on gas, food, clothing medication arguing it costs the typical family nearly four thousand dollars a year. Do you believe Americans can afford higher prices because of tariffs.

27. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: They aren't gonna have higher prices what's gonna have and who's gonna have higher prices is China and all of the countries that have been ripping us off for years. I charge, I was the only president ever China was paying us hundreds of billions of dollars and so were other countries and you know if she doesn't like 'em they should have gone out and they should have immediately cut the tariffs but those tariffs are there three and a half years now under their administration. We are gonna take in billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars. I had no inflation, virtually no inflation, they had the highest inflation, perhaps in the history of our country because I've never seen a worse period of time. People can't go out and buy cereal bacon or eggs or anything else. These the people of our country are absolutely dying with what they've done. They've destroyed the economy and all you have to do it look at a poll. The polls say 80 and 85 and even 90% that the Trump economy was great that their economy was terrible.

28. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris I do want to ask for your response and you heard what the president said there because the Biden administration did keep a number of the Trump tariffs in place so how do you respond?

29. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, let's be clear that the Trump administration resulted in a trade deficit, one of the highest we've ever seen in the history of America. He invited trade wars, you wanna talk about his deal with China what he ended up doing is under Donald Trump's presidency he ended up selling American chips to China to help them improve and modernize their military basically sold us out when a policy about China should be in making sure the United States of America wins the competition for the 21st century. Which means focusing on the details of what that requires, focusing on relationships with our allies, focusing on investing in American based technology so that we win the race on A.I. and quantum computing, focusing on what we need to do to support America's workforce, so that we don't end up having the on the short end of the stick in terms of workers' rights. But what Donald Trump did let's talk about this with COVID, is he actually thanked President XI for what he did during COVID. Look at his tweet. "Thank you, President XI," exclamation point. When we know that XI was responsible for lacking and not giving us transparency about the origins of COVID.

30. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, I'll let you respond.

31. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: First of all, they bought their chips from Taiwan. We hardly make chips anymore because of philosophies like they have and policies like they have. I don't say her because she has no policy. Everything that she believed three years ago and four years ago is out the window. She's going to my philosophy now. In fact, I was going to send her a MAGA hat. She's gone to my philosophy. But if she ever got elected, she'd change it. And it will be the end of our country. She's a Marxist. Everybody knows she's a Marxist. Her father's a Marxist professor in economics. And he taught her well. But when you look at what she's done to our country and when you look at these millions and millions of people that are pouring into our country monthly where it's I believe 21 million people, not the 15 that people say, and I think it's a lot higher than the 21. That's bigger than New York state. Pouring in. And just look at what they're doing to our country. They're criminals. Many of these people coming in are criminals. And that's bad for our economy too. You mentioned before, we'll talk about immigration later.

32. Well, bad immigration is the worst thing that can happen to our economy. They have and she has destroyed our country with policy that's insane. Almost policy that you'd say they have to hate our country.

33. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, thank you. Linsey?

34. LINSEY DAVIS: I want to turn to the issue of abortion. President Trump, you've often touted that you were able to kill Roe v. Wade. Last year, you said that you were proud to be the most pro-life president in American history. Then last month you said that your administration would be great for women and their reproductive rights. In your home state of Florida, you surprised many with regard to your six-week abortion ban because you initially had said that it was too short and you said, "I'm going to be voting that we need more than six weeks." But then the very next day, you reversed course and said you would vote to support the six-week ban. Vice President Harris says that women shouldn't trust you on the issue of abortion because you've changed your position so many times. Therefore, why should they trust you?

35. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, the reason I'm doing that vote is because the plan is, as you know, the vote is, they have abortion in the ninth month. They even

have, and you can look at the governor of West Virginia, the previous governor of West Virginia, not the current governor, who's doing an excellent job, but the governor before. He said the baby will be born and we will decide what to do with the baby. In other words, we'll execute the baby.

36. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: And that's why I did that, because that predominates. Because they're radical. The Democrats are radical in that. And her vice presidential pick, which I think was a horrible pick, by the way for our country, because he is really out of it. But her vice presidential pick says abortion in the ninth month is absolutely fine. He also says execution after birth, it's execution, no longer abortion, because the baby is born, is okay. And that's not okay with me. Hence the vote. But what I did is something for 52 years they've been trying to get Roe v. Wade into the states.

37. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: And through the genius and heart and strength of six supreme court justices we were able to do that. Now, I believe in the exceptions for rape, incest and life of the mother. I believe strongly in it. Ronald Reagan did also. 85% of Republicans do. Exceptions. Very important. But we were able to get it. And now states are voting on it. And for the first time you're going to see -- look, this is an issue that's torn our country apart for 52 years. Every legal scholar, every Democrat, every Republican, liberal, conservative, they all wanted this issue to be brought back to the states where the people could vote. And that's what happened, happened. Now, Ohio, the vote was somewhat liberal. Kansas the vote was somewhat liberal. Much more liberal than people would have thought. But each individual state is voting. It's the vote of the people now. It's not tied up in the federal government. I did a great service in doing it. It took courage to do it. And the supreme court had great courage in doing it. And I give tremendous credit to those six justices.

38. LINSEY DAVIS: There is no state in this country where it is legal to kill a baby after it's born. Madam vice president, I want to get your response to President Trump.

39. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, as I said, you're going to hear a bunch of lies. And that's not actually a surprising fact. Let's understand how we got here. Donald Trump hand-selected three members of the United States Supreme Court with the intention that they would undo the protections of Roe v. Wade. And they did exactly as he intended. And now in over 20 states there are Trump abortion bans which make it criminal for a doctor or nurse to provide health care. In one state it provides prison for life. Trump abortion bans that make no exception even for rape and incest. Which understand what that means. A survivor of a crime, a violation to their body, does not have the right to make a decision about what happens to their body next. That is immoral. And one does not have to abandon their faith or deeply held beliefs to agree the government, and Donald Trump certainly, should not be telling a woman what to do with her body.

40. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: I have talked with women around our country. You want to talk about this is what people wanted? Pregnant women who want to carry a pregnancy to term suffering from a miscarriage, being denied care in an emergency room because the health care providers are afraid they might go to jail and she's bleeding out in a car in the parking lot? **She didn't want that. Her husband didn't want that.** A 12 or 13-year-old survivor of incest being forced to carry a pregnancy to term? **They don't want that.** And I pledge to you when Congress passes a bill to put back in place the protections of Roe v. Wade as president of the United States, I will proudly sign it into law. But understand, if Donald Trump

were to be re-elected, he will sign a national abortion ban. Understand in his Project 2025 there would be a national abortion ban. Understand in his Project 2025 there would be a national abortion -- a monitor that would be monitoring your pregnancies, your miscarriages. I think the American people believe that certain freedoms, in particular the freedom to make decisions about one's own body, should not be made by the government.

41. LINSEY DAVIS: Thank you, Vice President Harris.

42. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, there she goes again. It's a lie. I'm not signing a ban. And there's no reason to sign a ban. Because we've gotten what everybody wanted. Democrats, Republicans and everybody else and every legal scholar wanted it to be brought back into the states. And the states are voting. And it may take a little time, but for 52 years this issue has torn our country apart. And they've wanted it back in the states. And I did something that nobody thought was possible. The states are now voting. What she says is an absolute lie. And as far as the abortion ban, no, I'm not in favor of abortion ban. But it doesn't matter because this issue has now been taken over by the states.

43. LINSEY DAVIS: Would you veto a national abortion ban if it came to --

44. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, I won't have to because again -- two things. Number one, she said she'll go back to congress. She'll never get the vote. It's impossible for her to get the vote. Especially now with a 50-50 --essentially 50-50 in both senate and the house. She's not going to get the vote. She can't get the vote. She won't even come close to it. So it's just talk. You know what it reminds me of? When they said they're going to get student loans terminated and it ended up being a total catastrophe. The student loans -- and then her I think probably her boss, if you call him a boss, he spends all his time on the beach, but look, her boss went out and said we'll do it again, we'll do it a different way. He went out, got rejected again by the supreme court. So all these students got taunted with this whole thing about -- this whole idea. And how unfair that would have been. Part of the reason they lost. To the millions and millions of people that had to pay off their student loans. They didn't get it for free. But they were saying -- it's the same way that they talked about that, that they talk about abortion.

45. LINSEY DAVIS: But if I could just get a yes or no. Because your running mate JD Vance has said that you would veto if it did come to your desk.

46. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, I didn't discuss it with JD In all fairness. JD -- And I don't mind if he has a certain view but I think he was speaking for me but I really didn't. Look, we don't have to discuss it because she'd never be able to get it just like she couldn't get student loans. They couldn't get -- they didn't even come close to getting student loans. They didn't even come close to getting student loans. They taunted young people and a lot of other people that had loans. They can never get this approved. So it doesn't matter what she says about going to congress. Wonderful. Let's go to congress. Do it. But the fact is that for years they wanted to get it out of congress and out of the federal government and we did something that everybody said couldn't be done. And now you have a vote of the people on abortion.

47. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, I want to give you your time to respond. But I do want to ask, would you support any restrictions on a woman's right to an abortion?

48. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: I absolutely support reinstating the protections of Roe v. Wade. And as you rightly mentioned, nowhere in America is a woman carrying a pregnancy to term and asking for an abortion. That is not happening. It's insulting to the women of America. And understand what has been happening under Donald Trump's abortion bans. Couples who pray and dream of having a family are being denied IVF treatments. What is happening in our country, working people, working women who are working one or two jobs, who can barely afford childcare as it is, have to travel to another state to get on a plane sitting next to strangers, to go and get the health care she needs. Barely can afford to do it. And what you are putting her through is unconscionable. And the people of America have not -- the majority of Americans believe in a woman's right to make decisions about her own body. And that is why in every state where this issue has been on the ballot, in red and blue states both, the people of America have voted for freedom.

49. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice president Harris --

50. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Excuse me, I have to respond. Another lie. It's another lie. I have been a leader on IVF which is fertilization. The IVF -- I have been a leader. In fact, when they got a very negative decision on IVF from the Alabama courts, I saw the people of Alabama and the legislature two days later voted it in. I've been a leader on it. They know that and everybody else knows it. I have been a leader on fertilization, IVF. And the other thing, they -- you should ask, will she allow abortion in the eighth month, ninth month, seventh month?

51. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Come on.

52. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Would you do that? Why don't you ask her that question --

53. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Why don't you answer the question would you veto --

54. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: That's the problem. Because under Roe v. Wade.

55. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Answer the question, would you veto--

56. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: You could do abortions in the seventh month, the eighth month, the ninth month -

57. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: That's not true.

58. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: And probably after birth. Just look at the governor, former governor of Virginia. The governor of Virginia said we put the baby aside and then we determine what we want to do with the baby.

59. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, thank you.

60. DAVID MUIR: We're going to turn now to immigration and border security. We know it's an issue that's important to Republicans, Democrats, voters across the board in this country. Vice President Harris, you were tasked by President Biden with getting to the root causes of migration from Central America. We know that illegal border crossings reached a record high in the Biden administration. This past June, President Biden imposed tough new asylum

restrictions. We know the numbers since then have dropped significantly. But my question to you tonight is why did the administration wait until six months before the election to act and would you have done anything differently from President Biden on this?

61. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: So I'm the only person on this stage who has prosecuted transnational criminal organizations for the trafficking of guns, drugs, and human beings. And let me say that the United States Congress, including some of the most conservative members of the United States Senate, came up with a border security bill which I supported. And that bill would have put 1,500 more border agents on the border to help those folks who are working there right now over time trying to do their job. It would have allowed us to stem the flow of fentanyl coming into the United States. I know there are so many families watching tonight who have been personally affected by the surge of fentanyl in our country. That bill would have put more resources to allow us to prosecute transnational criminal organizations for trafficking in guns, drugs and human beings. But you know what happened to that bill? Donald Trump got on the phone, called up some folks in Congress, and said kill the bill. And you know why? Because he preferred to run on a problem instead of fixing a problem. And understand, this comes at a time where the people of our country actually need a leader who engages in solutions, who actually addresses the problems at hand. But what we have in the former president is someone who would prefer to run on a problem instead of fixing a problem. And I'll tell you something, he's going to talk about immigration a lot tonight even when it's not the subject that is being raised. And I'm going to actually do something really unusual and I'm going to invite you to attend one of Donald Trump's rallies because it's a really interesting thing to watch. You will see during the course of his rallies he talks about fictional characters like Hannibal Lecter. He will talk about windmills cause cancer. And what you will also notice is that people start leaving his rallies early out of exhaustion and boredom. And I will tell you the one thing you will not hear him talk about is you. You will not hear him talk about your needs, your dreams, and your, your desires. And I'll tell you, I believe you deserve a president who actually puts you first. And I pledge to you that I will.

62. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, thank you. President Trump, on that point I want to get your response.

63. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, I would like to respond.

64. DAVID MUIR: Let me just ask, though, why did you try to kill that bill and successfully so? That would have put thousands of additional agents and officers on the border.

65. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: First let me respond as to the rallies. She said people start leaving. People don't go to her rallies. There's no reason to go. And the people that do go, she's busing them in and paying them to be there. And then showing them in a different light. So, she can't talk about that. People don't leave my rallies. **We have the biggest rallies, the most incredible rallies in the history of politics.** That's because people want to take their country back. **Our country is being lost. We're a failing nation. And it happened three and a half years ago.** And what, what's going on here, you're going to end up in World War 3, just to go into another subject. What they have done to our country by allowing these millions and millions of people to come into our country. And look at what's happening to the towns all over the United States. And a lot of towns don't want to talk -- not going to be Aurora or Springfield. A lot of towns don't want to talk about it because they're so embarrassed by it. **In Springfield, they're eating the dogs. The people that came in. They're eating the cats. They're eating -- they're**

eating the pets of the people that live there. And this is what's happening in our country. And it's a shame. As far as rallies are concerned, as far -- the reason they go is they like what I say. They want to bring our country back. They want to make America great again. It's a very simple phrase. Make America great again. She's destroying this country. And if she becomes president, this country doesn't have a chance of success. Not only success. We'll end up being Venezuela on steroids.

66. DAVID MUIR: I just want to clarify here, you bring up Springfield, Ohio. And ABC News did reach out to the city manager there. He told us there have been no credible reports of specific claims of pets being harmed, injured or abused by individuals within the immigrant community --

67. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, I've seen people on television

68. DAVID MUIR: Let me just say here this ...

69. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: The people on television say my dog was taken and used for food. So maybe he said that and maybe that's a good thing to say for a city manager.

70. DAVID MUIR: I'm not taking this from television. I'm taking it from the city manager.

71. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: But the people on television say their dog was eaten by the people that went there.

72. DAVID MUIR: Again, the Springfield city manager says there's no evidence of that.

73. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: We'll find out

74. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, I'll let you respond to the rest of what you heard.

75. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Talk about extreme. Um, you know, this is I think one of the reasons why in this election I actually have the endorsement of 200 Republicans who have formally worked with President Bush, Mitt Romney, and John McCain including the endorsement of former Vice President Dick Cheney and Congressman Liz Cheney. And if you want to really know the inside track on who the former president is, if he didn't make it clear already, just ask people who have worked with him. His former chief of staff, a four-star general, has said he has contempt for the constitution of the United States. His former national security adviser has said he is dangerous and unfit. His former secretary of defense has said the nation, the republic would never survive another Trump term. And when we listen to this kind of rhetoric, when the issues that affect the American people are not being addressed, I think the choice is clear in this election.

76. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, I'll give you a quick minute to respond.

77. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Yeah. Thank you. Because when I hear that - - see, I'm a different kind of a person. I fired most of those people. Not so graciously. They did bad things or a bad job. I fired them. They never fired one person. They didn't fire anybody having to do with Afghanistan and the Taliban and the 13 people whose, whose, were just killed viciously and violently killed and I got to know the parents and the family. They should have fired all those generals, all those top people because that was one of the most incompetently handled situations anybody has ever seen. So when somebody does a bad job I fire them. And

you take a guy like Esper. He was no good, I fired him. So he writes a book. Another one writes a book. Because with me they can write books. With nobody else can they. But they have done such a poor job. And they never fire anybody. Look at the economy. Look at the inflation. They didn't fire any of their economists. They have the same people. That's a good way not to have books written about you. But just to finish, I got more votes than any Republican in history by far. In fact, I got more votes than any president, sitting president in history by far.

78. DAVID MUIR: Let me continue on immigration. It was what you wanted to talk about earlier. So let's get back to your deportation proposal that the vice president has reacted to as well. President Trump, you called this the largest domestic deportation operation in the history of our country. You say you would use the National Guard. You say if things get out of control you'd have no problem using the U.S. military.

79. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: With local police.

80. DAVID MUIR: You also said you would use local police. How would you deport 11 million undocumented immigrants? I know you believe that number is much higher. Take us through this. What does this look like? Will authorities be going door to door in this country?

81. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Yeah. It is much higher because of them. They allowed criminals. Many, many, millions of criminals. They allowed terrorists. They allowed common street criminals. They allowed people to come in, drug dealers, to come into our country, and they're now in the United States. And told by their countries like Venezuela don't ever come back or we're going to kill you. Do you know that crime in Venezuela and crime in countries all over the world is way down? You know why? Because they've taken their criminals off the street and they've given them to her to put into our country. And this will be one of the greatest mistakes in history for them to allow -- and I think they probably did it because they think they're going to get votes. But it's not worth it. Because they're destroying the fabric of our country by what they've done. There's never been anything done like this at all. They've destroyed the fabric of our country. Millions of people let in. And all over the world crime is down. All over the world except here. Crime here is up and through the roof. Despite their fraudulent statements that they made. Crime in this country is through the roof. And we have a new form of crime. It's called migrant crime. And it's happening at levels that nobody thought possible.

82. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, as you know, the FBI says overall violent crime is coming down in this country, but Vice President the...

83. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: use me, the FBI -- they were defrauding statements. They didn't include the worst cities. They didn't include the cities with the worst crime. It was a fraud. Just like their number of 818,000 jobs that they said they created turned out to be a fraud.

84. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, thank you. I'll let you respond, Vice President Harris.

85. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, I think this is so rich. Coming from someone who has been prosecuted for national security crimes, economic crimes, election interference, has been found liable for sexual assault and his next big court appearance is in November at his own criminal sentencing. And let's be clear where each person stands on the issue of what is important about respect for the rule of law and respect for law enforcement.

The former vice president called for defunding, federal law enforcement, 45,000 agents, get this, on the day after he was arraigned on 34 felony counts. So let's talk about what is important in this race. It is important that we move forward, that we turn the page on this same old tired rhetoric. And address the needs of the American people, address what we

86. need to do about the housing shortage, which I have a plan for. Address what we must do to support our small businesses. Address bringing down the price of groceries. But frankly, the American people are exhausted with the same old tired playbook.

87. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, thank you.

88. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Excuse me. Every one of those cases was started by them against their political opponent. And I'm winning most of them and I'll win the rest on appeal. And you saw that with the decision that came down just recently from the Supreme Court. I'm winning most of them. But those are cases, it's called weaponization. Never happened in this country. They weaponized the justice department. Every one of those cases was involved with the DOJ, from Atlanta and Fani Willis -- to the attorney general of New York and the D.A. In New York. Every one of those cases. And then they say oh, he was -- he's a criminal. They're the ones that made them go after me. By the way, Joe Biden was found essentially guilty on the documents case. And what happened in my documents case? They said oh, that's the toughest of them all. A complete and total victory. Two months ago it was thrown out. It's weaponization. And they used it. And it's never happened in this country. They used it to try and win an election. They're fake cases.

89. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, thank you. A really quick response here, Vice President Harris, on this notion of weaponization of the justice department.

90. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well let's talk about extreme. And understand the context in which this election in 2024 is taking place. The United States Supreme Court recently ruled that the former president would essentially be immune from any misconduct if he were to enter the white house again. Understand, this is someone who has openly said he would terminate, I'm quoting, terminate the constitution of the United States. That he would weaponize the Department of Justice against his political enemies. Someone who has openly expressed disdain for members of our military. Understand what it would mean if Donald Trump were back in the white house with no guardrails. Because certainly, we know now the court won't stop him. We know JD Vance is not going to stop him. It's up to the American people to stop him.

91. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, thank you. Linsey?

92. LINDSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, in your last run for president...

93. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: This is the one that weaponized. Not me. She weaponized. I probably took a bullet to the head because of the things that they say about me. They talk about democracy. I'm a threat to democracy. They're the threat to democracy -- With the fake Russia Russia Russia investigation that went nowhere.

94. DAVID MUIR: We have a lot to get to. Linsey?

95. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, in your last run for president you said you wanted to ban fracking. Now you don't. You wanted mandatory government buyback programs for

assault weapons. Now your campaign says you don't. You supported decriminalizing border crossings. Now you're taking a harder line. I know you say that your values have not changed. So then why have so many of your policy positions changed?

96. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: **So my values have not changed.** And I'm going to discuss every one -- at least every point that you've made. But in particular, let's talk about fracking because we're here in Pennsylvania. I made that very clear in 2020. I will not ban fracking. I have not banned fracking as Vice President of the United States. And, in fact, I was the tie-breaking vote on the Inflation Reduction Act, which opened new leases for fracking. My position is that we have got to invest in diverse sources of energy so we reduce our reliance on foreign oil. We have had the largest increase in domestic oil production in history because of an approach that recognizes that we cannot over rely on foreign oil. **As it relates to my values,** let me tell you, I grew up a middle-class kid raised by a hard-working mother who worked and saved and was able to buy our first home when I was a teenager. The values I bring to the importance of home ownership knowing not everybody got handed \$400 million on a silver platter and then filed bankruptcy six times, is a value that I bring to my work to say we are going to work with the private sector and home builders to increase 3 million homes, increase by 3 million homes by the end of my first term. My work that is related to having a friend when I was in high school who was sexually assaulted by her stepfather. And my focus then, on protecting women and children from violent crime, is based on a value that is deeply grounded in the importance of standing up for those who are most vulnerable. My work that is about protecting social security and Medicare is based on long-standing work that I have done. Protecting seniors from scams. **My values have not changed.** And what is important is that there is a president who actually brings values and a perspective that is about lifting people up and not beating people down and name-calling. The true measure of the leader is the leader who actually understands that strength is not in beating people down, it's in lifting people up. I intend to be that president.

97. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, your response.

98. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, first of all, I wasn't given \$400 million. I wish I was. My father was a Brooklyn builder. Brooklyn, Queens. And a great father and I learned a lot from him. But I was given a fraction of that, a tiny fraction, and I built it into many, many billions of dollars. Many, many billions. And when people see it, they are even surprised. So, we don't have to talk about that. Fracking? She's been against it for 12 years. Uh, defund the police. She's been against that forever. She gave all that stuff up, very wrongly, very horribly. And everybody's laughing at it, okay? They're all laughing at it. She gave up at least 12 and probably 14 or 15 different policies. Like, she was big on defund the police.

99. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: That's not true. [mouthed, not audible]

100. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: In Minnesota, she went out -- wait a minute. I'm talking now. If you don't mind. Please. Does that sound familiar?

101. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Don't lie. [lie is audible]

102. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: She went out -- she went out in Minnesota and wanted to let criminals that killed people, that burned down Minneapolis, she went out and raised money to get them out of jail. She did things that nobody would ever think of. Now she wants to do transgender operations on illegal aliens that are in prison. This is a radical left

liberal that would do this. She wants to confiscate your guns and she will never allow fracking in Pennsylvania. If she won the election, fracking in Pennsylvania will end on day one. Just to finish one thing, so important in my opinion, so, I got the oil business going like nobody has ever done before. They took, when they took over, they got rid of it, started getting rid of it, and the prices were going up the roof. They immediately let these guys go to where they were. I would have been five times, four times, five times higher because you're talking about 3 1/2 years ago. They got it up to where I was because they had no choice. Because the prices of energy were quadrupling and doubling. You saw what happened to gasoline. So, they said let's go back to Trump. But if she won the election, the day after that election, they'll go back to destroying our country and oil will be dead, fossil fuel will be dead. We'll go back to windmills and we'll go back to solar, where they need a whole desert to get some energy to come out. You ever see a solar plant? By the way, I'm a big fan of solar. But they take 400, 500 acres of desert soil--

103. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump--

104. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: These are not good things for the environment that she understands.

105. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, we have a lot of issues that we have to get to. We're out of time. Thank you.

106. DAVID MUIR: Linsey, thank you. We have an election in just 56 days. I want to talk about the peaceful transfer of power, which of course we all know was a cornerstone of our democracy and the role of a president in a moment of crisis. Mr. President, on January 6th you told your supporters to march to the Capitol. You said you would be right there with them. The country and the world saw what played out at the Capitol that day. The officers coming under attack. Aides in the West Wing say you watched it unfold on television off the Oval Office. You did send out tweets, but it was more than two hours before you sent out that video message telling your supporters to go home. Is there anything you regret about what you did on that day?

107. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: You just said a thing that isn't covered. Peacefully and patriotically, I said during my speech. Not later on. Peacefully and patriotically. And nobody on the other side was killed. Ashli Babbitt was shot by an out-of-control police officer that should have never, ever shot her. It's a disgrace. But we didn't do -- this group of people that have been treated so badly. I ask, what about all the people that are pouring into our country and killing people? That she allowed to pour in. She was the border czar. Remember that. She was the border czar. She doesn't want to be called the border czar because she's embarrassed by the border. In fact, she said at the beginning, I'm surprised you're not talking about the border yet. That's because she knows what a bad job they've done. What about those people? What's, when are they going to be prosecuted -- when are these people from countries all over the world, not just South America, they're coming in from all over the world, David, all over the world. And crime rates are down all over the world because of it --

108. DAVID MUIR: But let me just ask you--

109. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: But when are those, David, when are those people going to be prosecuted? When are the people that burned down Minneapolis going to

be prosecuted or in Seattle? They went into Seattle, they took over a big percentage of the city of Seattle. When are those people going to be prosecuted?

110. DAVID MUIR: But let me just ask you--

111. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: You might ask her that question.

112. DAVID MUIR: You were the president. You were watching it unfold on television. It's a very simple question as we move forward toward another election. Is there anything you regret about what you did on that day? Yes or no.

113. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I had nothing to do with that other than they asked me to make a speech. I showed up for a speech. I said, I think it's going to be big. I went to Nancy Pelosi and the mayor of Washington, D.C. And the mayor put it back in writing, as you know. I said, you know, this is going to be a very big rally or whatever you want to call it. And again, it wasn't done by me. It was done by others. I said I'd like to give you 10,000 National Guard or soldiers. They rejected me. Nancy Pelosi rejected me. It was just two weeks ago, her daughter has a tape of her saying she is fully responsible for what happened. They want to get rid of that tape. It would have never happened if Nancy Pelosi and the mayor of Washington did their jobs. I wasn't responsible for security. Nancy Pelosi was responsible. She didn't do her job.

114. DAVID MUIR: The question was about you as president, not about Former Speaker Pelosi. But I do want Vice President Harris to respond here.

115. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: I was at the Capitol on January 6th. I was the Vice President-Elect. I was also an acting senator. I was there. And on that day, the president of the United States incited a violent mob to attack our nation's Capitol, to desecrate our nation's Capitol. On that day, 140 law enforcement officers were injured. And some died. And understand, the former president has been indicted and impeached for exactly that reason. But this is not an isolated situation. Let's remember Charlottesville, where there was a mob of people carrying tiki torches, spewing antisemitic hate, and what did the president then at the time say? There were fine people on each side. Let's remember that when it came to the Proud Boys, a militia, the president said, the former president said, "Stand back and stand by." So for everyone watching who remembers what January 6th was, I say we don't have to go back. Let's not go back. We're not going back. It's time to turn the page. And if that was a bridge too far for you, well, there is a place in our campaign for you. To stand for country. To stand for our democracy. To stand for rule of law. And to end the chaos. And to end the approach that is about attacking the foundations of our democracy 'cause you don't like the outcome. And be clear on that point. Donald Trump the candidate has said in this election there will be a bloodbath, if this -- and the outcome of this election is not to his liking. **Let's turn the page on this. Let's not go back. Let's chart a course for the future and not go backwards to the past.**

116. DAVID MUIR: Let me just follow up here--

117. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I have said blood bash, bath. It was a different term, and it was a term that related to energy, because they have destroyed our energy business. That was where bloodbath was. Also, on Charlottesville, that story has been as you would say, debunked. Laura Ingraham, Sean Hannity, Jesse -- all of these people, they covered it. If they go an extra sentence, they will see it was perfect. It was debunked in almost every

newspaper. But they still bring it up just like they bring 2025 up. They bring all of this stuff up. I ask you this. You talk about the Capitol. Why are we allowing these millions of people to come through on the southern border? How come she's not doing -- and I'll tell you what I would do. And I would be very proud to do it. I would say we would both leave this debate right now, I'd like to see her go down to Washington, D.C. during this debate 'cause we're wasting a lot of time. Go down to -- because she's been so bad, it's so ridiculous. Go down to Washington, D.C. And let her sign a bill to close up the border. Because they have the right to do it. They don't need bills. They have the right to do it. The President of the United States, you'll get him out of bed. You'll wake him up at 4:00 in the afternoon, you'll say come on. Come on down to the office, let's sign a bill. If he ... if he signs a bill that the border is closed, all he has to do is say it to the border patrol, who are phenomenal. If they do that, the border is closed.

118. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President --

119. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Those people are killing many people, unlike J-6.

120. DAVID MUIR: We talked immigration here tonight. I do want to focus on this next issue to both of you. Because it really brings us, this into focus. Truth in these times that we're living in. Mr. President, for 3 and a half years after you lost the 2020 election you repeatedly falsely claimed that you won, many times saying you won in a landslide. In the past couple of weeks leading up to this debate, you have said, quote, you lost by a whisker, that you, quote, didn't quite make it, that you came up a little bit short.

121. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I said that?

122. DAVID MUIR: Are you now acknowledging that you lost in 2020?

123. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: No, I don't acknowledge that at all.

124. DAVID MUIR: But you did say that.

125. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I said that sarcastically. You know that. It was said, oh we lost by a whisker. That was said sarcastically. Look, there's so much proof. All you have to do is look at it. And they should have sent it back to the legislatures for approval. I got almost 75 million votes. The most votes any sitting president has ever gotten. I was told if I got 63, which was what I got in 2016, you can't be beaten. The election, people should never be thinking about an election as fraudulent. We need two things. We need walls. We need -- and we have to have it. We have to have borders. And we have to have good elections.

126. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Our elections are bad. And a lot of these illegal immigrants coming in, they're trying to get them to vote. They can't even speak English. They don't even know what country they're in practically. And these people are trying to get them to vote. And that's why they're allowing them to come into our country.

127. DAVID MUIR: I did watch all of these pieces of video. I didn't detect the sarcasm, lost by a whisker, we didn't quite make it, and we should just point out as clarification, and you know this, you and your allies, 60 cases in front of many judges. Many of them --

128. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: No judge looked at it.

129. DAVID MUIR: And said there was no widespread fraud.

130. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: They said we didn't have standing. That's the other thing. They said we didn't have standing. A technicality. Can you imagine a system where a person in an election doesn't have standing, the President of the United States doesn't have standing? That's how we lost. If you look at the facts, and I'd love to have you -- you'll do a special on it. I'll show you Georgia and I'll show you Wisconsin and I'll show you Pennsylvania and I'll show you -- we have so many facts and statistics. But you know what? That doesn't matter. Because we have to solve the problem that we have right now. That's old news. And the problem that we have right now is we have a nation in decline and they have put it into decline. We have a nation that is dying, David.

131. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, thank you. Vice President Harris, you heard the president there tonight. He said he didn't say that he lost by a whisker. So he still believes he did not lose the election. That was won by President Biden and yourself. But I do want to ask you about something that's come up in the last couple of days. This was a post from President Trump about this upcoming election just weeks away. He said, "When I win, those people who cheated," and then he lists donors, voters, election officials, he says "Will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, which will include long-term prison sentences." One of your campaign's top lawyers responded saying, "We won't let Donald Trump intimidate us. We won't let him suppress the vote." Is that what you believe he's trying to do here?

132. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Donald Trump was fired by 81 million people. So, let's be clear about that. And clearly, he is having a very difficult time processing that. But we cannot afford to have a president of the United States who attempts as he did in the past to upend the will of the voters in a free and fair election. And I'm going to tell you that I have traveled the world as vice president of the United States. And world leaders are laughing at Donald Trump. I have talked with military leaders, some of whom worked with you. And they say you're a disgrace. And when you then talk in this way in a presidential debate and deny what over and over again are court cases you have lost, because you did in fact lose that election, it leads one to believe that perhaps we do not have in the candidate to my right the temperament or the ability to not be confused about fact. That's deeply troubling. And the American people deserve better.

133. DAVID MUIR: I'll give you one minute to respond, Mr. President.

134. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Let me just tell you about world leaders. Viktor Orban, one of the most respected men -- they call him a strong man. He's a tough person. Smart. Prime Minister of Hungary. They said why is the whole world blowing up? Three years ago it wasn't. Why is it blowing up? He said because you need Trump back as president. They were afraid of him. China was afraid. And I don't like to use the word afraid but I'm just quoting him. China was afraid of him. North Korea was afraid of him. Look at what's going on with North Korea, by the way. He said Russia was afraid of him. I ended the Nord Stream 2 pipeline and Biden put it back on day one but he ended the XL pipeline. The XL pipeline in our country. He ended that. But he let the Russians build a pipeline going all over Europe and heading into Germany. The biggest pipeline in the world. Look, Viktor Orban said it. He said the most respected, most feared person is Donald Trump. We had no problems when Trump was president. But when this weak pathetic man that you saw at a debate just a few months ago that if he weren't in that debate he'd be running instead of her, she got no votes, he got 14 million votes, what you did, you talk about a threat to democracy. He got 14 million votes and they

threw him out of office. And you know what? I'll give you a little secret. He hates her. He can't stand her.

135. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President --

136. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: But he had 14 million votes. They threw them out. She got zero votes. And when she ran, she was the first one to leave because she failed. And now she's running. I don't understand it but I'm okay with it – because I think we're going to do pretty well.

137. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, your time is up. We've got a lot more to get to.

138. LINSEY DAVIS: Turning now to the Israel-Hamas war and the hostages who are still being held, Americans among them. Vice President Harris, in December you said, "Israel has a right to defend itself" but you added, "It matters how." Saying international humanitarian law must be respected, Israel must do more to protect innocent civilians. You said that nine months ago. Now an estimated 40,000 Palestinians are dead. Nearly 100 hostages remain. Just last week Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said there's not a deal in the making. President Biden has not been able to break through the stalemate. How would you do it?

139. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, let's understand how we got here. On Oct. 7, Hamas, a terrorist organization, slaughtered 1,200 Israelis. Many of them young people who were simply attending a concert. Women were horribly raped. And so absolutely, I said then, I say now, Israel has a right to defend itself. We would. And how it does so matters. Because it is also true far too many innocent Palestinians have been killed. Children, mothers. What we know is that this war must end. It must when, end immediately, and the way it will end is **we need a cease-fire deal and we need the hostages out**. And so we will continue to work around the clock on that. **Work around the clock also understanding that we must chart** a course for a two-state solution. And in that solution, there must be security for the Israeli people and Israel and in equal measure for the Palestinians. **But the one thing I will assure you always, I will always give Israel the ability** to defend itself, in particular as it relates to Iran and any threat that Iran and its proxies pose to Israel. **But we must have a two-state solution** where we can rebuild Gaza, where the Palestinians have security, self-determination and the dignity they so rightly deserve.

140. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, how would you negotiate with Netanyahu and also Hamas in order to get the hostages out and prevent the killing of more innocent civilians in Gaza?

141. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: If I were president it would have never started. If I were president Russia would have never, ever -- I know Putin very well. He would have never -- and there was no threat of it either, by the way, for four years. Have gone into Ukraine and killed millions of people when you add it up. Far worse than people understand what's going on over there. But when she mentions about Israel all of a sudden -- she hates Israel. She wouldn't even meet with Netanyahu when he went to Congress to make a very important speech. She refused to be there because she was at a sorority party of hers. She wanted to go to the sorority party. She hates Israel. If she's president, I believe that Israel will not exist within two years from now. And I've been pretty good at predictions. And I hope I'm wrong about that one. She hates Israel. At the same time in her own way she hates the Arab population because the whole place is going to get blown up, Arabs, Jewish people, Israel.

Israel will be gone. It would have never happened. Iran was broke under Donald Trump. Now Iran has \$300 billion because they took off all the sanctions that I had. Iran had no money for Hamas or Hezbollah or any of the 28 different spheres of terror. And they are spheres of terror. Horrible terror. They had no money. It was a big story, and you know it. You covered it. Very well, actually. They had no money for terror. They were broke. Now they're a rich nation. And now what they're doing is spreading that money around. Look at what's happening with the Houthis and Yemen. Look at what's going on in the Middle East. This would have never happened. I will get that settled and fast. And I'll get the war with Ukraine and Russia ended. If I'm President-Elect, I'll get it done before even becoming president.

142. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, he says you hate Israel.

143. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: That's absolutely not true. I have my entire career and life supported Israel and the Israeli people. He knows that. He's trying to again divide and distract from the reality, which is it is very well known that Donald Trump is weak and wrong on national security and foreign policy. It is well known that he admires dictators, wants to be a dictator on day one according to himself. It is well known that he said of Putin that he can do whatever the hell he wants and go into Ukraine. It is well known when that he said when Russia went into Ukraine it was brilliant. It is well known he exchanged love letters with Kim Jong un. And it is absolutely well known that these dictators and autocrats are rooting for you to be president again because they're so clear, they can manipulate you with flattery and favors. And that is why so many military leaders who you have worked with have told me you are a disgrace. That is why we understand that we have to have a president who is not consistently weak and wrong on national security including the importance of upholding and respecting in highest regard our military.

144. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, thank you.

145. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: They're the ones -- and she's the one that caused it, that's weak on national security by allowing every nation last month for the year, 168 different countries sending people into our country. Their crime rates are way down. Putin endorsed her last week. Said I hope she wins. And I think he meant it. Because what he's gotten away with is absolutely incredible. It wouldn't have happened with me. The leaders of other countries think that they're weak and incompetent. And they are. They're grossly incompetent. And I just ask one question. Why does Biden go in and kill the Keystone pipeline and approve the single biggest deal that Russia's ever made, Nordstream 2, the biggest pipeline anywhere in the world going to Germany and all over Europe? Because they're weak and they're ineffective. And Biden, by the way --

146. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump...

147. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Gets paid a lot of money --

148. LINSEY DAVIS: Thank you. We have a lot of issues to get to.

149. DAVID MUIR: We'll be right back with much more of this historic ABC News presidential debate from the National Constitution Center right here in Philadelphia. Back in a moment.

150. DAVID MUIR: And I want to turn to the war in Ukraine. We're now 2 1/2 years into this conflict. Mr. President, it has been the position of the Biden administration that we must defend Ukraine from Russia, from Vladimir Putin, to defend their sovereignty, their democracy, that

it's in America's best interest to do so, arguing that if Putin wins he may be emboldened to move even further into other countries. You have said you would solve this war in 24 hours. You said so just before the break tonight. How exactly would you do that? And I want to ask you a very simple question tonight. Do you want Ukraine to win this war?

151. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I want the war to stop. I want to save lives that are being uselessly -- people being killed by the millions. It's the millions. It's so much worse than the numbers that you're getting, which are fake numbers. Look, we're in for 250 billion or more because they don't ask Europe, which is a much bigger beneficiary to getting this thing done than we are. They're in for \$150 billion less because Biden and you don't have the courage to ask Europe like I did with NATO. They paid billions and billions, hundreds of billions of dollars when I said either you pay up or we're not going to protect you anymore. So that may be one of the reasons they don't like me as much as they like weak people. But you take a look at what's happening. We're in for 250 to 275 billion. They're into 100 to 150. They should be forced to equalize. With that being said, I want to get the war settled. I know Zelenskyy very well and I know Putin very well. I have a good relationship. And they respect your president. Okay? They respect me. They don't respect Biden. How would you respect him? Why? For what reason? He hasn't even made a phone call in two years to Putin. Hasn't spoken to anybody. They don't even try and get it. That is a war that's dying to be settled. I will get it settled before I even become president. If I win, when I'm President-Elect, and what I'll do is I'll speak to one, I'll speak to the other, I'll get them together. That war would have never happened. And in fact when I saw Putin after I left, unfortunately left because our country has gone to hell, but after I left when I saw him building up soldiers, he did it after I left, I said oh, he must be negotiating. It must be a good strong point of negotiation. Well, it wasn't because Biden had no idea how to talk to him. He had no idea how to stop it. And now you have millions of people dead and it's only getting worse and it could lead to World War 3. Don't kid yourself, David. **We're playing with World War 3.** And we have a president that we don't even know if he's -- where is our president? We don't even know if he's a president.

152. DAVID MUIR: And just to clarify here.

153. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: They threw him out of a campaign like a dog. We don't even know, is he our president? But we have a president...

154. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President,

155. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: ...that doesn't know he's alive.

156. DAVID MUIR: Your time is up. Just to clarify the question, do you believe it's in the U.S. best interests for Ukraine to win this war? Yes or no?

157. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I think it's in the U.S. best interest to get this war finished and just get it done. All right. Negotiate a deal. Because we have to stop all of these human lives from being destroyed.

158. DAVID MUIR: I want to take this to Vice President Harris. I want to get your thoughts on support for Ukraine in this moment. But also as commander in chief if elected how would you deal with Vladimir Putin and would it be any different from what we're seeing from President Biden?

159. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, first of all, it's important to remind the former president you're not running against Joe Biden, you're running against me. I believe the reason that Donald Trump says that this war would be over within 24 hours is because he would just give it up. **And that's not who we are as Americans.** Let's understand what happened here. I actually met with Zelenskyy a few days before Russia invaded, tried through force to change territorial boundaries to defy one of the most important international rules and norms, which is the importance of sovereignty and territorial integrity. And I met with President Zelenskyy. I shared with him American intelligence about how he could defend himself. Days later I went to NATO's eastern flank, to Poland and Romania. And through the work that I and others did we brought 50 countries to support Ukraine in its righteous defense. And because of our support, because of the air defense, the ammunition, the artillery, the javelins, the Abrams tanks that we have provided, Ukraine stands as an independent and free country. If Donald Trump were president, Putin would be sitting in Kyiv right now. And understand what that would mean. Because Putin's agenda is not just about Ukraine. Understand why the European allies and our NATO allies are so thankful that you are no longer president and that we understand the importance of the greatest military alliance the world has ever known, which is NATO. And what we have done to preserve the ability of Zelenskyy and the Ukrainians to fight for their Independence. Otherwise, Putin would be sitting in Kyiv with his eyes on the rest of Europe. Starting with Poland. And why don't you tell the 800,000 Polish Americans right here in Pennsylvania how quickly you would give up for the sake of favor and what you think is a friendship with what is known to be a dictator who would eat you for lunch.

160. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris Thank you. We heard from both of you on Ukraine tonight. Afghanistan came up in the last hour -- I wanted her to respond to something you said earlier.

161. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I have to respond.

162. DAVID MUIR: Please I'll give you a minute here.

163. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Putin would be sitting in Moscow and he wouldn't have lost 300,000 men and women. But he would have been sitting in Moscow

164. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: (inaudible)

165. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Quiet, please. He would have been sitting in Moscow much happier than he is right now. But eventually, you know, he's got a thing that other people don't have. He's got nuclear weapons. They don't ever talk about that. He's got nuclear weapons. Nobody ever thinks about that. And eventually uh maybe he'll use them. Maybe he hasn't been that threatening. But he does have that. Something we don't even like to talk about. Nobody likes to talk about it. But just so you understand, they sent her to negotiate peace before this war started. Three days later he went in and he started the war because everything they said was weak and stupid. They said the wrong things. That war should have never started. She was the emissary. They sent her in to negotiate with Zelenskyy and Putin. And she did and the war started three days later.

166. DAVID MUIR: Vice president...

167. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: And that's the kind of talent we have with her. She's worse than Biden. In my opinion, I think he's the worst president in the history of

our country. She goes down as the worst vice president in the history of our country. But let me tell you something. She is a horrible negotiator. They sent her in to negotiate. As soon as they left Putin did the invasion.

168. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, thank you. You did bring up something, you said she went to negotiate with Vladimir Putin. Vice President Harris, have you ever met Vladimir Putin, can you clarify tonight?

169. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Yet again, I said it at the beginning of this debate, you're going to hear a bunch of lies coming from this fella. And that is another one. When I went to meet with President Zelenskyy, I've now met with him over five times. The reality is, it has been about standing as America always should, as a leader upholding international rules and norms. As a leader who shows strength, understanding that the alliances we have around the world are dependent on our ability to look out for our friends and not favor our enemies because you adore strongmen instead of caring about democracy. And that is very much what is at stake here. The President of the United States is commander-in-chief. And the American people have a right to rely on a president who understands the significance of America's role and responsibility in terms of ensuring that there is stability and ensuring we stand up for our principles and not sell them for the benefit of personal flattery.

170. DAVID MUIR: We've talked about Ukraine and Vladimir Putin. I do want to talk about Afghanistan. It came up in the first hour of this debate.

171. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: David, one thing.

172. DAVID MUIR: I want to move on to Afghanistan.

173. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Secretary General Stoltenberg said Trump did the most amazing thing I've ever seen, he got these countries, the 28 countries at the time, to pay up. He said I've never seen -- he's the head of NATO. He said I've never seen -- for years we were paying almost all of NATO. We were being ripped off by European nations both on trade and on NATO. I got them to pay up by saying one of the statements you made before, if you don't pay we're not going to protect you.

174. DAVID MUIR: President Trump--

175. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Otherwise we would've never gotten it. He said it was one of the most incredible jobs that he's ever seen done.

176. DAVID MUIR: Thank you. I want to turn to Afghanistan. We witnessed a poignant moment today on Capitol Hill honoring the soldiers who died in the chaotic withdrawal from Afghanistan. I do want to ask the vice president, do you believe you bear any responsibility in the way that withdrawal played out?

177. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, I will tell you, I agreed with President Biden's decision to pull out of Afghanistan. Four presidents said they would, and Joe Biden did. And as a result, America's taxpayers are not paying the \$300 million a day we were paying for that endless war. And as of today, there is not one member of the United States military who is in active duty in a combat zone in any war zone around the world, the first time this century. But let's understand how we got to where we are. Donald Trump when he was president negotiated one of the weakest deals you can imagine. He calls himself a dealmaker. Even his

national security adviser said it was a weak, terrible deal. And here's how it went down. He bypassed the Afghan government. He negotiated directly with a terrorist organization called the Taliban. The negotiation involved the Taliban getting 5,000 terrorists, Taliban terrorists released.

178. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: And get this -- no, get this. And the president at the time invited the Taliban to Camp David. A place of storied significance for us as Americans, a place where we honor the importance of American diplomacy, where we invite and receive respected world leaders. And this former president as president invited them to Camp David because he does not again appreciate the role and responsibility of the President of the United States to be commander in chief with a level of respect. And this gets back to the point of how he has consistently disparaged and demeaned members of our military, fallen soldiers, and the work that we must do to uphold the strength and the respect of the United States of America around the world.

179. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, thank you. President Trump, your response to her saying that you began the negotiations with the Taliban.

180. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Yeah, thank you. So if you take a look at that period of time, the Taliban was killing our soldiers, a lot of them, with snipers. And I got involved with the Taliban because the Taliban was doing the killing. That's the fighting force within Afghanistan. They don't bother doing that because you know, they deal with the wrong people all the time. But I got involved. And Abdul is the head of the Taliban. He is still the head of the Taliban. And I told Abdul don't do it anymore, you do it anymore you're going to have problems. And he said why do you send me a picture of my house? I said you're going to have to figure that out, Abdul. And for 18 months we had nobody killed. We did have an agreement negotiated by Mike Pompeo. It was a very good agreement. The reason it was good, it was -- we were getting out. We would have been out faster than them, but we wouldn't have lost the soldiers. We wouldn't have left many Americans behind. And we wouldn't have left -- we wouldn't have left \$85 billion worth of brand new beautiful military equipment behind. And just to finish, they blew it. The agreement said you have to do this, this, this, this, this, and they didn't do it. They didn't do it. The agreement was, was terminated by us because they didn't do what they were supposed to do.

181. DAVID MUIR: I want to move on.

182. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: And these people did the worst withdrawal and in my opinion the most embarrassing moment in the history of our country. And by the way, that's why Russia attacked Ukraine. Because they saw how incompetent she and her boss are.

183. DAVID MUIR: President Trump, thank you. I want to move on now to race and politics in this country. Mr. President, you recently said of Vice President Harris, "I didn't know she was Black until a number of years ago when she happened to turn Black, and now she wants to be known as Black." I want to ask a bigger-picture question here tonight. Why do you believe it's appropriate to weigh in on the racial identity of your opponent?

184. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I don't. And I don't care. I don't care what she is. I don't care. You make a big deal out of something. I couldn't care less. Whatever she wants to be is okay with me.

185. DAVID MUIR: But those were your words. So, I'm asking --

186. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I don't know. I don't know. All I can say is I read where she was not Black, that she put out. And, I'll say that. And then I read that she was black. And that's okay. Either one was okay with me. That's up to her. That's up to her.

187. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, your thoughts on this?

188. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: I think it's -- I mean honestly, I think it's a tragedy that we have someone who wants to be president who has consistently over the course of his career attempted to use race to divide the American people. You know, I do believe that the vast majority of us know that we have so much more in common than what separates us. And we don't want this kind of approach that is just constantly trying to divide us, and especially by race. And let's remember how Donald Trump started. He was a, a, a—land, he owned land, he owned buildings, and he was investigated because he refused to rent property to Black families. Let's remember, this is the same individual who took out a full-page ad in The New York Times calling for the execution of five young Black and Latino boys who were innocent, the Central Park Five. Took out a full-page ad calling for their execution. This is the same individual who spread birther lies about the first Black President of the United States. And I think the American people want better than that. Want better than this. Want someone who understands as I do, I travel our country, we see in each other a friend. We see in each other a neighbor. We don't want a leader who is constantly trying to have Americans point their fingers at each other. I meet with people all the time who tell me "Can we please just have discourse about how we're going to invest in the aspirations and the ambitions and the dreams of the American people?" Knowing that regardless of people's color or the language their grandmother speaks we all have the same dreams and aspirations and want a president who invests in those, not in hate and division.

189. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris thank you. Linsey?

190. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, this is now your third time --

191. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: This is the most divisive presidency in the history of our country. There's never been anything like it. They're destroying our country. And they come up with things like what she just said going back many, many years when a lot of people including Mayor Bloomberg agreed with me on the Central Park Five. They admitted - - they said, they pled guilty. And I said, well, if they pled guilty they badly hurt a person, killed a person ultimately. And if they pled guilty -- then they pled we're not guilty. But this is a person that has to stretch back years, 40, 50 years ago because there's nothing now. I built one of the greatest economies in the history of the world and I'm going to build it again. It's going to be bigger, better and stronger. But they're destroying our economy. They have no idea what a good economy is. Their oil policies -- every single policy -- and remember this. She is Biden. She's trying to get away from Biden. I don't know the gentleman, she says. She is Biden. The worst inflation we've ever had. A horrible economy because inflation has made it so bad and she can't get away with that.

192. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, thank you, your time is up. Linsey --

193. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: I want to respond to that, though. I want to just respond briefly. Clearly, I am not Joe Biden, and I am certainly not Donald Trump. And what I

do offer is a new generation of leadership for our country. One who believes in what is possible, one who brings a sense of optimism about what we can do instead of always disparaging the American people. I believe in what we can do to strengthen our small businesses, which is why I have a plan. Let's talk about our plans. And, and let's compare the plans. I have a plan to give startup businesses \$50,000 tax deduction, to pursue their ambitions, their innovation, their ideas, their hard work. I have a plan. \$6,000 for young families for the first year of your child's life. To help you in that most critical stage of your child's development. I have a plan that is about allowing people to be able to pursue what has been fleeting in terms of the American dream by offering help with down payment of \$25,000, down payment assistance for first-time home buyers. That's the kind of conversation I believe, David, that people really want tonight as opposed to a conversation that is constantly about belittling and name-calling. Let's turn the page and move forward.

194. DAVID MUIR: Vice President Harris, thank you.

195. LINSEY DAVIS: We have to move on. President trump --

196. PRESIDENT TRUMP: She is destroying our country. She has a plan to defund the police. She has a plan to confiscate everybody's gun. She has a plan to not allow fracking in Pennsylvania or anywhere else. That's what her plan is until just recently.

197. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, President Trump.

198. VICE PRESIDENT HARRIS: The former president has said something twice and I need to respond too. I just need to respond one time to what he has said multiple times.

199. LINSEY DAVIS: I'm sorry, we're going to move on, Vice President Harris. This is now your third time running for president. you have long vowed to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare. You have failed to accomplish that. You now say you're going to keep Obamacare. Quote, unless we can do something much better. Last month you said, quote, we're working on it. So tonight, nine years after you first started running, do you have a plan and can you tell us what it is?

200. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Obamacare was lousy health care. Always was. It's not very good today. And what I said, that if we come up with something, we are working on things, we're going to do it and we're going to replace it. But remember this. I inherited Obamacare because Democrats wouldn't change it. They wouldn't vote for it. They were unanimous. They wouldn't vote to change it. If they would have done that, we would have had a much better plan than Obamacare. But the Democrats came up, they wouldn't vote for it. I had a choice to make when I was president, do I save it and make it as good as it can be? Never going to be great. Or do I let it rot? And I felt I had an obligation, even though politically it would have been good to just let it rot and let it go away. I decided -- and I told my people, the top people, and they're very good people -- I have a lot of good people in this -- that administration. We read about the bad ones. We had some real bad ones too. And so do they. They have really bad ones. The difference is they don't get rid of them. But let me just explain. I had a choice to make do I save it and make it as good as it can be or let it rot? And I saved it. I did the right thing. But it's still never going to be great. And it's too expensive for people. And what we will do is we're looking at different plans. If we can come up with a plan that's going to cost our people, our population less money and be better health care than Obamacare, then I would absolutely do it. But until then I'd run it as good as it can be run.

201. LINSEY DAVIS: So just a yes or no, you still do not have a plan?

202. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I have concepts of a plan. I'm not president right now. But if we come up with something I would only change it if we come up with something better and less expensive. And there are concepts and options we have to do that. And you'll be hearing about it in the not-too-distant future.

203. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, in 2017 you supported Bernie Sanders' proposal to do away with private insurance and create a government-run health care system. Two years later you proposed a plan that included a private insurance option. What is your plan today?

204. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, first of all, I absolutely support and over the last four years as vice president private health care options. But what we need to do is maintain and grow the Affordable Care Act. But I, I'll get to that, linsey. I just need to respond to a previous point that the former president has made. I've made very clear my position on fracking. And then this business about taking everyone's guns away. Tim Walz and I are both gun owners. We're not taking anybody's guns away. So stop with the continuous lying about this stuff. As it relates to the Affordable Care Act, understand, just look at the history to know where people stand. When Donald Trump was president, 60 times he tried to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. 60 times. I was a senator at the time. When, I will never forget the early morning hours when it was up for a vote in the United States Senate and the late great John McCain, who you have disparaged as being – uh, you don't like him, you said at the time because he got caught, he was an American hero. The late great John McCain, I will never forget that night. Walked onto the Senate floor and said no, you don't. No, you don't. No, you don't get rid of the Affordable Care Act. You have no plan. And what the Affordable Care Act has done is eliminate the ability of insurance companies to deny people with pre-existing conditions. I don't have to tell the people watching tonight, you remember what that was like? Remember when an insurance company could deny if a child had asthma, if someone was a breast cancer survivor, if a grandparent had diabetes? And thankfully, as I've been vice president and we over the last four years have strengthened the Affordable Care Act, we have allowed for the first time Medicare to negotiate drug prices on behalf of you the American people. Donald Trump said he was going to allow Medicare to negotiate dr, drug prices. He never did. We did. And now we have capped the cost of insulin at \$35 a month. Since I've been vice president we have capped the cost of prescription medication for seniors at \$2,000 a year. And when I am president we will do that for all people understanding that the value I bring to this is that access to health care should be a right and not just a privilege of those who can afford it. And the plan has to be to strengthen the Affordable Care Act, not get rid of it, (in audible) in terms of where Donald Trump stands on that.

205. LINSEY DAVIS: I want to move to an issue that's important --

206. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: She made a mistake. Number one, John McCain fought Obamacare for ten years. But it wasn't only him. It was, All of the Democrats that kept it going. And you know what? We could do much better than Obamacare. Much less money. But she won't improve private insurance for people. Private, medical insurance. That's another thing she doesn't want

207. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump.

208. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: People are paying privately for insurance that have worked hard and made money and they want to have private. She wants everybody to be on government insurance where you wait six months for an operation that you need immediately.

209. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, thank you. We have another issue that we'd like to get to that's important for a number of Americans, in particular younger voters, and that's climate change. President Trump, with regard to the environment, you say that we have to have clean air and clean water. Vice President Harris, you call climate change an existential threat. The question to you both tonight is what would you do to fight climate change? And Vice President Harris, we'll start with you. One minute for you each.

210. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: Well, the former president had said that climate change is a hoax. And what we know is that it is very real. You ask anyone who lives in a state who has experienced these extreme weather occurrences who now is either being denied home insurance or is being jacked up. You ask anybody who has been the victim of what that means in terms of losing their home, having nowhere to go. We know that we can actually deal with this issue. The young people of America care deeply about this issue. And I am proud that as vice president over the last four years, we have invested a trillion dollars in a clean energy economy while we have also increased domestic gas production to historic levels. We have created over 800,000 new manufacturing jobs while I have been vice president. We have invested in clean energy to the point that we are opening up factories around the world. Donald Trump said he was going to create manufacturing jobs. He lost manufacturing jobs. And I'm also proud to have the endorsement of the United Auto Workers and Shawn Fain, who also know that part of building a clean energy economy includes investing in American-made products, American automobiles. It includes growing what we can do around American manufacturing and opening up auto plants, not closing them like what happened under Donald Trump.

211. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, thank you.

212. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: That didn't happen under Donald Trump. Let me just tell you, they lost 10,000 manufacturing jobs this last month. It's going -- they're all leaving. They're building big auto plants in Mexico. In many cases owned by China. They're building these massive plants, and they think they're going to sell their cars into the United States because of these people. What they have given to China is unbelievable. But we're not going to let that. We'll put tariffs on those cars so they can't come into our country. Because they will kill the United Auto Workers and any auto worker, whether it's in Detroit or South Carolina or any other place. What they've done to business and manufacturing in this country is horrible. We have nothing because they refuse -- you know, Biden doesn't go after people because supposedly China paid him millions of dollars. He's afraid to do it. Between him and his son. They get all this money from Ukraine. They get all this money from all of these different countries. And then you wonder why is he so loyal to this one, that one Ukraine, China? Why is he? Why did he get 3 1/2 million dollars from the mayor of Moscow's wife? Why did he get -- why did she pay him 3 1/2 million dollars? This is a crooked administration, and they're selling our country down the tubes.

213. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump, thank you.

214. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Thank you.

215. DAVID MUIR: We'll be right back with closing statements from both of our candidates. A historic night, this ABC News Presidential Debate from Philadelphia. Back in a moment.

216. DAVID MUIR: The time has come for closing statements. And Vice President Harris, we begin with you.

217. VICE PRESIDENT KAMALA HARRIS: So I think you've heard tonight two very different visions for our country. One that is focused on the future and the other that is focused on the past. And an attempt to take us backward. But we're not going back. And I do believe that the American people know we all have so much more in common than what separates us and we can chart a new way forward. And a vision of that includes having a plan, understanding the aspirations, the dreams, the hopes, the ambition of the American people, which is why I intend to create an opportunity economy, investing in small businesses, in new families, in what we can do around protecting seniors, what we can do that is about giving hard-working folks a break in bringing down the cost of living. I believe in what we can do together that is about sustaining America's standing in the world and ensuring we have the respect that we so rightly deserve including respecting our military and ensuring we have the most lethal fighting force in the world. I will be a president that will protect our fundamental rights and freedoms including the right of a woman to make decisions about her own body and not have her government tell her what to do. I'll tell you, I started my career as a prosecutor. I was a D.A. I was an attorney general. A United States senator. And now vice president. I've only had one client. The people. And I'll tell you, as a prosecutor I never asked a victim or a witness are you a Republican or a Democrat. The only thing I ever asked them, are you okay? And that's the kind of president we need right now. Someone who cares about you and is not putting themselves first. I intend to be a president for all Americans and focus on what we can do over the next 10 and 20 years to build back up our country by investing right now in you the American people.

218. LINSEY DAVIS: Vice President Harris, thank you. President Trump?

219. FORMER PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: So, she just started by saying she's going to do this, she's going to do that, she's going to do all these wonderful things. Why hasn't she done it? She's been there for 3 1/2 years. They've had 3 1/2 years to fix the border. They've had 3 1/2 years to create jobs and all the things we talked about. Why hasn't she done it? She should leave right now, go down to that beautiful white house, go to the capitol, get everyone together and do the things you want to do. But you haven't done it. And you won't do it. Because you believe in things that the American people don't believe in. You believe in things like we're not going to frack. We're not going to take fossil fuel. We're not going to do, things that are going to make this country strong, whether you like it or not. Germany tried that and within one year they were back to building normal energy plants. We're not ready for it. We can't sacrifice our country for the sake of bad vision. But I just ask one simple question. Why didn't she do it? We're a failing nation. We're a nation that's in serious decline. We're being laughed at all over the world. All over the world, they laugh, I know the leaders very well. They're coming to see me. They call me. We're laughed at all over the world. They don't understand what happened to us as a nation. We're not a leader. We don't have any idea what's going on. We have wars going on in the Middle East. We have wars going on with Russia and Ukraine. We're going to end up in a third World War. And it will be a war like no other because of nuclear weapons, the

power of weaponry. I rebuilt our entire military. She gave a lot of it away to the Taliban. She gave it to Afghanistan. What these people have done to our country, and maybe toughest of all is allowing millions of people to come into our country, many of them are criminals, and they're destroying our country. The worst president, the worst vice president in the history of our country.

220. LINSEY DAVIS: President Trump thank you. And that is our ABC News presidential debate from here in Philadelphia at the National Constitution Center. I'm Linsey Davis.

221. DAVID MUIR: And I'm David Muir. Thank you for watching here in the U.S. And all over the world. And from all of us here at ABC News, good night.