

**The 2024 Presidential Election: Continuity or Change?**

Kayla S. Chea

Department of Political Science, Diablo Valley College

POLSC-121: Introduction to American Government

Professor John Kropf

December 10, 2024

### **Abstract**

Every four years, Americans vote for a new president, hoping that they will stay true to their campaign promises and propel the United States towards their goals. Although the American public tends to view a large divide between the Republican and Democratic parties, the status quo of the United States, both politically and economically, has remained stagnant for the past few years. Whether the country was led by a Republican president, like Donald Trump, or a Democratic president, like Joe Biden, American policies have not changed as much as past presidents and the media claim that they have. Republicans and Democrats tend to be quite different in their delivery of policies but theatrics aside, the parties generally have similar ideas. The main reason driving this similarity is the donations made by large corporations to both political parties to influence political decisions, so they align with their interests. Trump's success during the 2024 Presidential Election still means that the American government will continue to be one that reflects the needs of large corporations at the expense of its own citizens. Although current events have caused the U.S. economy to fluctuate, the economic status quo has and will continue to remain constant as well. The prioritization of corporate interests in American politics raises the question of how viable a third-party option would be and if that third party could change the course of U.S. politics.

## **The 2024 Presidential Election: Continuity or Change?**

With the 2024 Presidential Election wrapping up, the American public is eager to see what President-elect Donald Trump will do in the next four years. Although people tend to see a radical difference between the Republican and Democratic parties, the main difference between the two parties is their presentation of policies, not the content of the policies themselves. Currently, the United States government is not necessarily one of the people, as the democratic theory would suggest. Rather, the government functions as a mechanism for large corporations to protect their interests and economic gains at the expense of the well-being of the American public. The United States runs as an oligarchy, in which a “tiny, unelected, obscenely wealthy minority of people” have the majority of political power while the rest of the United States has little influence (Wolff, 2024). The government's support for corporations results in an elitist model of government, with the top 1% holding most political positions and utilizing that power to make political decisions that benefit them (Heineman et al., 1995, p. 7). No matter which political party the president belongs to, or which party has the majority in the House of Representatives or the Senate, this corporation-centric government style is still going to prevail because it is built into the political and economic foundation of the United States government. However, more nuanced changes can be made, specifically regarding social issues that have little to no bearing on corporations and their power. With this political environment that places ordinary citizens at the bottom of its priorities, straying from America’s bipartisan system and adding a third political party is appealing to many.

According to the political compass (2024), a website that assesses the ideologies of political candidates, the political and economic status quo of the United States can be categorized as right-wing authoritarian, with every Republican and Democratic presidential candidate falling

into this category since 2004 when the political compass started their assessments. The “right” part of the category indicates the economic scale representing a market economy structure, or a free market, and the “authoritarian” portion indicates the prioritization of government obedience in place of personal freedom. Countries like Singapore and Saudi Arabia are categorized as right-wing authoritarian, while North Korea and China fall into the left-wing authoritarian category, and Uruguay and Switzerland are considered right-wing libertarian (The Political Compass, 2024). Right-wing authoritarianism prioritizes conventionalism, authoritarian submission, which is the prioritization of and respect for authority, and authoritarian aggression, which involves “punitive attitudes toward those who deviate from conventional values” (Manson, 2020). For instance, the United States is notorious for its high incarceration rates, following the concepts of authoritarian aggression and authoritarian submission by punishing individuals who deviate from laws. Additionally, the United States’ dependence on the Constitution and ideologies of the Founding Fathers, which were created almost 200 years ago, demonstrates the government’s placed value on conventionalism.

Currently, the United States’ economy runs under a capitalist model with characteristics of socialism. While the United States likes to claim that its economy is a free, capitalist market, it is actually a mixed economy, as government control is exercised in the form of regulations and taxes on certain products. For example, private businesses have to register with the government, many professions, such as teachers and attorneys, require government certifications, and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates foods and medicines before they enter the market. Features of capitalism apparent in the U.S. economy include privately owned businesses that are generally able to set their own prices for goods and services, and extremely wealthy individuals that create a wealth gap (Ross, 2024).

## **Candidate Policies and Domestic Policy**

The Republican and Democratic parties have been contenders for years, and as the two parties develop, there seems to be a growing division between them. Every four years, presidential candidates compete to win the presidency, and each has their own agenda and plans to change the country. Even with this growing divide, voters have not seen a radical change in domestic policy for a long time because, when looking at the actual policies, the two parties are fairly similar. Additionally, the president is only one entity in the U.S. government, and the checks and balances system ensure that they do not have overpowering influence in U.S. politics.

An instance in which theatrics took center stage and created a perceived division between two candidates was with Biden and Trump's stances on climate change during the 2020 Presidential Election. During his 2016 to 2020 presidential term, Trump claimed to aim for net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, yet he and his administration were responsible for at least 74 instances of weakening environmental protection during those four years (Gross, 2020). On the other hand, with President Biden, many Americans expected a change in climate protection policies because of the opposing viewpoints held by the Democratic party, which is generally more concerned about climate change. During his presidency, from 2020 to 2024, Biden made similar statements to Trump and emphasized the importance of reducing climate change and minimizing dependence on oil and fossil fuels, promising "no more drilling on federal lands, period" during his 2020 campaign. However, three years into his term, Biden went back on his initial policy and caused controversy by approving the Willow oil drilling project in Alaska. The Willow project would "wipe out the emissions cuts provided by renewable projects on public lands and waters, adding the equivalent of 2 [million] new gas-guzzling cars to the roads" which goes against virtually all of his previous claims regarding environmental

protection. While most Americans would say that Trump and Biden have taken very different approaches when it comes to climate change, and that Biden is more environmentally-conscious, the Biden administration has actually contributed more to the support of oil drilling, with the Biden Administration issuing 6,787 oil drilling leases in their first 25 months and the Trump administration issuing 6,695 leases during their first 25 months (Milman, 2023). Although Harris' current campaign details policies to promote environmental justice, she was serving as Biden's vice president at the time of the Willow project approval and supported Biden's decision. Thus, it is likely that Harris or Trump will continue to extend America's oil and fossil fuel dependence.

Another action on Trump and Harris' political agendas is lowering crime rates, and although the two candidates have differentiating details in their plans, their positions do not have a significant impact on policing. On one hand, Harris supports additional funding for the police and strengthened gun restriction laws while Trump supports harsher criminal penalties and a lessened due process (Astor, 2024). Both candidates claim to have plans to reduce crime and create a safer America, but the likelihood that the president is going to directly affect crime rates is low. Kevin Drakulich, the associate director of criminology and criminal justice at Northeastern University, argued that "the federal government can influence [local police funding], but local police departments are not under the jurisdiction of the presidency", and Mark Bliss, deputy chief of the Detroit Police Department, corroborates this argument by stating that the federal government cannot tailor its resource allocation to the specific needs of each police department because each location has different needs and wants (Stogniew, 2024). Even though Trump and Harris both have plans for crime reform and lowering crime rates, they actually do not have the power to fully impact police efficiency because, like many political issues, it

requires tailored resources that the president does not necessarily have time for. The bureaucratic nature of police departments makes it difficult for the president to directly improve police efficiency, and greater effectiveness could be achieved with this power lying in the hands of more local government authorities, such as mayors or governors.

As evident by both Biden and Trump's environmental plans and Harris and Trump's crime-rate policies, changes in domestic policy are unlikely because changes in the political status quo require differences in policies and viewpoints on political issues. Although they were pitted against each other and depicted as enemies, Biden and Trump did not have a lot of domestic policies that they disagreed on and since Harris' campaigning platform heavily relies on Biden's policies, her policies do not stray too far from Trump's.

### **The U.S. Government: A Government of the People or of the Corporations?**

While Republican and Democratic politicians have their own beliefs and agendas, the values and interests of big corporations tend to shine through in political decisions. When people vote for the president and Congress members, they vote for who they believe will represent them best and prioritize their needs and interests. However, no matter who someone votes for or which party the candidate belongs to, their decisions typically do not benefit ordinary citizens. Large corporations drive the decisions made by Congress and even the president, so no matter who wins the election, Congressional and presidential decisions and agendas will not radically change. In what is labeled as "legal corruption," wealthy individuals and powerful corporations are "paying to get tax cuts, subsidies, special laws and 'access'", which is why the government prioritizes the needs of the upper class and large corporations over the middle and lower classes (Johnson, 2011).

Political donations, specifically donations to both political parties, largely account for the stagnation of America's political environment. The same companies fund both parties, meaning that no matter who wins, these corporations' political ideals will be fulfilled by the elected representatives. Corporations such as Coinbase, Ripple Labs, and AH Capital Management, which are cryptocurrency or venture capital firms, have donated to both parties with their total sum of political donations amounting to almost \$200 million (Morse et al., 2024). The success of a political campaign depends on funding, and politicians will either find donors by supporting corporate policies or donors will contact them to set up a mutually beneficial relationship in which the politician advocates for the company in exchange for donations (Wolff, 2024). Republicans and Democrats are not the complete opposites that the media and news depict them as since the same companies are controlling both of their political agendas, leading to no real change based on popular opinion. Politicians are pawns for corporations, acting as representatives of corporate interests rather than representatives of the American people and their interests.

The Supreme Court is one of the biggest proponents of corporations when it comes to granting them immense political and social power. Since the Supreme Court justices have no term limits, there is likely to be little to no change in the Supreme Court's status quo and even if Harris won the election, the Supreme Court would have likely continued its Republican majority and conservative rulings in favor of corporations. The current Supreme Court, and virtually every Supreme Court since the Burger Court ended in 1986, has made it quite clear through their rulings and decisions that corporations are of high priority to them, and in multiple cases regarding numerous fields of law, the Court has favored the side of corporations (Cohen, 2020, pp. 69-70).



At the start of the 20th century, author Frank Norris wrote a book entitled *The Octopus*, detailing the power held by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, the railroad company responsible for the Transcontinental Railroad. He described corporations, specifically the Southern Pacific, saying that “they swindle a nation of a hundred million and call it Financiering; they levy a blackmail and call it Commerce; they corrupt a legislature and call it Politics; they bribe a judge and call it Law,” (Norris, 1901, Chapter VII). Although the novel was fictional, many characters and quotes reflected the attitudes of American citizens towards big corporations and the influence that they had on the government. Unfortunately, this sort of under-the-table corruption in the United States government system has not ceased from the time of Norris’ writing to the present. Norris’ writing about political donations and the power of corporations is still reflective of our political landscape more than 100 years later.

One of the earlier examples of the Supreme Court’s support of corporations is in *Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad Company (1866)*. Under California law, people could deduct mortgages and debts from their taxable property value, and the Southern Pacific sought the same right for their corporation by arguing that corporations are people. The Southern Pacific utilized their political influence and power to win the case, with “the judge—a friend of the Southern Pacific—[finding] that the ‘defendant Corporations are persons within the intent of the...Fourteenth Amendment,’” (Solnit, 2014). Essentially, the case granted corporations the same rights as human beings and took advantage of the Fourteenth Amendment, an amendment made to protect citizens, to help corporations. This policy that has given a large advantage to corporations has not been changed or abolished in more than thirty presidencies, providing little to no reason to believe that the next president, whoever it is, is going to change that.

A more recent instance of the political power granted to corporations was *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010)*. Once again, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of corporations and their decision in favor of Citizens United “would extend to corporations the [...] right to make unlimited independent expenditures” and “open up a loophole to allow corporate money in ballot measure campaigns”, meaning that corporations would be able to donate an unlimited amount of funds to political parties (Winkler, 2018, p. 309, p. 329). A court of entirely different justices carrying out the same task as the Supreme Court had once done 144 years prior with *Southern Pacific v. Santa Clara County* leads many to believe that corporate influence in the government cannot be attributed to a certain period of corrupt politicians, rather it is embedded into the fundamentals of the U.S. government due to political donations. The continuation of corporation-centered decisions is evidence that changes in the presidency do not change the power that corporations hold in America.

With a Supreme Court that favors corporations more than the citizens it was initially intended to protect, many ordinary citizens suffer at the hands of the Supreme Court justices who choose corporations over them. In 2009, the Court determined that a mining company was permitted to dispose of 4.5 million tons of waste into Alaska’s Lower Slate Lake, which would destroy the lake’s ecosystem and cause health conditions such as cancer, heart disease, and lung disease (Cohen, 2020, p. 260, p. 266). Even though more liberal justices, such as Ruth Bader Ginsburg, argued that the Court had evaded policies outlined in the Environmental Protection Agency’s pollution standards and Clean Water Act, most of the justices still sided with the mining company (Cohen, 2020, p. 260).

Corporate powers also have Congress members in their pockets when it comes to determining industry regulations, often sacrificing the health and well-being of the American

public in the process. In the early 2000s, Republican Representative Billy Tauzin served as the chairman of the House committee regulating the pharmaceutical industry. During his term, he made decisions supporting pharmaceutical companies and after retiring, he joined a pharmaceutical lobbying group, which seems highly corrupt and unethical (Johnson, 2011). With this sort of corruption, it is increasingly apparent that Congress does not have the best interest of the public in mind, rather they make decisions based on their personal benefit and interest, which includes supporting corporations. Even if a Congressman enters office with the goal of helping the public, there are so many opportunities to garner wealth and power that it is tempting to prioritize one's wealth and social status. The United States' checks and balances system was implemented to limit the power of each branch of government, but if each branch supports corporations, there is no one to keep the power of corporations in check.

### **Foreign Policy**

While the president plays a role in domestic policies that directly affects American citizens, they are also responsible for the United States' impact on foreign countries through their role in foreign policy development. Trump and Harris have different views on many foreign policy issues, such as how to approach the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or the role that the United States will play in international alliances. However, voters have seen this sort of opposition happen before with Trump and Biden. Harris' platform takes a very similar approach to Biden's and yet, Biden's presidency looked quite like Trump's when it came to foreign policies. The former Secretary of State under President Trump, Stephen E. Biegun, said that "the [foreign] policies are converging" and "continuity is the norm, even between presidents as different as Trump and Biden" (Wong, 2022). Biegun's analysis of foreign policies reflects the idea that

Trump and Biden's policies are pretty similar and even though it seems like they are complete opposites, their policies say otherwise.

Trump and Harris' policies may sound different, but they imply that similar actions will be taken. With the Israeli-Palestinian conflict being an important current event, Harris and Trump included plans on how they would deal with this foreign conflict in their campaigns. Harris has taken a more critical approach to Israel and acknowledged the losses of Palestinian lives during the conflict, saying that "Israel has a right to defend itself, and how it does so matters". However, she also stated that she did not plan to change any of Biden's policies regarding providing weapons and aid, and the Biden administration approved of a \$20 billion arms sale to Israel, including fighter jets, advanced air missiles, and tactical vehicles ("Biden administration approves \$20 billion in weapons", 2024). If Harris truly believed that Israel should attempt a more diplomatic approach to the conflict, she would also include some changes to Biden's policies that would decrease the number of weapons and arms being added to the conflict. Similarly, Trump supports Israel and their actions against Palestine and "[has ended] decades of U.S. opposition to Israeli settlements" during his term as president (Astor, 2024). When the information is really boiled down to the most crucial points, both Trump and Harris support Israel in this conflict and will likely continue to send aid and weapons to them.

When discussing foreign policy, international trade is also a topic of interest, and many are curious as to what Harris and Trump are going to do with the United States' relationship with China, a global and economic superpower that supplies goods to the majority of Americans. In this instance, both candidates agree with each other on the basic principles of the topic. Both presidential candidates agree that the United States should not develop a dependence on Chinese goods, with Harris vowing to "make sure that America, not China, wins the competition for the

21st century” and Trump detailing a plan that would “eliminate U.S. dependence on China” (Astor, 2024). Although they have different ways of implementing these plans, especially with Trump’s aggressive tariff plan towards China, the overall status quo of the U.S.’s foreign policies won’t be heavily affected because both candidates supported a more independent United States.

With Trump and Harris competing in a battle of similar policies, the future of U.S. foreign policy will remain the same. If Biden’s actions towards foreign policy were not that different from Trump’s, it’s likely that Harris’ actions would not be too different from Biden’s or Trump’s. Similarly to their domestic policies, Harris and Trump present their foreign policies in different lights, but they both support the same side of the arguments.

### **Economic Policy**

Regardless of the outcome of the 2024 Presidential Election, the economic status quo is also expected to remain stationary. According to the Pew Research Center, an important issue for voters in this year’s election is the economy, with 81% of voters saying that economic policy is very important in their decision of who to vote for (Pew Research Center, 2024). Prominent aspects of economic policy include inflation and unemployment rates, and the federal budget. In general, both candidates support the United States’ capitalist economy structure and do not have plans to deviate from a free market.

Inflation rates are a large part of the United States’ economic status quo because they impact the overall cost of living for all Americans as well as their economic activity. A collection of graphs from Trump and Biden’s presidencies cites that during Trump’s presidency from January 2017 to January 2021, the inflation rate started at 2.5% and increased by 1.1%, with a recession in February and March of 2020 due to the coronavirus pandemic. Subsequently,

inflation rate under Biden has increased by 2.9% since the beginning of his term in January 2021 and sat at 3.3% in May 2024, with a spike during 2022 which can again be explained by the coronavirus pandemic (Bhattarai, 2023). While Biden's inflation rate did increase during his term, the graphs show that it began to decrease towards the second half of his term and is currently on a downward trend. Both presidents had variations in inflation rates during their presidencies, but they were most likely caused by the pandemic which was out of their control, and the inflation rate remained fairly constant before and after the pandemic. Additionally, a graph of the past 20 years of inflation rates from the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that, despite recessions and fluctuations in the national inflation rate, it tends to hover around 2.5% and has remained fairly constant since 2004 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.). Past evidence suggests that the next president will continue this pattern, and even in the event of a recession or other economic downturn, it is likely that the economy will stabilize, and inflation rates will remain constant.

Similarly to inflation rates, the unemployment rates in the U.S. have remained fairly stable over the course of many years. At the beginning of Trump's presidency, in January 2017, unemployment rates sat at 4.7% and rose to 6.4% at the end of his presidency in January 2021. Biden started his presidency with a 6.4% unemployment rate and as of May 2024, has lowered that rate to 4.0% (Bhattarai, 2023). While Trump's inflation rate did increase during his presidency, it can largely be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic, and over time the unemployment rate steadied, and Biden's current unemployment rate returned to that of Trump's at the beginning of his term.

When breaking down the federal budget, there has been little change in the allocation of federal funds in the past few years. According to the U.S. Department of Treasury, federal

spending in the United States is divided into three sections: mandatory spending, discretionary spending, and supplemental spending. Discretionary spending is the most flexible category of spending involving Congressional and presidential decisions on how that portion of spending is going to be allocated (U.S. Department of the Treasury, n.d.). Although the president does have a say in the discretionary funds and proposes a budget for Congressional review, the percentage of GDP allocated to discretionary spending categories has remained fairly stagnant for the past few years.

In 2019, under President Trump, 6.3% of the United States' GDP was spent on discretionary spending, and in 2023, under President Biden, that percentage only increased to 6.4% of the country's GDP (Bogusz et al., 2020; Congressional Budget Office, 2024). According to the Congressional Budget Office, discretionary spending is spent on two categories: defense, which includes military personnel and resources, and nondefense, which includes certain education, health, and transportation programs (Congressional Budget Office, 2024). Although Trump and Biden had very different views on certain social issues and American policies, their uses of the federal budget were fairly similar, with only a fraction of the allocations changing over four years. Even though the president proposes a budget, it needs to be approved by Congress, so there is a very small chance that future federal budgets are going to stray from this general pattern.

Since Congress has to approve the president's budget, many of the plans that candidates have for their presidency are not actually acted upon if they are elected. During his 2016 presidential campaign, Donald Trump vocalized his support of the expansion of the U.S. military and "outlined multi-billion-dollar investments to bolster the US military, mostly calling for increasing in spending," (Diamond, 2016). However, Trump's claims of increased military

spending were not realized during his presidency. From 2016 to 2019, the first three years of Trump's presidency, the percentage of the United States' GDP spent on defense remained at 3.2% (Congressional Budget Office, 2017; Bogusz et al., 2020).

### **2024 and Beyond: What Can the President Change?**

Although the next president is not going to make any radical changes regarding corporate power in the government and economic and foreign policies, they do have some impact on social issues. Trump and Harris have fairly opposing views when it comes to social issues, and since those issues generally do not impact the economic status of Congress members and corporations, there is a high probability that their agendas may actually be put into place and impact the American public. Most corporations will not have a strong opinion on controversial topics such as abortion, immigration, and transgender rights because they do not want to take a side and lose business. Thus, these decisions are generally up to the president and Congress, and in this scenario, Trump and Harris both have their own ideologies and beliefs that drive their opinions when it comes to their stances on social issues, most of which are controversial.

One major plan from the Trump administration is the notorious Project 2025, a 900-page policy book detailing Trump's plan for a government overhaul. This project is worrying for many progressive voters, as it details the limitations of abortion access, a decrease in federal support in education, and aggressive deportation policies (Rosen & Quinn, 2024). While not everything that Trump has planned is going to be enacted, some of these policies would heavily impact various groups, including women and minority groups.

On the other hand, Harris takes a very different stance. She supports the federal right to abortion, an increase in public school funding, and DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals in which individuals who entered the United States illegally as children are protected



from deportation (Astor, 2024). Although Trump and Harris are placed in the same quadrant on the political compass, Harris and Walz are much more libertarian than Trump and Vance, which is reflected in their political views (The Political Compass, 2024).

While these policies can make a possible impact on American society, they are not going to change the status quo, meaning that regardless of what policies are in place regarding social issues, the United States government is going to maintain its oligarchic rule and mixed economy. These issues and policies may be very important to voters and citizens and play a large role in determining who votes for who, but these policies will not influence the fact that the United States government still serves corporations.

### **A Third Political Party: Is It Possible?**

As political parties and their politicians move towards a more corporate-centric America, many citizens are yearning for a more representative party, introducing the idea of a third party. Approximately 25% of Americans do not identify with either party and about 63% of Americans are not satisfied with the 2024 presidential candidate options (Pew Research Center, 2023). The general hope with the addition of a third party is to radically change the status quo in the United States and steer the country in a new direction. Smaller political parties, who receive much less funding and donations than the Republican and Democratic parties are generally less incentivized to help corporations, allowing them to stray from the norms of American politics. The political compass' analysis of the 2024 presidential candidates places Cornel West, the Independent Party candidate, and Jill Stein, the Green Party candidate in the left libertarian quadrant, the complete opposite of where Trump and Harris stand (The Political Compass, 2024). If these candidates were elected as president, a radical change may be possible because their policies actually differ from those of the Republican and Democratic candidates.

Arguably the most important aspect of campaign success is funding. Months before the election, virtually every American will receive advertisements, text messages, or emails urging them to donate because candidates tell them that their donation can change the course of the election. Money in politics is crucial because it allows political parties to garner support for their stances and raises awareness for their candidates and policies. The viability of a third political party almost fully depends on its ability to fund its campaigns, and with the sheer amount of money that is collected by the Republican and Democratic parties, it seems almost impossible for a third party to compete. In the 12 months preceding the 2024 election, presidential candidates alone collected \$374.9 million, Congressional candidates collected a massive amount of \$1.3 billion, and political parties received \$684.5 million (Federal Election Commission, 2024). Even though these numbers combine both Republican and Democratic funds, it's highly unlikely that a third party is going to be able to gather the support of enough individuals and corporations to even try and compete with these numbers, especially if the third party is one that will fight against corporate power. Past examples of changing political parties cannot be applied to the current political landscape of the United States because of the evolution of American politics. In the past, it was much easier for political parties to form and "back then, a party formed when a critical mass of people came together and called themselves a party, nominated candidates, printed their own ballots, and persuaded people to take those ballots and vote for them," (Sifry, 2003). In current politics, the heightened role that money plays allows for the current political parties to hold onto their power.

### **Conclusion**

Historical evidence supports that continuity is expected in the foreseeable future, specifically for the next four years following this year's election. Harris and Trump may seem

like opposites in the way that they present their ideas, plans, and potential policies, but, as evident with Biden's presidency, Democratic and Republican policies tend to be fairly similar. Trump and Harris both believed in an authoritarian government style. While some small policies, such as immigration or abortion rights, may change, the overall economic and political status quo of the United States is not going to change following the 2024 Presidential Election because large corporations hold power over both parties and candidates, meaning that no matter who wins, corporations will win. All three branches of government impact the status quo of U.S. politics and as of now, all three branches support corporations so even with Trump as the next president, he wouldn't have too much power in changing the political status quo if he tried. The economy is still going to be a market economy after Trump assumes the presidential position—he may affect certain economic policies by implementing plans like tariffs for Chinese goods, but those plans do not largely deviate from the current status quo. The reality is that the political environment of the United States is stationary: voters elect which figurehead of corporations is going to give speeches and present empty promises. The bipartisan system relies on outside funding, creating a barrier for third-party candidates to win the presidency. The possibility of a third party is virtually nonexistent because of this corporate-run machine that people call the government and the puppet master's that are corporations are going to continue their reign of terror on American citizens.

## References

- Astor, M. (2024, September 9). Where Kamala Harris and Donald Trump stand on.... *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2024/us/politics/trump-harris-issues-election.html#israel>
- Bhattarai, A. (2023, December 23). Biden's economy vs. Trump's, in 12 charts. *Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/12/23/trump-biden-us-economy-compared/>
- Biden administration approves \$20 billion in weapons, aircraft sales to Israel. (2024, August 14). *CBS News*. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/us-approves-20-billion-weapons-sales-israel-amas-backs-out-cease-fire-talks/>
- Bogusz, C., Feinstein, A., Ready, D., & Salazar, J. (n.d.). The federal budget in 2019. *Congressional Budget Office*. <https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2020-04/56324-CBO-2019-budget-infographic.pdf>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). 12-month percentage change, consumer price index, selected categories. *Bureau of Labor Statistics*. <https://www.bls.gov/charts/consumer-price-index/consumer-price-index-by-category-line-chart.htm>
- Cohen, A. S. (2020). *Supreme Inequality: The Supreme Court's fifty-year battle for a more unjust America*. Penguin Press.
- Congressional Budget Office. (2017, February 8). The federal budget in 2016: an infographic. *Congressional Budget Office*. <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/52408>
- Congressional Budget Office. (2024, March 5). The federal budget in fiscal year 2023: an infographic. *Congressional Budget Office*. <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/59727>

- Diamond, J. (2016, September 7). Trump calls for military spending increase. *CNN*.  
<https://www.cnn.com/2016/09/06/politics/donald-trump-defense-spending-sequester/index.html>
- Federal Election Commission. (2024, April 2). Statistical summary of 12-month campaign activity of the 2023-2024 election cycle. *Federal Election Commission*.  
<https://www.fec.gov/updates/statistical-summary-of-12-month-campaign-activity-of-the-2023-2024-election-cycle/>
- Gross, S. (2020, August 4). What is the Trump administration's track record on the environment? *Brookings Institution*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/what-is-the-trump-administrations-track-record-on-the-environment/>
- Heineman, R. A., Peterson, S. A., & Rasmussen, T. H. (1995). *American government*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Johnson, D. (2011, December 6). License to profit: legalized corruption in the US Congress. *Truthout*. <https://truthout.org/articles/license-to-profit-legalized-corruption-in-the-us-congress/>
- Kelly, J., & Quinn, M. (2024, November 4). What is Project 2025? What to know about the conservative blueprint for a second Trump administration. *CBS News*.  
<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/what-is-project-2025-trump-conservative-blueprint-heritage-foundation/>
- Manson, J. H. (2020, July 16). Right-wing authoritarianism, left-wing authoritarianism, and pandemic-mitigation authoritarianism. *PubMed Central*.  
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7365073/>

Milman, O. (2023, March 14). Biden's approval of Willow project shows inconsistency of US's first 'climate president'. *The Guardian*.

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/mar/14/biden-president-approved-alaska-willow-project>

Morse, C. E., Melgar, L., & Reston, M. (2024, October 28). Meet the megadonors pumping over \$2.5 billion into the election. *The Washington Post*.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/elections/interactive/2024/biggest-campaign-donors-election-2024/>

Norris, F. (1901). *The octopus: A story of California*. Penguin Books.

Pew Research Center. (2023, September 19). Americans' dismal views of the nation's politics.

*Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2023/09/19/americans-dismal-views-of-the-nations-politics/>

Pew Research Center. (2024, September 9). In tied presidential race, Harris and Trump have contrasting strengths, weaknesses. *Pew Research Center*.

<https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2024/09/09/in-tied-presidential-race-harris-and-trump-have-contrasting-strengths-weaknesses/>

The Political Compass. (2024, September 21). *About the political compass*.

<https://www.politicalcompass.org/>

Ross, S. (2024, March 28). Is the United States a market economy or a mixed economy?

*Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/031815/united-states-considered-market-economy-or-mixed-economy.asp#toc-elements-of-our-mixed-economy>

Sifry, M. L. (2003). *Spoiling for a fight: Third-party politics in America*. Routledge.

Solnit, R. (2014, August). The octopus and its grandchildren. *Harper's Magazine*.

<https://harpers.org/archive/2014/08/the-octopus-and-its-grandchildren/>

Stogniew, A. (2024, October 21). Trump and Harris make widely different claims on crime.

Here's what the data shows. *NBC Bay Area*. [https://www.nbcbayarea.com/decision-](https://www.nbcbayarea.com/decision-2024/crime-rate-statistics-trump-harris-biden-fact-check/3685701/)

[2024/crime-rate-statistics-trump-harris-biden-fact-check/3685701/](https://www.nbcbayarea.com/decision-2024/crime-rate-statistics-trump-harris-biden-fact-check/3685701/)

U.S. Department of the Treasury. (n.d.). How much has the U.S. government spent this year?

Fiscal Data. [https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov/americas-finance-guide/federal-](https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov/americas-finance-guide/federal-spending/#spending-trends-over-time-and-the-us-economy)

[spending/#spending-trends-over-time-and-the-us-economy](https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov/americas-finance-guide/federal-spending/#spending-trends-over-time-and-the-us-economy)

Winkler, A. (2018). *We the corporations: How American businesses won their civil rights*.

Liveright Publishing Corporation.

Wolff, R. D. (2024, August 6). The undemocratic reality of capitalism. *Counterpunch*.

<https://www.counterpunch.org/2024/08/06/the-undemocratic-reality-of-capitalism/>

Wong, E. (2022, July 25). On U.S. foreign policy, the new boss acts a lot like the old one. *The*

*New York Times*. [https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/24/us/politics/biden-trump-foreign-](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/24/us/politics/biden-trump-foreign-policy.html)

[policy.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/24/us/politics/biden-trump-foreign-policy.html)