

**America's Changing Status Quo: Who Will Provide Change to Our Current Political and
Economic State?**

Madison Dee

Department of Political Science, Diablo Valley College

POLSC-121: Introduction to the United States Government

Adjunct Professor: John Kropf

December 5, 2023

Abstract

The 2024 presidential election will mark a crucial moment in American politics. Republicans are considering their options and former President Trump emerges as a leading runner. Democrats, on the other hand, will continue to support current President Biden. With this dynamic environment, America finds itself forced to make a decision of consequence. The choices are divided into two options, as the nation contemplates a renewed term for President Biden or the return of Donald Trump. The selection carries a great implication for the future of the United States, causing voters to thoroughly examine the candidates. Guiding the path to predicting and inferring possible results of the election, both Donald Trump and Joe Biden uphold corruption. It is the wealthy who have the true power, and the people remain stuck with inequality and injustice. Considering the positions of the third-party candidates and other ideological stances will pitch into the diversity of American politics and the status quo. Embarking on the suspense of this journey, examining the current state as well as the history of politics and the economy will impact the conclusion of how the wealthy elite continue to dominate our nation with corruption for their benefit. They push policies executed by the two parties which is why the status quo remains as it is. The 2024 election presents a critical opportunity where the power of a third-party candidate could bring about transformative change, but the entrenched influence of the wealthy elite, which shapes policies within both major parties, is unlikely to alter the cycle of inequality and injustice.

America's Changing Status Quo: Who Will Provide Change to Our Current Political and Economic State?

In the past years under Donald Trump and Joe Biden, politics have mostly not developed for the better. From wars to abortion laws, it is obvious that our status quo has not changed at all. The news continues to be an outlet for several crucial mistakes that both Biden and Trump have made. Whether either of the candidates wins the 2024 election, it would be a long time for change to be implemented if they continue to act the way they do.

This paper analyzes the extent to which both the Biden and Trump administration has changed the status quo politically and economically in America. Knowing the distinct differences between the Democratic and Republican parties, the government favors citizens who are among the wealthy, leaving the status quo unchanged. This controversial topic is described through the history of the political system as well as the terms and visions of Trump and Biden.

Historical Context

Throughout history, relationships between wealth and corruption have been a complex topic that impacts society today. Examining past events will provide a base for understanding current American politics. Economic power and corruption have molded every action of the nation and have seriously impacted the welfare of citizens.

During the times of ancient civilizations and monarchies, wealth was a major factor in dictating power and corruption. For example, in the Roman Empire, the emperors held vast fortunes because of corrupt practices which led to inequalities and turmoil among the population. Similarly, medieval monarchies were separated into societal divisions because of how wealth was constantly flowing into the ruling elites (Casual Scholar, 2022). The Gilded Age also serves as another example of how wealth breeds corruption. In this era, robber barons and industry

produced large amounts of wealth while using their power to change the government for their benefit. These periods in history are filled with examples of imperialism and colonialism, as wealth and economic interests are linked which have driven corruption globally. Going back to European colonialism, they exploited resources and took the homes of people to create colonies (Rothman, 2018). This created poverty and inequality all while making the elite more rich.

Ideas of power and wealth and how they impacted society have been influenced by important thoughts and developments that were brought up during the Enlightenment Period. Rationalism, in particular, of specific governmental systems was evolving within these centuries. During this crucial period, people like Adam Smith and John Locke built the foundation for modern capitalism (History, 2019). There were certain aspects that were specifically valued by these figures, such as free markets and the idea that achieving financial success could benefit society. Rather than being viewed primarily as a means of aristocratic dominance, people viewed wealth differently. It was now considered a possible source of prosperity for the general public. The relationship between wealth and power ignited the Enlightenment ideas that are still ongoing today. This period started multiple debates over wealth and corruption as well as the theoretical foundations of modern economic systems. Now during the modern era, things like individual rights and income equality have caused a lot of arguments and debates on the morality of the system and the ethical decisions when it comes to wealth accumulation, as well as the connection between corruption and the economy. The historical context of the Enlightenment helps us to understand the complex relationship between wealth and power, which shows how concepts such as liberty and wealth have shaped and still impact our current political and economic state.

Shifting to the modern era, there is no shortage of political scandals and the continuous situations of how wealth has been incorporated into corruption. Embezzlement, bribery, and

fraud are all things that powerful and wealthy citizens have practiced around the globe.

Empirical research has also proved the connection between wealth and corruption. Studies have shown that in various instances those with more financial resources are more likely to engage in corrupt practices often involving unethical decisions (The University of Utah, 2013). This reaffirms the historical relevance of the relationship and highlights why accountability is crucial to addressing this issue. History has proved that corruption has disproportionately affected the people.

The Status Quo Under Donald Trump

Being the 45th President of the United States, the administration of Donald Trump exposed the corrupt power of the wealthy elite when it came to discussing policies inside both major parties. The policies he oversaw throughout his administration clearly expressed and showed the ongoing cycle of injustice and inequality, consistently favoring the economic elites while raising concerns about societal inequalities. His actions have been known to demonstrate the power of the wealthy elite within the government. In keeping with the interests of the economic elites who support them, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act significantly decreased company tax rates (Tax Policy Center, 2017). According to The New York Times, a lot of people thought that this reduction was specifically favoring the wealthy, which led to income inequality. (Chen, 2023). The trade policy revealed a cycle that favored the wealthy and went against Republican views on free trade. Even while it did seem as though the trade conflicts and tariffs, especially those placed on China, were an attempt to protect American employment, they were also criticized for favoring rich economic sectors (Collins, 2018). Concerns about the maintenance of economic inequality and the preference for rich interests above merely advancing the economy were heightened by these acts (Paddison, 2021). When Trump implemented tight border and

immigration controls during his term as president, it showed how influential business interests are in determining public policy. While upholding national sovereignty and maintaining law and order, these policies regularly ignored humanitarian considerations and created a big gap in societal divisions (Martin, 2020). According to *The Washington Post*, it seemed that the actions were thought to be aggravating socioeconomic inequality, especially in places that were already vulnerable. The approach of the Trump administration to healthcare reform also demonstrated the influence of the wealthy or those who are powerful. Instances where they tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act were motivated by the perception that it served the interests of big healthcare businesses that had a lot of money (Bagley, 2019). This strategy may have benefited particular economic industries while also raising concerns about the reduced access to healthcare for underprivileged groups (Collins & Aboulaflia, 2020). Similarly, the stance of the administration on environmental policy, which ranged from deregulation to backing out from international agreements, showed cooperation with strong corporate interests. It was thought that the interest of some businesses and wealthy individuals praised efforts to undercut environmental rules and minimize the severity of climate change (Qiu, 2018). While some economic sectors may have profited from these policies, it is unclear how they will actually affect environmental sustainability (Waldman et al., 2019). The selection of regulatory cabinet members by the Trump administration was another example of the power of economic elites. People having connections to the companies or financial interests that these positions were supposed to monitor often held important government positions, particularly those in regulatory agencies (Ehrenfreund, 2017). Conflicts of interest were brought up when this alignment was thought to be a means of influencing laws that favored rich companies.

Trump is also a highly unreliable candidate as he is known for spreading false news. He claimed he accomplished certain goals economically, but most of them were lies. According to the United States of Distraction, “He claimed that America has finally turned the page on decades of unfair trade deals, but the trade deficit had only grown deeper under his presidency.” (Higdon & Huff, 2018, p. 54). There have been many similar situations to Trump spreading lies about his developments to America, proving that he is unreliable in changing the status quo. As Hidgon says in *The Anatomy of Fake News*, “Fake news is dangerous to democracy and public safety when it is optimized by politicians.” (Hidgon, 2020, p. 2). It is important to have a reliable individual who will not actively claim that everything is fake; it will hurt our country in the long run both economically and politically. Hence, Donald Trump is not fit to benefit the status quo.

With the corrupt elite power of the nation and the possibility for radical change, if Donald Trump is elected to a second term, the political and economic status quo in the nation will be negatively affected. Keeping policies that serve just the interests of the rich elite is likely to aggravate the already existing inequities in many areas of government and continue this frustrating cycle of injustice and inequality. Reelecting Donald Trump would also likely continue the developments from his first term in office. Economic policies that benefit the wealthy and corporate entities, trade restrictions aimed at certain industries, and stringent immigration and border security measures reflecting a conservative stance may all persist. These policies, influenced by economic elites, could exacerbate inequality by widening societal gaps.

The Status Quo Under Joe Biden

Given that Joe Biden may seek a second term, it appears that his government will likely stick to policies and tactics that uphold the status quo and advance the interests of influential organizations, most notably the rich elite.

Even though the economic tactics by Biden are meant to spur economic recovery, they seem to accept elements that the corporate and wealthy sectors want—as seen by the American Rescue Plan and subsequent suggested measures (Tankersley & Crowley, 2021). These policies may include social welfare programs and plans for infrastructure, but it is most likely they will not challenge the powerful interests that uphold the status quo or completely address the underlying economic disparity. While the Biden administration advocated for higher taxes on corporations and the wealthy, it is uncertain whether these measures would be practical and beneficial in largely eradicating economic imbalance (Luhby & Lobosco, 2022). The question of how much of the status quo has experienced revolutionary upheaval remains after it is suggested that the issues deeply rooted in contemporary economic structures will endure. The immigration policies implemented by the administration appear to be influenced by powerful interests although they are more liberal than those of the previous administration. Some types of imprisonment and deportation persist despite efforts to implement a more humanitarian immigration policy, demonstrating the challenges in modifying deeply ingrained mechanisms that uphold injustice (National Public Radio, 2021).

There is a clear emphasis on combating climate change and renewing international accord participation in his environmental policies as compared to those of the previous administration. The shift in focus is a component of a bigger strategy to address climate change with greater vigor. However, it is not clear how effectively these measures will be able to subvert the formidable sway of elite interests in the energy sector and wider economic organizations

(Eilperin et al., 2021). The very nature of this uncertainty underscores how hard it will be to convince major policy changes and align them with influential interests. In that it prioritizes climate action more than the previous administration did, the environmental strategies by Biden are very different. This distinction indicates a strong stance in favor of giving climate change top priority both domestically and globally. The strong influence of elite interests in the energy business and larger economic institutions casts doubt on the revolutionary potential of these measures, even though this shift in emphasis represents a clear break from earlier policies. The intricate network of relationships, established hierarchies, and deeply rooted agendas provide a significant barrier to major reforms that have the potential to completely transform the status quo. The intricate relationships that exist between government initiatives and the powerful pull of well-established elite interests explain how challenging it is to alter deeply ingrained policies. The uncertainty surrounding environmental policies from Biden and the limited capacity to challenge the status quo is a reflection of the complexity and resistance found in these influential sectors. The establishment of policies is closely linked to major interests in the energy and economic sectors, suggesting a systemic resilience that hinders the adoption of radically new policies. The weight of this relationship draws attention to how challenging it is to cultivate differentiated impacts on policy, as well as the enduring influence of existing interests and the challenges they pose to significant policy change.

Ultimately, President Joe Biden might not be able to make a big difference in the current circumstances for several reasons. His economic policies align with powerful groups and their interests, raising doubts about his capacity to tackle economic injustice even as they strive toward recovery. While it is recommended to raise taxes on companies and the wealthy, it is unclear how practical these measures will be in enacting meaningful change. Immigration rules,

notwithstanding a small liberalization, are unable to eliminate deeply ingrained injustices, underscoring the challenges of bringing about significant reform. Environmental campaigns may draw attention to the significance of climate change, but there are still concerns about their ability to challenge the interests of the ruling class and identify structural obstacles to meaningful policy reforms. The complex relationships between strong interests and deeply rooted systems are highlighted by this confluence of barriers and regulations, which may limit the capacity of Biden to enact significant changes that depart from the status quo.

The Status Quo

The tenure of both the Biden and Trump administrations revealed an astonishing resemblance in the upholding or exacerbation of the status quo, which is largely shaped by wealthy elites. Despite numerous tactics, the supremacy of strong economic forces continues to show how little has changed about the current situation and underscores the need for substantial reform to reduce injustices. Significant transformational advances appeared to be relatively immune to the status quo under both regimes. Different policy measures notwithstanding, the power of affluent elites persisted in molding political and economic environments. Policies promoting tax breaks for corporations and the wealthy were implemented under the Trump administration, which strengthened the position of existing economic powers. On the other hand, the Biden administration encountered challenges in successfully addressing the persistently deep-rooted economic gaps, even though he supported increased taxes on companies and the rich. The status quo was maintained by striking a compromise between corrupt interests and reformative initiatives, which prevented significant change. The economic systems of both regimes continued to function efficiently, and the existing situation rarely varied from established norms. The economic ideas of Trump were largely centered on corporate interests, in contrast to the

programs from Biden that seemed to strike a balance between the interests of powerful economic sectors and reformative measures. However, it was evident that the goals of public welfare and the ambitions of strong economic forces have a complicated relationship, indicating that defying tradition will not be simple. The status quo is usually perceived as maintaining current affairs, particularly in areas like immigration rules and environmental initiatives, and it symbolizes the continued dominance of wealthy elites. The immigration laws were unable to significantly alter the deeply ingrained structures that sustain injustice, although they showed differing degrees of humanitarianism. Even though environmental initiatives demonstrated a shift in the direction of focus toward climate change, they faced difficulties in overcoming powerful interests in the energy sector and bigger economic structures. The fact that both administrations have either upheld or worsened the current situation highlights how urgently significant change is required. Persistent gaps and societal inequality have been exacerbated by things like the contemporary climate and the interests of the existing elite mostly shape it. A break from this prevailing norm is required to successfully address persistent disparities and establish a more equitable and just society. This deviation should be toward a norm that is more representative of broader community aspirations and less influenced by powerful economic pressures.

Third-Party Impact to the Status Quo

The emergence of independent candidates in American politics presents a challenge to the wealthy elites and the major parties' long-standing power structures. Despite formidable challenges, these competing ideas and candidates offer chances for revolutionary change within the existing system. While the main focus is to examine the potential of these third-party candidates and their ideas, it is important to analyze their positioning within the political compass to fully understand the spectrum of change they can bring (The Political Compass,

2017). For example, The Libertarian Party covers the right-leaning stance on the economic axis, which pushes for limited government intervention economically, as well as more freedom for the people. In contrast, the Green Party covers the far-left area on the economic axis, advocating for strong social welfare and especially focusing on promising environmental regulations. On the social axis, they want progressive social policies that align with libertarian values. By comprehending these positions on the political compass, we can see the discourse surrounding third-party actions and how they have the potential to challenge wealthy elites. Although there are many challenges faced by these candidates, they can reshape conventional political stances and redefine the status quo.

The two-party system in America contains significant barriers that prevent outside parties from participating in politics. Regarding ballot access, media coverage, and funding, the two major parties get advantages from well-established systems. In both the 2016 and 2020 elections, TV debates were closed to third-party candidates, thus reducing their public visibility (Schilling, 2016). Third-party candidates have a history of presenting distinctive perspectives and ideas that go counter to the mainstream political narrative. The Green Party focuses on environmental policies and the Libertarian Party emphasizes individual liberty which has spurred crucial discussions that the major parties routinely overlook. The introduction of these ideas into politics has had a domino effect, changing public opinion and sometimes compelling major parties to address issues that they had previously shied away from (Whose vote... 2020). Third-party candidates can effect revolutionary change, even though they must overcome institutional barriers. They have a significant influence even though they do not always win elections. Ross Perot and his 1992 presidential campaign is a well-known example. His focus on fiscal prudence and opposition to free trade agreements influenced the economic discourse, compelling the main

political parties to incorporate these concerns into their platforms (Waxman, 2019). Converting third-party platforms into useful governance is a challenging process. Even if they can win local government and implement policies, third-party candidates still face challenges in the current political system. Furthermore, their lack of representation in Congress frequently limits their ability to effect meaningful change, which limits their legislative impact (Astor, 2023). Opposing the influence of main parties and their links to elite interests is a critical function of third parties. Strong third-party movements provide a powerful counterbalance to the entrenched dominance of wealthy elites. Parties like the People's Party, which originated from grassroots movements and support political and economic reforms, provide a possible break from elite-dominated politics. Their agenda is less reliant on economic special interests (Public Broadcasting Service, 2023). In conclusion, third-party candidates in American politics remain a force for transformation despite the major challenges they face. Their ability to disrupt the status quo and impact discourse underscores the necessity for a more varied political landscape that can accept a greater variety of ideas and points of view.

Conclusion

Examining the circumstances under the Trump and Biden administrations shows that wealthy elites remain powerful and that there has been little deviation from the norm. The economic policies of Trump, which prioritize corporate interests over individual ones, widened income gaps and strengthened elite power. But while advocating for more taxes on big business and the rich, the administration of Biden was unable to effectively combat systemic economic disparity. The delicate balance both governments had to keep between appeasing strong economic forces and carrying out reformative measures prevented significant revolutionary transformation. Immigration restrictions, environmental initiatives, and economic endeavors

faced challenges from influential individuals in the energy sector and larger financial institutions, notwithstanding their differences. The way things are now, shaped by powerful elite interests, highlights how urgently we need to shift from narrow economic forces to a more inclusive, representative democracy that addresses social injustices. If either Biden or Trump wins another presidential term, the status quo will be unchanged if not worsened. The discussion around the place of third-party movements in American politics emphasizes the ongoing struggle against institutional barriers and the hegemony of the two-party system. Despite obstacles, third parties have continued to offer opposing views that challenge the dominant political narrative. The rise of the People's Party, which includes its roots in grassroots movements, represents a potential change from politics that is mostly run by corrupt economic interests. This movement demands changes to political and economic systems, more inclusive democracy, and the creation of more appropriate and fair financing laws. These things all fall in line with a broad group that is tired of traditional party lines. Despite facing challenges, third-party movements are a disruptive force that can change the political landscape by challenging conventional wisdom and adding new perspectives. A more thorough examination of American politics and its historical background highlights the difficulties third-party movements confront within the democratic structure. Obstacles include scant media attention and being left out of important discussions have made them less visible and less influential. Historical instances, such as Ross Perot and his 1992 campaign, demonstrate how third-party movements have the power to shape public opinion and force major parties to take up neglected topics.

The political state in the United States is marked by both continuous challenges and indications of coming change. The status quo is still the same because of the limitations of the democratic and republican systems, as well as the ongoing influence of wealthy elites. However,

the potential for the rise of political parties such as the People's Party shows that specific economic interests are no longer the main focus of politics, offering a society that is less likely to be under the influence of wealthy individuals. Even though there is a high chance of difficult challenges they may approach, third-party movements are extremely vital for bringing a wide variety of perspectives to the political table, which will cause a potential break from the current status quo in favor of a more representative government. Current events prove the necessity of revolutionary change, encouraging a complete halt from these elite influences and toward a more accountable economic and political system.

References

Analysis of the Tax Cuts and Job Act. (n.d.). *Tax Policy Center*.

<https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/feature/analysis-tax-cuts-and-jobs-act>

Astor, M. (2023, Nov. 9). Jill Stein announces third-party bid for president. *New York Times*.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/09/us/politics/jill-stein-presidential-bid.html>

Bagley, N. (2019, July 25). Rise of the know-nothing knowledge. *The Atlantic*.

<https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/07/texas-v-us-rise-know-nothing-judge/593959/>

Chen, S. (2023, September 8). New York is rebounding for the rich. Nearly everyone else is struggling. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/09/28/nyregion/nyc-income-gap-wages.html>

Collins, K. (2018, June 15). All the threats and tariffs in the U.S.-China trade conflict. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/04/05/business/china-us-trade-conflict.html>

Collins, S. & Aboulaflia, G. (2020, October 8). Healthcare in the 2020 presidential election:

Health insurance coverage and affordability. *The Commonwealth Fund*.

<https://www.commonwealthfund.org/blog/2020/health-care-2020-presidential-election-health-insurance-coverage-and-affordability>

Ehrenfreund, M. (2017, May 23). How Trump's budget helps the rich at the expense of the poor. *The Washington Post*.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/05/23/how-trumps-budget-helps-the-rich-at-the-expense-of-the-poor/>

Higdon, N. (2020). *The anatomy of fake news*. University of California Press.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2021/climate-environment/biden-climate-environment-actions/>

Higdon, N. & Huff, M. (2019). *United States of distraction*. San Francisco: Open Media Series

John Locke. (2019, September 20). *History.com*.

<https://www.history.com/topics/european-history/john-locke>

Luhby, T. & Lobosco, K. (2022, March 28). Biden's plan to tax the super wealthy. *CNN*.

<https://www.cnn.com/2022/03/28/politics/biden-minimum-billionaire-tax-proposal/index.html>

Martin, M. (2020, October 17). Trump's lasting influence on the U.S. immigration system. *National Public Radio*.

<https://www.npr.org/2020/10/17/924977215/trumps-lasting-influence-on-the-u-s-immigration-system>

Montoya-Galvez, C., et al. (2021, November 21). When it comes to immigration, where does the Biden administration stand? *National Public Radio*.

<https://www.npr.org/2021/11/04/1052301945/when-it-comes-to-immigration-where-does-the-biden-administration-stand>

Paddison, L. (2021, October 27). How the rich are driving climate change. *British Broadcasting Corporation*. <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20211025-climate-how-to-make-the-rich-pay-for-their-carbon-emissions>

Qiu, L. (2018, November 27). The baseless claim that climate scientists are ‘driven’ by money. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/27/us/politics/climate-report-fact-check.html>

Rothman, L. (2018, February 5). How American inequality in the Gilded Age compares to today. *Time Magazine*. <https://time.com/5122375/american-inequality-gilded-age/>

Schilling, D. (2016, August 30). Third-party candidates excluded from presidential debates. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/aug/30/third-party-candidates-presidential-debates-jill-stein-gary-johnson>

Scholar, progressive activist Cornel West says he will run for president in 2024 as 3rd-party candidate. (2023, June 5). *PBS*. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/scholar-progressive-activist-cornel-west-says-he-will-run-for-president-in-2024-as-3rd-party-candidate>

Study shows money cues can trigger unethical behavior. (n.d.). *UNews Archive*.

https://archive.unews.utah.edu/news_releases/study-shows-money-cues-can-trigger-unethical-behavior/

Tankersley, J. & Crowley, M. (2021, April 29). Biden's 'American Rescue Plan.' *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/14/us/biden-american-rescue-plan.html>

The insane wealth of the Roman Empire (2022). Casual Scholar.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NboXuLjnjxE>

The Political Compass—a brief intro (2017). *The Political Compass*.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5u3UCz0TM5Q>

Waldman S., et al. (2019, July 9). In environmental speech, Trump fails to mention climate change. *Scientific American*. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/in-environment-speech-trump-fails-to-mention-climate-change/>

Waxman, O. (2019, July 9). How Ross Perot changed political campaigns. *Time Magazine*.

<https://time.com/5622818/ross-perot-dead-legacy/>

Whose vote counts, explained (2020). Netflix.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yn36tY7rNUM>

