

Success in a Neoliberal Capitalist Society

For my research question, I decided to explore the following: what does it take to succeed? The word “success” itself opens up an entire line of questioning. What does it *look* like to succeed? How is success *determined*? What are different *types* of success? How does an individual succeed in this particular society? This is an important topic to explore because the abstract idea of success is something that everyone strives for: it motivates us to achieve, humans desire success. In addition, it’s necessary to investigate the causes of success-- where it originates, the steps leading to success, and the people who actually have success. I plan to take a closer look at what defines “success”, how certain people came to their success, and the fundamental roots of success as the hallmark of achievement in a capitalistic society.

When investigating this term alone, “success”, several things come up from that one google search. According to Oxford dictionary, the definition of success is “the accomplishment of an aim or purpose.” One source defining historical forms of success describes it as obtaining as many material goods as one possibly could. Success was defined merely by physical possessions. In addition, social class was highly valued as a form of achievement (Nackenoff). Basically stating, the more physical possessions one has, the higher their social class was, and therefore put one at a higher degree of success. Wealth appeared to be a common theme in most historical success stories, which is true of the world today. Another source defines success through character-- The “promise” of wealth would come with “proper character” and would result in “capital that did not fluctuate with changes in the labor market” (Nackenoff). This concept focuses on the building of the individual, and that success would follow those who have

good character. But still, this perspective solely focuses on wealth being the end goal. The wealth of money, and wealth of character. In simpler terms, if one has “things” and “money” then one has success. Or, if one has a strong character, or “influence,” it will bring one money, which leads to success. It is so ingrained in society that one cannot achieve peak performance without having abundance and excess. Money as a symbol of success has been around since the earliest of times, and is considered the hallmark of a fulfilled life. This understanding of possessions equaling success is where the obsession with affluence came into play, and creates the foundation for the avarice in the capitalist society of the US today.

Another important key factor into understanding the concept of success, one must look into the basis of the concept. The American success story all originated in the idea of “The American Dream.” The American Dream can be defined as “... a dedication to individual freedom, justice under law, equality of educational and economic opportunity, and finally, constant material improvement and well being” (Padover 404). Take a step back and look at that definition. Is this true for all americans? No. What the American Dream stands for is the hope that this statement will become reality because of all the nation stands for. However, according to Sarah Combs, the American Dream is described as a “nightmare” that “further frustrates their lives.” She continues to state that “For many americans... Justice, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness seem to be out of their reach” (Combs 234). Comb’s interpretation of the American Dream is that the promises it entails are an illusion to those who lack the necessary survival tools to exist successfully in a neoliberal capitalist society such as America. In the words of

comedian George Carlin, "It's called the American Dream because you have to be asleep to believe it."

The concept of the American Dream can manifest in many different forms. Money, for example, is always associated with success because it's a quantitative way to measure one's achievement in life. The more money one has, the more opportunities are opened up for them. Money and wealth are direct results of one's career and job; if one has a high paying job, they make more money. In order to get a high paying job, one must have an education. So, education results in money, which is a quantitative measure of a person's success. Getting an education for most people is difficult because of two things: financial inability and work ethic. Work ethic is something that stood out to me especially because it's an innate quality, not affected by race, gender, or social status. People can be predisposed to be financially insecure, but work ethic is solely up to the individual. "No matter what one's motivation to work...work ethic precedes attitudes and evaluations as a core imperative that one should work"(Stam). If work ethic helps one get an education, they carry that innate character trait with them into their job, and therefore move off the track to success. People who already have wealth may have money but not necessarily be successful in the career aspect of their lives. This begs the question, what *kind* of success can be achieved through wealth?

Money has the ability to change a person's way of life-- people with more money have more opportunities, and the ability to pursue those opportunities in a financially secure way. Finances divide the public into classes, and each class higher has more freedom than the next. For example, take the gender wage gap. In a study on the wage gap, it noted that employees who focus on "making more money" would be more

inclined to bargain with employers for higher pay. In contrast, employees who prioritize “being successful at work” and show “work related behaviors” leads to better income, and more respect in the workplace (Fortin). This study in particular noted that there was a higher amount of men who fell into the first category-- that making more money was the goal of the job. While both parties achieved higher pay, the motivation behind the second party was based on work ethic and the desire to succeed; making their priority *individual* success, rather than a sum of money that determines their achievement.

Issues involving money inequalities have been present throughout history in many ways, particularly in regards to race and gender. These inequalities can be traced as far back as times of slavery in the United States, when African Americans were paid nothing at all for their labor. Residuals of this discrimination can be seen today, in addition to significant gaps between Hispanic, Asian, and Native American populations in comparison with their white counterparts. Characterized by social control and domination, the ability of POC to make money in the United States is based on the color of their skin. Hispanic populations are another increasingly relevant example of the racial wage gap, with an even more significant discrepancy between white males and Latinos than white males and African Americans. This discrepancy is most likely due to the fact that a portion of the Hispanic population in the US are migrant workers-- and often their wages are significantly lower, often hovering just under the the Federal poverty line (EPI, Mora). The National Partnership of Women and Families provided information on the the actual evidence of this gap, stating “In the 25 states with the largest numbers of Latinas working full time, year-round, pay for Latinas is around 42 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men in those states”(NPWF). This

drastic separation provides an example as to why POC are so underprivileged-- their pay is not equated to that of white males. And, without the means to make money, how could they afford an education? How can the issue between race and money be ignored when the very fundamentals of a person's monetary worth is based off their land of origin? While there are many other forms of discrimination that affect the Latino population, the wage gap is the most tangible, because it can be seen through raw data.

Racial disparities on the road to success are also present in the form of power. Power can also come through politics, social standing, or career choice. From this conclusion, it can be determined that not everyone has access to this kind of power. In turn, not everyone can be successful. If it takes money and power to be a successful person, is it up to the individual to find their own success? Or does power originate from elsewhere? A white person, for example, may be more inclined to success through power and wealth than a black person, simply because of racial prejudice. The idea that the individual is responsible for their own success is a very conservative idea; which contradicts success as a collective responsibility. Some disadvantages that people have cannot be prevented, sometimes the world is actually against certain individuals in their route to success based on things that dictate their lives that cannot be "fixed". People who have disabilities or come from minority groups have a smaller chance at achieving success through wealth and power because of the stigmas set against them by society.

To expand on the concept of power as a form of success, one must look at the different and most prominent types of power in the world. In Steven Lukes article on power, he notices this difference between strength and power, in particular when power becomes a fallacy. The first fallacy, known as the "exercise fallacy," is when power is

defined as the exercise of it. This type of power is commonly seen in political settings. Using power only for “winning” or “prevailing over others” makes the concept of power “operational” and therefore isn’t true power, but rather an exercise of it. Secondly, Luke's discussion of “vehicle fallacy” which is essentially when power is equated with “the means and resources of power”. This is commonly seen in military, when power is given to the country with the most guns, the biggest military, or the best commanders. However, “having the means of power is not the same as being powerful”. These two types of power fallacies show that power doesn’t always come from exercising power or finding a means. Often, these power fallacies fall short because they’re empty-- one cannot exercise power without having the strength to back it up. For my purposes, I decided to apply the “exercise fallacy” to my observations of success through power.

To discover what true success through power is, I took a look at attributes that make a person powerful. The explicit theory of power begins at the very basis of human interaction-- language. Through communication, humans develop a sense of connection, and the very way in which people speak can determine how the world sees them. Therefore, if communication is the basis of all human connections, and connections to other humans determine your power, then having good communication skills is an attribute of power. “ The high status and the low have this power merely by virtue of their involvement in the communicative process” (Phillips). Despite the differences in race, gender, and wealth, having the understanding that power, and in turn success, is predisposed to those with good communication. Other basic key terms include knowledge and influence. The phrase “there’s power in knowledge” is pretty well known, but if someone has all the knowledge in the world and lacks the skills to

communicate it, their knowledge has no merit. Knowledge is only valuable to those who can communicate it effectively, and obtain the desired results from that communication. Power, in a sense, can come from teaching. The power that an instructor holds over a student is significant in the sense that the student relies completely on the instructor's ability to communicate their knowledge in order for them to succeed. Communicative power is the ultimate path to success through the power of language.

The skill of communication also builds one's influence. The concept of influence is really key to understanding the roots of success, because the more influence that a person has, the more power they hold, and this leads them to success. It's similar to societal physics in a way; each input has an equal and opposite output, and gaining influence leads to the output of power. The capacity to affect others is an extremely powerful skill, and this effect can often be seen by the way people communicate. Influence manifests in different ways; it can be a useful tool through fear, situational circumstances, and action. Being able to bend people to one's will based on the influence they hold is a huge amount of responsibility and control for a person to have. The span of influence that a person has determines exactly *what* they can influence, and by determining how far it expands determines how much power they have through their influence. The curious thing about the concept of influence is that it has to be proven-- people don't just decide to comply with the wishes of another "because they said so." How does one prove they are an influential person? Whether it be through their communication skills, their charisma, or, wildly enough, their influence through wealth, it can be determined that the more influence a person has, the greater their power.

I decided to take a closer look at the contrasting elements of success *in a* capitalistic society. The relevance of the two fundamental pillars in capitalistic society, power and wealth, only emphasizes the neoliberal beliefs that are imposed on people to this day. For example, POC in impoverished communities are told to “pull themselves up by their bootstraps,” yet they don’t even have access to the boots. This inequality of accessibility to the things that lead one to success is why success, the pinnacle of societal dominance, is merely a social construct built off the backs of others who will never reach the point of “success” defined by this society. Many people will never have the education, the communication skills, or the grounds to influence. This means they don’t have access to power, access to wealth. What about the differences in “wealth” and “power”? Are they different? Can you have one without the other? If power is built from influence, and wealth is built from education, then each of these compounding resources to success need a foundation to reach the desired effect, and this most commonly uses *both* wealth and power to access this achievement in the real world. So if wealth and power go somewhat hand in hand, it makes it even more difficult for certain people to reach success. If an individual cannot reach success on their own due to societal constraints, they still have to do something with their lives. This is where the hierarchy of capitalistic society comes into play. Those at the bottom of the pyramid, in low-paying, minimal education needed, jobs do the grunt work for those at the top of the pyramid, who are the educated members of society with the high-paying jobs. The people at the top are successful, and the people at the bottom are not.

It is common knowledge that Jeff Bezos, founder of amazon.com, is the richest man in the United States. His company has made him billions, his net worth surpassing

one hundred and thirty billion dollars, and his ranking in Forbes magazine as the fifth most powerful person in 2018 (Forbes). Bezos is seen as an example of ultimate success. But where did all this success come from? First, Bezos had an 4 year education. Second, Bezos is a white male in the United States. These elements of Bezos' background make him a candidate for success. His education, achieved through work ethic and financial means led him to more opportunities for him to earn more money. He is socially inclined to have a greater chance in the business world because of his gender and race, and his company has made him a fortune and given him the keys to success: power and wealth. Bezos may seem like the model of success everyone aspires to be, but his display of power can be seen in the "exercise fallacy." In The New York Times article, *Inside Amazon: Wrestling Big Ideas in a Bruising Workplace*, Jodi Kantor and David Streitfeld analyze the working conditions of Amazon employees, white collar and blue collar. They determined that the overworked employees were being forced into unsafe work so that the company wouldn't fall behind in productivity. The article discussed the fifty five hour work weeks, competitive compensation, and unsafe work environments. "In Amazon warehouses, employees are monitored by sophisticated electronic systems to ensure they are packing enough boxes every hour. Amazon came under fire in 2011 when workers in an eastern Pennsylvania warehouse toiled in more than 100-degree heat with ambulances waiting outside, taking away laborers as they fell" (NY Times). Bezos may have been socially inclined to succeed, but the progress of his company as a worldwide superpower is due to the "exercise fallacy" he exhibits by "prevailing over others," making his so called "power" only built on the backs of others. By analyzing Jeff Bezos, who is considered by

many to be a successful person, it can be determined that his success began with his gender and race, which led to his education accessibility, and then to his business success. And, from this route to success, he has built his business success on the fallacy that he holds power over the people he works for-- however, the power that he is exercising upon his employees is different than a CEO to worker relationship. Bezos is exercising power over their health and their rights to a safe workplace.

This pattern of success stories can be seen in other wealthy business leaders as well-- Phil Knight is also a shining example of a success fallacy. While in terms of capitalism and neoliberalism he is a role model of excellence, his success is only built off the backs of others. This issue became extremely important in the 90's, when Nike faces allegations of sweatshop work. This exposure was emphasized by showing picture of young children working in these factories in magazines reporting on the accusations. While Nike was very embarrassed by their wrongdoing, but "Nike has continued to treat the sweatshop issue as a public relations inconvenience rather than as a serious human rights matter"(Salazar). The concern of worker's rights is not a priority with Nike, because the desire to make money is greater than the desire to provide safe environments for their workers. This is key to understanding Knight's use of the exercise fallacy-- his execution of such affects even those across seas in order for him to maintain his success through power over the powerless and wealth accumulated from the exploitation of workers.

Another example of this "exercise fallacy" is Donald Trump. Trump is an extremely important figure to analyze because of his position as the leader of this country. This puts him in a position of extremely high political power, and gives him the

ability to influence others through this position. Trump is not only in a position of political power, but has acquired a vast amount of wealth in his time as a businessman. The idea that there is a person in existence who owns billions of dollars *as well as* being in control of the way an entire country operates is truly frightening. The way that Trump upholds the power given to him is even more frightening-- over the course of his presidency he has made many racist and sexist comments that normalize these issues by having our own president condone them. Is this what success looks like? After all, if the President of the United States can objectify women and abuse his societal privilege, then everyone else should be able to, right? Earlier this year, Trump faced a suit against Stormy Daniels, an adult star who was charging Trump with sexual assault. As seen on Twitter, @realDonaldTrump, his response to the case and Daniels was as follows: "Federal Judge throws out Stormy Daniels lawsuit versus Trump. Trump is entitled to full legal fees." @FoxNews Great, now I can go after Horseface and her 3rd rate lawyer in the Great State of Texas." This statement obviously showed no respect for Daniels, and presented this disrespect in an immature and classless manner. Republican Congressman Ryan Anthony Costello responded by stating "To say this is unbecoming of any man, let alone the POTUS, is a vast understatement. And to say this enables teenage boys to feel they have a license to refer to girls w such names is obvious. It's all very embarrassing." How does this case relate to power? Trump's position has allowed him to make these kinds of comments about women, and for them to be tolerated to some extent by the American public that represents his social class and race. This danger of power abuse has been exercised in many other examples throughout his presidency, but his use of the exercise fallacy is shown particularly in this

situation. Stormy is an adult film star, her career choices don't particularly appeal to the general public. This therefore allows Trump to exercise his power as a white, educated male over a woman trying to get justice for the assault inflicted on her simply by creating doubt in her veritability as an honest source.

From this research and this case study, the conclusion can be made that success boils down to the two fundamental points of power and wealth. These two core elements of success can be traced back to other key points such as access to education, gender, race, but also communication and work ethic, as well as the range of one's influence. My research has shown where success fallacies exist, and that successful people exercise these fallacies to reach their goals. Success then, can be defined as no more than a social construct to define a quantitative measure of achievement. Some people are in a position where success is more accessible to them, and some are predestined to have a harder time on the route to success because of societal constructs. From observing older definitions of success, such as those described in the Nackenoff article, the obsession with wealth as a key to success led to one having a higher social standing, and the same is true today. This can be said about the distribution of freedom in our country-- more money, more opportunities, more freedom. Should money dominate freedom? Wealth and power both dictate the class system, and the same can be said about the success system. Are we divided in our success parallel to our divisions in race, class and gender? With these questions in mind, it can be understood that perhaps success itself is a fallacy of hope in a neoliberal capitalist society such as the United States.

However, if we are to tie all this information together, what's the pattern? It's apparent what to look for in identifying motifs in the success structure-- through my research I've paid close attention to the concepts of race, gender, and economic standing, but the idea that some people are more inclined to a path of success than others is more than a pattern; it's been handed down through generations in order to sustain the recurring pattern of patriarchy and whiteness. In Joan Acker's article, *The Problem with Patriarchy*, she discusses how this successorship is determined from the feminist perspective. "These concepts and frameworks were deeply gendered, reflecting part of the reality of male and capitalist dominated societies, while obscuring other important aspects, such as the realities of women and minorities" (Acker 237). Acker's analysis of the system is so ingrained with patriarchal influence that the experiences of minorities are invalidated. This is how the system of successorship works. The power and wealth aspects of success are passed down through the system by white, male successors, and by excluding others from this system, the access to "success" is kept in a tightly knit loop protected by how others are categorized in relation to this successorship. If these are the themes that we see in American society, how do we break the cycle? How does the self replicating, closed system of success become universal? The concept of successorship as a way to sustain stereotypes and deprivation of minorities through the tools of wealth and power only emphasize the methodic weathering of "The American Dream" in neoliberal capitalist societies.

Nackenoff, Carol. "Success." *American History Through Literature 1870-1920*, edited by Tom Quirk and Gary Scharnhorst, vol. 3, Charles Scribner's Sons, 2006, pp. 1092-1100. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/CX3470800240/GVRL?u=seat84569&sid=GVRL&xid=6e4014c5> Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.

Carol Nackenoff's piece delves into the history of what success looks like throughout time. This piece researches success literature in particular-- and how success is portrayed through the characters. One prominent writer that the article mentions is Alger Horatio, who wrote about heroes who "*invariably gain success through hard work and moral rectitude* (Nackenoff)." Nackenoff is an author who writes about American history through literature, and as success is such a large part of American History, I saw it fitting to use her work. One argument that I plan to use in my research is the concept that success is an innate character quality that stems from the traits of effort and morality, and relate it to the writing of Alger Horatio. This piece is important to my research because it shows what success looked like in an early point of history.

N. A. "Success." *The Art Union*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1885, pp. 10–11. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/20443005.

This is a research piece that focuses on the psychology behind success and defining the word itself. Despite this paper being extremely old, it still deals with the same kind of questions I am asking. It discusses the inability to measure the success of two different people in two different professions, in particular, the success of artists. The reason that this piece is important to research is because often times artists aren't rich and influential in their own era-- making success for them look very different from success that a businessman might have. I especially want to explore the phrase, "To lack success is to have an imperfect, incomplete, partially ruined

life (Art of Union)”. I will use this in my project to further expand my line of questioning throughout my paper by exploring similar ideas.

Allitt, Patrick. “How to Succeed in Politics.” *The National Interest*, no. 108, 2010, pp. 36–45. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/42896320.

This research piece discusses how Americans have succeeded in politics throughout history, and why some political movements haven’t done as well. Essentially, what I’m hoping to draw from this piece is an understanding of how people work together for the general well being, and how success can be achieved through a unit versus an individual. Because our government dictates so much of how our country as a whole succeeds, I’m curious to see how our government set up encourages the success of the individual, who it guarantees the success of, and if democracy is the ultimate form of government for optimal success. One argument I noticed was “Political parties adjust their principles if necessary... they speak the language of high morality but only concern themselves with holding office (Allitt) ” This piece will be important to explore concepts of power as methods to success, primarily in a political setting.

John, Richard St., director. *8 Secrets to Success. TED: Ideas Worth Spreading*, 2005, www.ted.com/talks/richard_st_john_s_8_secrets_of_success?referrer=playlist-what_is_success.

TED talks will probably be a good source for my topic as the research process continues, but this one in particular struck me because it practically begs to be played-- everyone wants to know the secrets to success. This video essentially summarized the eight keys to success as passion, hard work, focus, pushing yourself, service, show good, ideas, and persistence. Richard St. John is a self proclaimed “average guy” who has distilled these elements of success in his TED talk as well as a book. These tips to success will be interesting to explore throughout my

research, as well as comparing these “secrets” to other theories from professionals about success. I will use this in my paper to compare to different theories of elements to success.

Lukes, Steven. “Power.” *Contexts*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2007, pp. 59–61. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/41801062.

Steven’s article focuses heavily on the contexts of power, and the meaning of the word alone. This article was especially interesting because it focuses on power fallacies-- and in turn, success fallacies. This discussion of power fallacies takes place in the contexts of social and political climates, where this type of power illusion is most relevant. This will be extremely useful to my paper to help redefine the true meaning of power-- and what power looks like. In addition, Luke’s article will help differentiate types of power. This piece in particular was helpful because it used the same kinds of research discussion formatting that I’m using in my paper-- asking questions and engaging with the material rather than just listing facts.

Philips, Susan U. “Power.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, vol. 9, no. 1/2, 1999, pp. 194–196. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/43102464.

This source looks at power from the anthropological standpoint-- especially as a social construct that is only defined by the responses of others. Phillip’s piece in particular looks at language; and how language is the foundation of power. This theory is further developed in the piece by the emphasis on communication skills, which is a trait that leads to power, and as my paper will hopefully prove, power into success. This source is another example of one of the subcategories I plan to explore in my research; as I look into success, I boiled it down to power and wealth, and as I look into power, I find communication, and all of these elements tie back to success. In my paper, I plan to use Phillip’s ideas on language as evidence to strengthen my claim on power as a way to success.

Stam, Kirsten, et al. "Do Values Matter? The Impact of Work Ethic and Traditional Gender Role Values on Female Labour Market Supply." *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 116, no. 2, 2014, pp. 593–610., www.jstor.org/stable/24720862.

This article discusses work ethic, particularly in the role of women. The basics of this article include the discrepancy between female and male workplace strategies, as well as how this is reflected in pay. The reason this article is such an important source to my paper is because I discuss gender as something that plays a role in people's road to success (i.e., it's harder for women to succeed than men because of reinforced gender norms). This source proves, from studies, that female work ethic is just as good, if not more thorough, and yet the wage gap still prevents women from reaching a monetary level of success.

Fortin, Nicole M. "The Gender Wage Gap among Young Adults in the United States: The Importance of Money versus People." *The Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 43, no. 4, 2008, pp. 884–918. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/40057374.

This source expands on the gender enforced wage gap, and how money relates to self-esteem, external locus of control, the importance of money/work and the importance of people/family. These ideas explored in Fortin's piece show how different people value money, and why. Specifically, this piece focuses on personality traits among men and women and how they relate to each gender's priorities. I incorporated this source in my writing because I wanted to provide additional evidence regarding gender as a factor to success-- by showing which traits in specific genders are more productive, I can determine which traits it takes to make more money in the workplace. By understanding which traits factor in to making the most money in the workplace, I can understand the quantitative measure of success, through money, presented in the character traits of different genders.

Streitfeld, J. (2018). *Inside Amazon: Wrestling Big Ideas in a Bruising Workplace*. [online] Nytimes.com. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/16/technology/inside-amazon-wrestling-big-ideas-in-a-bruising-workplace.html?module=inline> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2018].

I used this source as an example of the exercise fallacy that Bezos uses in his company, and how his use of power over his employees is shown through their exploitation in the workplace. The reason this example is important to supporting my claims is because it is proof of Bezos exercising his use of power over low wage employees and dictating their livelihoods and health by forcing them to work long hours that result in the harm of workers. In addition, I used this source to gain more knowledge about the inner workings of amazon warehouses, and the conditions that they are kept in, which only added to my supporting claim of poor treatment of amazon employees.

“Jeff Bezos.” Forbes, Forbes Magazine, www.forbes.com/profile/jeff-bezos/#7db650861b23.

I used this source in my piece as an example for my case study about Jeff Bezos. This article is used as evidence for the conclusions I made about Bezos being one of the most successful men alive and includes his own personal statistics, background information, and net worth-- all contributing to the claims in my paper about a certain type of socioeconomic group as well as racial group being at a higher advantage to achieve success in a neoliberal capitalist society. Bezos fits this model perfectly, and emphasized my points about power and wealthy being fundamentals to his own success story.

“Social Influence.” Changing minds, changingminds.org/explanations/theories/social_influence.htm.

I used this source to expand on the ideas of influence in my paper. Because power ties in so closely to influence, I thought it would be beneficial to explore this concept as a supporting claim to how power relates to the neoliberalism of capitalistic society, and the factors that allow power to manifest in certain people. The way that influence is shown in this piece as a way of affecting the mindsets of others, and showed different types of influence that have been observed and the behaviors associated with it, as well as the responses. I used this in my paper as a way to gain more background knowledge on a key term used to support my claims about power.

“Business Career of Donald Trump.” Wikipedia, Wikimedia Foundation, 30 Nov. 2018, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_career_of_Donald_Trump.

I used this article to gain more background knowledge on Trump's career and background. This source was helpful in allowing me to pare down all of the scandals that Trump has been involved in and focus on one and delve into how his response was an exertion of his individual power. I also was able to determine where Trump's money came from, the start of his career, and how he built his business empire. This article also discussed how his career in business has morphed into a political career. From this Article, I also learned about several scandals that Trump has been involved in that don't relate to my project, but question the content of his character, which in turn questions the power that he possesses.

“The Hispanic–White Wage Gap Has Remained Wide and Relatively Steady: Examining Hispanic–White Gaps in Wages, Unemployment, Labor Force Participation, and Education by Gender, Immigrant Status, and Other Subpopulations.” Economic Policy Institute, www.epi.org/publication/the-hispanic-white-wage-gap-has-remained-wide-and-relatively-steady-examining-hispanic-white-gaps-in-wages-unemployment-labor-force-participation-and-education-by-gender-immigrant/.

I used this source to examine the wage gap between Hispanics and whites and how the influence of race affects income. This source provided me with statistics about the discrepancy and contributed to my claims. I used these statistics and facts in my research to observe the difference between unemployment rates as well as other contributing factors to income, including education and gender and how these impacted the Hispanic community in particular. I also chose a source from the economic perspective so that I could gain a better understanding of how this wage gap is an economic issue as well as a racial issue.

<http://www.nationalpartnership.org/research-library/workplace-fairness/fair-pay/latinas-wage-gap.pdf>

I used this source to help define the discrepancy between Hispanic income and white income with facts from a source that focused more on the social aspects of the issue in relation to the lower income issue. This was an important source for me to use because my first source about the racial wage gap focused heavily on statistics and data, which helped to prove my point, but didn't do much to elaborate on the humanitarian aspects of the issue, and what this lower income means for the survival of families. This article brought to life the fact that Latina families cannot afford the discrimination that comes with unfair wages, and causes them inability to support their families and households.

Fabian, Jordan. "Trump Calls Stormy Daniels 'Horseface.'" *TheHill*, The Hill, 16 Oct. 2018, thehill.com/homenews/administration/411607-trump-calls-stormy-daniels-horseface.

I used this article in my description of Donald Trump's scandal with Stormy Daniels. This article used tweets on its page as quotes from the president in regards to his treatment of women, and highlighted the entire twitter feud between Trump, Stormy, and her attorney. I focused on this scandal in particular because it portrays Trump as a misogynist and included a

response of distaste from one of Trump's fellow Republicans. It also highlights a few other examples of Trump's expressions of misogyny and how it has played into his career as a politician, even causing internal issues among the republican party with his comments.

Acker, Joan. "THE PROBLEM WITH PATRIARCHY." *Sociology*, vol. 23, no. 2, 1989, pp. 235–240. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/42853922.

I used this article to analyze the effects of the patriarchy and how this relates to my research on the system of success. This article in particular highlighted the fact that patriarchy makes the aspects of success exclusive to certain people based on their social standing. While this article doesn't discuss the other factors such as race and economic standing, it does provide an insight into one of the many attributes that make the success system, and the successors who dictate the system, what they are today. This article also frames many theories as to why the patriarchy is so prevalent today, which helped me in using these theories to contrast similar ideas about success and successorship.

Padover, Saul K. "The 'American Dream'." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 15, no. 4, 1956, pp. 404–404., www.jstor.org/stable/3484288.

This article was used in my essay as a perspective on the American Dream based on Economics and Sociology. Analyzing the concept of the American Dream is important to my research because it directly relates to the idea that founded the society in which we exist. "The 'American Dream'" gave me more information on how people viewed this dream, what it stood for, and how it is carried out.

Combs, Sandra L. "The American Dream: Divisible Economic Justice For All." *Race, Gender & Class*, vol. 22, no. 1-2, 2015, pp. 228–235. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26505335.

This article, along with “The American Dream” (Padover) both gave me insight into the American Dream as a social concept that motivated people, and guided the society that we live in today. However, this piece particularly expanded on the American Dream for minorities. This includes the impoverished, racial minorities, and gender minorities. The article describes The American Dream as “just out of reach for most americans” which strongly resonates with my research. This article puts an emphasis on the disparity between the actualized version of America and the “American Dream” that so many desire.

<https://theweek.com/articles/655770/61-things-donald-trump-said-about-women>