

# Breathing Profits: The Businessman in John Steinbeck's Fiction<sup>1</sup>

John J. Han and Aya Kubota

スタインベックに見抜かれた「利益を吸って生きる実業家達」

ジョン・ハン\*, 久保田 文\*\*

**要 旨** ジョン・スタインベックは、1962年のノーベル文学賞受賞演説において、mass method のために人類が精神的危機にある、と指摘した。彼に言わせれば、大量生産的手法は、経済のみならず政治や宗教、人々の物の考え方にまで浸透して芳しくない影響を与えていた。そして彼は、人々の想像力の自由を奪うものとは断固として戦う、と述べた。スタインベックが個人の創造力を生かしきれない大企業や心なく非倫理的な実業家を嫌ったことは一般によく知られているが、彼の作品を細かく見ていくと、ビジネスマンが一貫して批判的に描かれているわけではないことがわかる。本論文では、数々の作品におけるビジネスマンの扱われ方を精読した上で、利潤に突き動かされた貪欲なタイプのビジネスマンが消費者の暮らしを遠隔操作し、本来労働者が得るべきものを搾取し、違法なビジネスを展開した場合に、作者が嫌悪する対象となっていたことを検証する。また、彼は個々人の人生や家庭生活が大量生産の組織にのみこまれ犠牲となっていくことに対し、非常にネガティブな見解を示しており、ここにスタインベックが重視し続けたものが鮮明に浮かび上がる。

キーワード John Steinbeck businessman American literature

## Introduction

Since the mid-twentieth century, the businessman<sup>2</sup> in American literature, especially in fiction, has drawn considerable critical attention from both literary and business scholars. In addition to numerous papers, several book-length works on the fictional businessman have appeared.<sup>3</sup> Some of them discuss realist and naturalist novelists, such as Theodore Dreiser, William Dean Howells, and Frank Norris, who expose the greed and corruption seemingly inherent in the corporate world. Other works discuss popular economic novelists, such as Horatio Alger and George Barr McCutcheon, who tend to write rags-to-riches stories.

Although many of John Steinbeck's fictional works not only include businesspeople but also deal with some major economic issues of his day, he is rarely mentioned in the same breath as Dreiser, Howells, and Norris. In *The Businessman in American Literature* (1983), for instance, Emily Stipes Watts briefly mentions Steinbeck twice. Commenting on the proletarian novelists of the

\* Missouri Baptist University American literature \*\* Bunka Gakuen University American literature

1930s, she notes that writers such as Sinclair Lewis and John Steinbeck “were not associated with the proletarian movement per se but nevertheless produced works harshly critical of capitalism” (92). She also observes that heroic businesspeople are hard to find in American fiction in the 1930s: “America’s two major novelists, William Faulkner and Ernest Hemingway, created no such characters, nor did such important writers as John Steinbeck and Theodore Dreiser” (102). In her book, Watts discusses both capitalist writers who uphold businesspeople as heroes and writers who attack capitalism; Ken Kesey and Stanley Elkin belong to the first group, and Upton Sinclair, William Gaddis, and Kurt Vonnegut belong to the second group.

Unfortunately, Steinbeck’s fiction receives little attention in Watts’s study; so does in other book-length studies of economic novelists. Watts says that Steinbeck is “harshly critical of capitalism” (92), especially in *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), but it should be noted that he attacks the excesses of capitalism during the Depression era, not the system itself. Much similar to the Victorian novelist Charles Dickens, his attack on businesspeople derives from his humanistic and humanitarian concerns. Following the publication of *The Grapes of Wrath*, some readers, especially those who in California and the Midwest, accused the author of being a Communist who advocated class struggle; even today, some readers consider him so.

However, there is no evidence, either fictional or anecdotal, that Steinbeck was against the capitalist system. For instance, he wrote to Louis Paul in 1936, “I don’t like communists either, I mean I dislike them as people. I rather imagine the apostles had the same waspish qualities and the New Testament is proof that they had equally bad manners” (112-13). At the end of chapter 14 of *The Grapes of Wrath*, an intercalary chapter, Steinbeck mentions four revolutionary figures—Paine, Marx, Jefferson, and Lenin—when he points out that economic injustice causes group action, not the other way around. Steinbeck states, “Need is the stimulus to concept, concept to action”; the dispossessed people want to “survive” and “preserve [themselves]” by whatever means (156). Meanwhile, in chapter 16 of the novel, a camp proprietor accuses Tom Joad of being “one of these here troublemakers, and Tom retorts, “Damn right. I’m bolshevisky” (199). As Thomas E. Barden points out in his introduction to *Steinbeck in Vietnam* (2012), Tom is simply being “ironic” (xii) here. Nowhere in the novel is an implication that Tom and his mentor, Jim Casy, are dreaming of a proletarian revolution. They simply want to protect the basic human rights of the poor and the dispossessed.

This study aims to establish Steinbeck as an economic novelist by examining his predominantly negative representation of businesspeople in his fiction.<sup>4</sup> Steinbeck’s criticism particularly targets big businessmen, such as bankers and large land owners. We will discuss how Steinbeck criticizes businessmen for their remote control over common people’s lives, their exploitation of cheap labor, and their shady or illegal business practices. Considering lingering suspicions about Steinbeck’s supposedly radical politico-economic ideology, this paper will help clarify not only his economic

views but also his moral vision for America. Main texts for discussion will include *In Dubious Battle* (1936), *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), *The Pearl* (1947), and *The Winter of Our Discontent* (1961).

## **The Faceless Face of Profit-driven Businesses**

Steinbeck's fiction portrays how big businesses destroy the lives of common people long-distance. In *The Grapes of Wrath*, for example, bank foreclosures force sharecroppers out of their land. The tenant farmers are angry with the bulldozer driver and the farm superintendent and protest against them; they may not own the land but, they argue, have been tilling it for decades. However, the messengers say that they are simply following the orders of the landowners, who in turn take orders from a bank far away—an institution that is both faceless and unreachable to them.

Steinbeck was keenly aware of economic changes in his time: Traditional small farms gave way to corporate farms owned by businessmen and controlled by mortgage banks. Agricultural industrialization had produced divisions among farmers. In his 1936 essay "Dubious Battle in California," Steinbeck observes that not all farmers belong to the same class:

There are in California, therefore, two distinct classes of farmers widely separated in standard of living, desires, needs, and sympathies: the very small farmer who more often than not takes the side of the workers in disputes and the speculative farmer, like A. J. Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles *Times*, or like Herbert Hoover and William Randolph Hearst, absentee owners who possess huge sections of land. Allied with these large individual growers have been the big incorporated farms, owned by their stockholders and farmed by instructed managers, and a large number of bank farms, acquired by foreclosure and operated by superintendents whose labor policy is dictated by the bank. For example, the Bank of America is very nearly the largest farm owner and operator in the state of California. ("Dubious" 71)

Thus, modern agriculture has become an industry that drives small farmers—those who love and live in communion with land—away from the roots of their existence.

In chapter 5 of *The Grapes of Wrath*, Steinbeck describes how agricultural mechanization and the banking industry have transformed the traditional concept of farming. The owners of the land, who are "caught in something larger than themselves," have no choice but to force their tenant farmers to move out of their land; they are under the control of "a monster," called the bank or finance company. The banks are "machines and masters all at the same time." Some landowners

are unhappy with their monstrous masters; others are “a little proud to be slaves to such cold and powerful masters” (31). By nature, those masters pursue profits—and profits only: “... those creatures don’t breathe air, don’t eat side-meat. They breathe profits; they eat the interest on money. If they don’t get it, they die the way you die without air, without side-meat. It is a sad thing, but it is so. It is just so” (32). The sharecroppers argue that they have lived on the land for generations, asserting their right to continue to live there. The landowners remind them that times have changed and that the changes are insurmountable; a single tractor can handle the work of twelve or fourteen families (33). The tractor that demolishes farmhouses represents the monstrous nature of industrial agriculture. The tractor operator loses his human quality as well:

The man sitting in the iron seat did not look like a man; gloved, goggled, rubber dust mask over nose and mouth, he was a part of the monster, a robot in the seat.... [T]he monster that built the tractor, the monster that sent the tractor out, has somehow got into the driver’s hands, into his brain and muscle, had goggled him and muzzled him—goggled his mind, muzzled his speech, goggled his perception, muzzled his protest. He could not see the land as it was, he could not smell the land as it smelled; his feet did not stamp the clods or feel the warmth and power of the earth.... He did not know or own or trust or beseech the land. (*Grapes* 35-36)

The tone of this passage is both nostalgic and accusatory. On the one hand, Steinbeck acknowledges that times have irreversibly changed. On the other hand, he deplores that the land falls into the monstrous, invisible hands of corporations.

In chapter 19 of the same novel, an intercalary chapter, Steinbeck exposes the brutal nature of corporate farming this way:

And the great owners, who must lose their land in an upheaval, the great owners with access to history, with eyes to read history and to know the great fact: when property accumulates in two few hands it is taken away. And that companion fact: when a majority of the people are hungry and cold they will take by force what they need. And the little screaming fact that sounds through all history: repression works only to strengthen and knit the repressed. The great owners ignored the three cries of history. The land fell into fewer hands, the number of the disposed increased, and every effort of the great owners was directed at repression. The money was spent for arms, for gas to protect the great holdings, and spies were sent to catch the murmuring of revolt so that it might be stamped out. The changing economy was ignored, plans for the change ignored; and only means to destroy revolt were considered, while the causes of revolt went on. (*Grapes* 247)

Here Steinbeck does not advocate some kind of proletarian revolution. He simply explains the possible results of the dispossession of small farmers.

## **The Exploitation of Cheap Labor**

Steinbeck attacks big businesses for their manipulative use of cheap labor. *In Dubious Battle* is a case in point. In the novel, Steinbeck sides with neither fruit growers nor strikers. His aim for writing the novel was to expose the “dubious” motives of both parties: the Torgas Valley Growers Association, which tries to underpay its apple pickers, and the Communist strike leaders who take advantage of economic difficulties to expand their ideological influences. The novel effectively describes how agro businesses capitalize on cheap labor. Taking advantage of the surplus of migrant apple-pickers, the Association reduces their wages. Announcing his plans to organize the crop tramps in the Valley, Mac denounces the landowners’ practice of lowering wages after the arrival of workers: “There’re thousands of acres of apples ready to pick down there. Be damn near two thousand fruit tramps. Well, the Growers’ Association just announced a pay cut to the pickers” (*In Dubious Battle* 24). The workers with depleted resources have no choice but to endure low wages, a reality Mac and other Communist organizers challenge.

As Warren French notes, *In Dubious Battle* received less criticism from conservative critics than *The Grapes of Wrath* because they liked the way Steinbeck portrays the power of the haves:

*In Dubious Battle* acknowledges the power of the Establishment that they supported. The novel can be read as a warning to those foolish enough to challenge the status quo. As has been pointed out, there is never any doubt about the outcome of this strike. Mac, the principal organizer, admits from the beginning that the situation is hopelessly stacked against the strikers because the growers are unusually well organized and have commanding resources at their disposal. Labor’s supporters could find little comfort in this novel that offers nothing of the “we shall overcome” tone of the “proletarian fiction” of the period. . . . (French xix)

Although Steinbeck certainly highlights the reckless and inhumane side of Communists in the novel, especially in its last chapter, he also describes the inhumane ways in which landowners treat laborers. In addition to having to endure low wages, the fruit pickers are forced to pay higher prices at the company store. When the labor dispute continues, the landowners also cut off critical supplies for the strikers.

Landowners manipulate cheap labor in *The Grapes of Wrath* as well. In chapter 20, Floyd

Knowles, a labor organizer, explains how big corporate farmers over-recruit temporary workers so that they can pay them as little as possible. If there is one worker for one job, the employer will pay a fair wage; if there are one hundred workers for one job, there will be steep competition among workers, which will lead to a reduced wage. Knowles states, "S'pose a nickel'll buy at leas' somepin for them kids. An' you got a hundred men. Jus' offer 'em a nickel—why, they'll kill each other fightin' for that nickel" (*Grapes* 254). That is why the orchard owners print more handbills than needed. Later in the chapter, a labor contractor arrives alongside a deputy sheriff who is armed with a pistol. As Knowles questions the contractor whether he is licensed, the contractor calls him a Communist agitator (*Grapes* 273-74).

In chapter 22, Mr. Thomas, the owner of a 65-acre farm who sympathizes with laborers, brings bad news to Tom Joad, Timothy, and Wilkie Wallace: The Farmers' Association, which is controlled by the Bank of the West, is forcing him—and has no choice but—to reduce his wages from 30 cents to 25 cents an hour. On the one hand, he wants to pay his migrant workers sufficient wages. On the other hand, his hands are tied to the bank which will deny his annual crop loan unless he lowers his wages. He explains his helplessness this way: "That bank owns most of this valley, and it's got paper on everything it don't own. . . . Mr. Bank hires two thousand men an' I hire three. I've got paper to meet" (*Grapes* 306). Mr. Thomas warns that the Farmers' Association does not like the federal government camps and is planning to disrupt the Weedpatch dance: "There's going to be a fight in the camp Saturday night. And there's going to be deputies ready to go in" (*Grapes* 307). Timothy shares the story of a larger landowner who considers anyone who demands a fair wage a Communist:

Fella named Hines—got 'bout thirty thousan' acres, peaches and grapes—got as cannery an' a winery. Well, he's just all a time talkin' about "them goddamn reds." "Goddamn reds is drivin' the country to ruin," he says, an' "We got to drive these here red bastards out." Well, they were a young fella jus' come out west here, an' he's listenin' one day. He kinda scratched his head an' he says, "Mr. Hines, I ain't been here long. What is these goddamn reds?" Well, sir, Hines says, "A Red is any son-of-a-bitch that wants thirty cents an hour when we're payin' twenty-five!" Well, this young fella he thinks about her, an' he scratches his head, an' he says, "Well, Jesus, Mr. Hines. I ain't a son-of-a-bitch, but if that's what a red is—why, I want thirty cents an hour. Ever'body does. Hell, Mr. Hines, we're all reds." (*Grapes* 309)

Thus, by stigmatizing all demands for a fair wage as communist, the landowners suppress organized labor and maximize their profits. Steinbeck's view on this issue is clear: It is unethical

to capitalize on poor people's misfortunes, and labor suppression will eventually lead to violence, because hungry people will think they have nothing to lose in their struggle for basic human needs.

### **Shady or Illegal Business Practices**

In addition to the facelessness nature of big businesses and their exploitation of cheap labor, Steinbeck voices his moral indignation against shady or illegal practices. Some practices may be legal, but morally reprehensible; others may be disreputable. In chapter 25 of *The Grapes of Wrath*, for example, the big farmers destroy their fruit crops so that they can manipulate their market prices. Because of the struggling economy, 40 five-pound boxes of pears sell for only \$5—five dollars a ton. The landowners let the fruits rot on the ground or burn them so that hungry migrants cannot eat them:

The works of the roots of the vines, of the trees, must be destroyed to keep up the price, and this is the saddest, bitterest thing of all. Carloads of oranges dumped on the ground. The people came for miles to take the fruit, but this could not be. How would they buy oranges at twenty cents a dozen if they could drive out and pick them up? And men with hoses squirt kerosene on the oranges, and they are angry at the crime, angry at the people who have come to take the fruit. A million people hungry, needing the fruit—and kerosene sprayed over the golden mountains.

And the smell of rot fills the country.

Burn coffee for fuel in the ships. Burn corn to keep warm, it makes a hot fire. Dump potatoes in the rivers and place guards along the banks to keep the hungry people from fishing them out. Slaughter the pigs and bury them, and let the putrescence drip down into the earth. (*Grapes* 362-63)

Steinbeck says that such practices border on a crime against humanity that warrants “the grapes of wrath”—the righteous angers of the poor and dispossessed (*Grapes* 363).

Steinbeck's novella *The Pearl* also portrays a shady business practice. An uneducated, poor Mexican man, Kino, finds a precious pearl, “the Pearl of the World” (*The Pearl* 28). Once a despised man living in a brush house, he suddenly becomes a celebrity among his villagers, and the doctor, who refused to treat Kino's young son because Kino is poor, says that he will treat the son. Kino decides to go to town, sell the pearl to a pearl buyer, and use the money for the future of his family. He is not a greedy man or someone who does not know his station in life. He has a commendable dream for his family, especially for his child:

Kino's face shone with prophecy. "My son will read and open the books, and my son will write and will know writing. And my son will make numbers, and these things will make us free because he will know—he will know and through him we will know." And in the pearl Kino saw himself and Juana [his wife] squatting by the little fire in the brush hut while Coyotito read from a great book. "This is what the pearl will do," said Kino. (*The Pearl* 31)

Thus Kino harbors a commendable dream—a dream similar to the one many slaves had before the abolition. Kino knows that literacy is power, and he has found a pearl of great price.

Unbeknownst to him is that pearl buyers in town actually belong to the same company; they pretend to compete with each other to pay pearl sellers as little money as possible. Steinbeck describes the shady business practice of the pearl buyers this way:

Now there was only one pearl buyer with many hands, and the men who sat in their offices and waited for Kino knew what price they would offer, how high they would bid, and what method each one would use. And although these men would not profit beyond their salaries, there was excitement among the pearl buyers, for there was excitement in the hunt, and if it be a man's function to break down a price, then he must take joy and satisfaction in breaking it as far down as possible. For every man in the world functions to the best of his ability, and no one does less than his best, no matter what he may think about it. Quite apart from any reward they might get, from any word of praise, from any promotion, a pearl buyer was a pearl buyer, and the best and happiest pearl buyer was he who bought for the lowest prices. (*The Pearl* 47)

As Kino shows his pearl to the buyers, its beauty awes them. However, they criticize it, saying that it is not a pricey pearl. With "a sad and contemptuous smile," a dealer complains that Kino's pearl is "too large" and "clumsy" only good for display at a museum but not for resale. Kino thinks that the pearl is worth 50,000 pesos, but the dealer proposes 1,000 pesos. Another dealer proposes only 500 pesos, and a third dealer pretends generosity by offering 1,500 pesos (*The Pearl* 54-57). Although the greedy dealers try to extort him, Kino instinctively knows that the worth of his pearl and refuses to sell it. However, Kino's possession of the pearl brings disasters to his family, resulting in hostility from his community and the death of his child. By the end of the story, Kino accepts his wife's advice and throws the pearl back to the sea where it came from. Despite this morally confusing—and unsatisfying—ending, Steinbeck vividly exemplifies the ways in which the corporate world can be manipulative in pricing a product.

Steinbeck's novel *The Winter of Our Discontent* decries moral decay, including the decline in



business ethics, in mid-twentieth-century America. Alfio Marullo and Mr. Baker are two of the businesspeople who engage in shady or illegal tactics in the novel. An illegal immigrant from Italy, Marullo came to the United States empty-handed, worked his way up, and now runs a grocery store with a hard-nosed, no-nonsense attitude toward business. He advises his clerk, Ethan Allen Hawley, about how the young man should view business: "Business is money. Money is not friendly. Kid, maybe you too friendly—too nice. Money is not nice. Money got no friends but more money." When Ethan disagrees, saying that he has seen "plenty of nice, friendly, honorable businessmen," Marullo replies, "When not doing business, kid, yes..." (*Winter* 24-25). In addition to his belief in the cold-hearted nature of money, Marullo is convinced that bribery is an essential part of business life. Marullo may be a flawed character, but he is not involved in large-scale irregularities. In contrast, Mr. Baker, the president of First National Bank in New Baytown, plots to control the town council for the sake of his business. Rumor also has it that he and his family committed arson against a whaling ship to commit insurance. Marullo and Mr. Baker are two of the many businessmen with shady characters in Steinbeck's fiction.

## Conclusion

A study of Steinbeck's fiction reveals several aspects of his economic ideas. First, it is clear that he fundamentally distrusts big business. He is sympathetic toward some small businessmen but is almost always suspicious of big business owners, including agricultural businessmen; they are greedy, heartless, or unethical. He seems especially wary of banks which own lands or control large landowners who are in a position to exploit their employees or customers.

In addition to a distrust of big business, Steinbeck's fiction reflects his fundamentally agrarian view of life: A simple rural life is superior to a city life marked by banks and factories.<sup>5</sup> As an agrarian, Steinbeck longed for land and lived close to it, he loved gardening (some of his characters are gardeners), and he felt kinship with farmers. Many of his good characters live in nature. They live in close proximity to land, as the Wayne family does in *To a God Unknown*, or desire to have land of their own, as George and Lennie do in *Of Mice and Men*. Steinbeck even portrays farming as an art that needs devotion, knowledge, and skills. Chapter 25 of *The Grapes of Wrath* is a case in point. After describing the beauty of springtime in California valleys, he states,

Behind the fruitfulness are men of understanding and knowledge and skill, men who experiment with seed, endlessly developing the techniques for greater crops of plants whose roots will resist the million enemies of the earth: the moles, the insects, the rusts, the blights. These men work carefully and endlessly to perfect the seed, the roots. And there are the men of chemistry who spray the trees against pests, who sulphate the grapes,

who cut out disease and rots, mildews and sickness. Doctors of preventive medicine, men at the borders who look for fruit flies, for Japanese beetle, men who quarantine the sick trees and root them out and burn them, men of knowledge. The men who graft the young trees, the little vines, are the cleverest of all, for theirs is a surgeon's job, as tender and delicate' and these men must have surgeons' hands and surgeons' hearts to slit the bark, to place the grafts, to bind the wounds and cover them from the air. These are great men. (*Grapes* 360)

Thus, instead of treating farmers as simple-minded people with little sophistication, Steinbeck represents them as heroes who, like surgeons, use high skills to execute their tasks with superb knowledge and skill.

It should be noted that, although Steinbeck criticizes faceless businessmen disconnected with people greedy businessmen and big companies, his criticism is tempered by his reluctant acknowledgement that society needs businesspeople. An example is the husband in Steinbeck's story "The White Quail." Mr. Harry E. Teller is a banker, and the wife cruelly criticizes his profession. She speaks ill of it as if he were taking advantage of people's weaknesses, although his money lets her do what she likes to and affords the beautiful garden. The husband is good-natured, and his company does not do anything illegal. He says, "The people must have the money, and we supply it. The law regulates the interest rate. We haven't anything to do with that" (20). Steinbeck dislikes the banking industry, but as far as it is legal, he seems willing to accept it.

Steinbeck's sociological stories should be read in historical context: He wrote those stories during the Great Depression, an unprecedented time period in which millions of people lost their money, land, and hope. His fiction advocates socially responsible business ethics and condemns exploitations of the poor and the dispossessed. As an economic novelist, he advocates humanism and humanitarianism; he embraces capitalism but reveals the excesses of a capitalist economic system. In dealing with businesspeople in his fiction, Steinbeck's tone is sometimes indignant (as in *The Winter of Our Discontent*, a novel which condemns moral depravity in the United States in the mid-twentieth century), other times nostalgic (as in *The Grapes of Wrath*, in which Steinbeck acknowledges that America has fundamentally changed from an agricultural to a mechanized, industrial society), and still other times mixed (as in *In Dubious Battle*, in which he condemns both the fruit growers and their hired workers). Nevertheless, Steinbeck's view of twentieth-century American businesses and businesspeople is largely negative.

#### Notes

- 1 The co-authors would like to thank Dr. Clark Triplett for his critical comments on an earlier draft.
- 2 Nowadays the term *businessman* is so generically used that their exact meanings are hard to pin down.

*Random House Dictionary* (2013) defines it as “a man regularly employed in business, especially a white-collar worker, executive, or owner,” and *Collins English Dictionary* (10<sup>th</sup> edition) defines it as “a person, esp. a man, engaged in commercial or industrial business, esp. as an owner or executive,” but they are not wholly satisfactory definitions. For the sake of this paper, we will define *businessman* as someone who owns or runs a business and is in a position to potentially exploit other people. Although the gender-specific term *businesswoman* is increasingly used nowadays, we will use *businessman* as a general term for both a man and a woman engaged in business, as was a practice for Steinbeck himself.

- 3 They include Gordon Wilson Clarke’s *The Changing Conception of the Businessman in the American Novel 1865 to 1940* (1949); Michael J. McTague’s *The Businessman in Literature: Dante to Melville* (1979); Emily Stipes Watts’s *The Businessman in American Literature* (1982); and Christa Mahalik’s *Merchants, Barons, Sellers and Suits: The Changing Images of the Businessman through Literature* (2010).
- 4 Admittedly, not all of businesspeople receive criticism in Steinbeck’s fiction, and he seems to have ambivalent feelings toward the corporate world. As a writer, Steinbeck strove to maximize his profits, living among publishers and literary agents who tried to make him successful. In his fiction, some businessmen are portrayed either positively or neutrally. For instance, Mr. Thomas, a small ranch owner in *The Grapes of Wrath*, is a good man concerned about the wellbeing of migrant laborers. In *Cannery Row*, Steinbeck gently pokes fun at Lee Chong, a Chinese merchant, as a shrewd and manipulative businessman. However, Lee is still good-natured, generous, and likeable; that is why he is fondly remembered at the beginning of the novel’s sequel, *Sweet Thursday*.
- 5 For an analysis of Steinbeck’s idea of Jeffersonian agrarianism, see Chester E. Eisinger’s essay “Jeffersonian Agrarianism in *The Grapes of Wrath*” (*University of Kansas City Review*, Winter 1957, pp. 149-54).

#### Works Cited

- Barden, Thomas E. *Steinbeck in Vietnam: Dispatches from the War*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2012. Print.
- French, Warren. Introduction. In *Dubious Battle*, by John Steinbeck. 1936. New York: Penguin, 2006.vii-xxiv. Print.
- Steinbeck, John. *The Grapes of Wrath*. New York: Viking, 1939. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Dubious Battle in California.” *America and Americans and Selected Nonfiction*, by John Steinbeck. Ed. Susan Shillinglaw and Jackson J. Benson. New York: Penguin, 2003. 71-77. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *In Dubious Battle*. 1936. New York: Penguin, 2006. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Pearl*. 1947. New York: Penguin, 1994. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Steinbeck: A Life in Letters*. Ed. Elaine Steinbeck and Robert Wallsten. New York: Viking, 1975. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The White Quail.” *The Long Valley*, by John Steinbeck. 1938. New York: Penguin, 1995. 14-27. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Winter of Our Discontent*. 1961. New York: Bantam, 1962. Print.
- Watts, Emily Stipes. *The Businessman in American Literature*. Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1983. Print.