

Economic Archetypes and Market Participants in Steinbeck's East of Eden

An Honors Thesis (HONR 499)

by

Lilly Reece

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Cecil Bohanon

**Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana**

April 2017

Expected Date of Graduation

May 2017

Abstract

John Steinbeck is considered to be one of the quintessential American writers of the early 20th century. His characters and narratives are known for their accessibility and relatability, and the religious and political allegories found in his works have captured the imaginations of millions for nearly a hundred years. This is especially true in the case of the masterpiece *East of Eden*. Stories of nature versus nurture, agriculture versus industry, and, ultimately, good versus evil are all present in this account of flawed individuals living in a society obsessed with duality. The analysis of one of these dualistic frameworks, that of capitalism versus its alternatives, is used to explain why certain characters in Salinas Valley interact with the free market in the way they do, and what their interactions say about their own morality. Cathy, Adam, and Cal all enter the market for different reasons to achieve different aims, and the market is used to facilitate these goals, regardless of their lawfulness, intentions, or ethical qualms. I have used these specific characters and their actions to create three categories of market participant archetypes, demonstrating that the market is nothing more than what we make of it.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Cecil Bohanon for, firstly, writing *Pride and Profit: The Intersection of Jane Austen and Adam Smith* with Dr. Michelle Albert Vachris, as it gave me my first taste of combining classic literature with economic theory. Secondly, Dr. Bohanon reintroduced me to Steinbeck and the rich characters of *East of Eden*, and gave me the support and advice necessary to combine this rather odd amalgamation of topics into a coherent, interesting paper.

I would also like to thank the entirety of the Economics Department at Ball State University for fostering my interest in “my fun major” and challenging me to ask questions I didn’t know could be asked.

To my parents, you instilled in me a love of reading and literature at a young age. I went on a thousand adventures before I ever left home, thanks to you. And to my brother, Gideon, thanks for repeatedly handing me books throughout my childhood that I was probably too young for. I didn’t always understand them right away, but they fed a hunger in me that I still can’t name. Don’t stop doing it.

SpCo11
Undergrad
Thesis
LD
2489
.24
2017
.R428

2

Process Analysis

In the semester of Fall 2015, which was my junior year at Ball State, I took International Economics with Dr. Cecil Bohanon. There were some extremely interesting topics covered and questions posed, but the most interesting thing I learned had nothing to do with trade policies or reserve currencies. I discovered that there was a niche branch of economic academia that dedicates itself to analyzing classic literature through economic lenses. During the class, Dr. Bohanon introduced a book he was about to publish, along with Dr. Michelle Albert Vachris of Christopher Newport University, about linking Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* with several characters in Jane Austen's most famous novels. I thought, "You can do that?" I, of course, purchased this book, *Pride and Profit: The Interaction of Jane Austen and Adam Smith*, and filled it with sticky notes and scribbles. Going into the summer before my senior year, I thought, if there is a topic I would try and write a thesis on, it would be in this same vein. This was encouraging because my choices for a thesis topic were constrained to the fields of either accounting or economics, which meant I could write a paper on Sarbanes-Oxley, or, I could do something fun. So, the first week of senior year, I went to Dr. Bohanon and told him about how much I loved *Pride and Profit* and how I would really love to write a thesis that catered to that same audience. He mentioned John Steinbeck and how much he loves the James Dean version of *East of Eden*. He suggested there were archetypes of how characters in the movie interact with the market, and that he hated how everyone in the movie turned on Cal for his bean deal because it was "dirty," but it was actually an excellent use of the free market. I was convinced that the book would offer more insights into this, so, in three days, I read the 600-page book, and wrote up a proposal to analyze three chief characters, focusing on Cal and using Adam and Cathy as foils in their market dealings.

With the proposal approved, I spent the Fall semester of 2016 reading and rereading the book, watching the movie a few times, and accumulating compilations of essays and articles on Steinbeck in general and *East of Eden* more specifically. There is a lot of stuff out there, ranging from collections of essays that get released every year as a result of the annual International Steinbeck Congress in Kyoto, Japan, to articles published in the Steinbeck Review periodical that releases a few issues each year. Plus, the same five or six academics will put out a book on Steinbeck every couple of years, so I had no lack of analysis and meta-analysis to pull from. Once the spring of 2017 rolled around, I actually started the organization and writing process. Dr. Bohanon and I had meetings at least once a month to analyze my progress and discuss where we thought the paper was going. This continued until I reached a point where we did not want to bog down readers with extra, nonessential content, but rather sought to keep the premise lean and concise.

While market participant archetypes in *East of Eden* might seem overly specific, I feel like you could apply these ideas to several different literary works. Transactions on the market, regardless of their scale, happen everywhere in real life, and so, because literature is constructed by our imaginations, they also happen everywhere in literature. Characters of all genres participate and react to *a*, if not, *the* market in various ways that you can use to extrapolate on that character's personalities, or even propose insights about the author. This sort of analysis has the potential to expand the fields of both literature and economics in new and exciting ways.

Thesis

Humanity is shaped by a long list of dichotomies. Every core decision made comes in twos. Left or right. Yes or No. Us or Them. Great, historical shifts of the societal landscape in America, and the movements to resist those changes, were also dualistic in nature. Agrarian resisting industrial, capitalism fighting communism, individuals rebelling in the face of the collective. Progress or complacency. Traditional values or social revolution. The grace of poverty or the corruption of wealth. Looking deeper at these politically and economically charged arguments, the observer can pick out the most important, and most ambiguous dichotomy mankind has ever created: Good or Evil. As a civilization develops, what is defined as good and evil is morphed by the collective experiences of the group. Once those definitions are considered satisfactory, they are slow to change, and any individual who does not conform to them, or who is not concerned enough about society's reaction to bother conforming, is feared and chastised. To some, good and evil are mutually exclusive opposites. To others, if not most, there are a myriad degrees of action where they exist side-by-side. Regardless, it is agreed that one cannot exist without the other, otherwise we wouldn't know how to react to either.

The literary mind of John Steinbeck sought to explore and depict this great contrast between good and evil in his self-proclaimed magnum opus, *East of Eden*, which I will abbreviate as *EoE* for the length of this analysis. In his *Journal of a Novel: The East of Eden Letters*, Steinbeck wrote to his longtime friend and editor Pascal Covici a series of letters, notes, and comments throughout the process of writing *EoE*, which Steinbeck devoted most of the year 1951 to completing. Right off the bat, in the first entry under January 29, 1951, Steinbeck tells Covici that he plans to tell "one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest story of all – the story of good and evil, of strength and weakness, of love and hate, of beauty and ugliness..." (*Journal of*

a Novel: The East of Eden Letters, 4). With the goal of imparting on his two young sons some important family history, as well as what he deemed to be critical moral lessons rooted in Genesis, Steinbeck wrote a sometimes autobiography, sometime fictitious narrative of two families, one valley, and the deeply religious allegories connecting it all. The end result was a cross-generational portmanteau of a book that captured the imagination of millions, and the criticism of several.

Criticism of two separate, disjointed stories being interwoven and swapped without preamble throughout the work, of first person interjections into the narrative and Steinbeck's personal anecdotes sprinkled in without furthering any plot, of characters being over-exaggerated caricatures, of heavy-handed symbolism and religious metaphor: there was no shortage of things for professional critics to find to dislike about *EoE*. Steinbeck even admitted in that very first letter to Covici that he felt his work was very two-pronged, saying: "In a sense it will be two books – the story of my county and the story of me... It may be that they should not be printed together. But we will have to see..." (*Journal of a Novel: The East of Eden Letters*, 3).

Suggested by his letters and musings, Steinbeck was simply writing the story as it demanded to be written. If that meant letting his pen carry him through a reinterpretation of the tale of Cain and Abel in, not one, but two sets of brothers, he was determined to answer the siren song.

Heralded as one of the quintessential stories of the good and evil narrative, the Genesis 4 story of violent Cain and his unfortunate brother Abel is one many millions of people know, or are at least familiar with the names. In the Judeo-Christian tradition, Cain and Abel are the two sons of Adam and Eve, the first humans God created. As they grow up, they are both tasked with what several millennia of children were tasked with doing, working for their parents. Cain goes into the fields and becomes a farmer, while Abel is put in charge of the flocks of sheep and other

livestock. At one point, Cain and Abel bring offerings of their hard work to God, Cain bringing “some of the fruits of the soil,” and Abel bringing “fat portions from some of the firstborn of his flock” (New International Version Bible, Gen. 4.3-4). Then God does something religious scholars can only speculate as to why, but He accepts Abel’s offering and rejects Cain’s. Cain, perhaps understandably, is not pleased about this. God notices that anger and jealousy are brewing in Cain, and tries to warn him off of acting on those feelings, saying: “If you do what is right, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do what is right, sin is crouching at your door; it desires to have you, but you must rule over it” (Gen. 4.7). Cain chooses not to heed God’s warning, and shortly thereafter murders his brother Abel. When Cain tries, and fails to hide his act from an omniscient God, he receives his punishment in the form of a banishment from his homeland and a curse that nothing will ever grow under his hand again. “So Cain went out from the Lord’s presence and lived in the land of Nod, east of Eden” (Gen 4.16).

As one might deduce, this account is where Steinbeck drew much of his inspiration for the main struggle of his book about brothers and sons and sons of brothers, as well as the title itself. The characters of the Trask family fill these roles, with Charles and Caleb as spiritual descendants of Cain, whereas Adam and Aron are the ghosts of Abel. Another extremely important element taken from Genesis and placed directly in the text of *EoE* is the notion that God gave Cain a choice to resist temptation and rule over sin, one that Cain did not make. In the novel, the ever-faithful Lee pores over this one verse, hoping to unveil its secrets, going so far as to consult Chinese elders who also happen to know Hebrew to hear what they think about what the original text might have been alluding to. He shares their revelations with his employer Adam Trask, and impoverished inventor Samuel Hamilton, citing a Hebrew word that

encompasses that idea of choice between good and evil, one so poignant that Adam uses what might be his dying breath to utter it over a decade later: "Timshel" (Steinbeck, 301, 601).

So then is that the answer to the struggle between good and evil for each of us? Walk the line and constantly make the choice to control our baser impulses and maintain a more upright zeal? Cal certainly fights with some of the sociopathic tendencies nature bestowed upon him, courtesy of his unhinged mother Cathy, as well as the oppressive righteousness of his father, Adam, and the violent competitiveness of his uncle Charles. As if "walking the line" wasn't difficult enough, being born of two people who are the absolutes of the good and evil spectrum would certainly make life more difficult. Cal, in the book and the 1954 movie, is seen struggling with his society's expectations of his behavior and trying to create an identity separate from his parents, mostly by resisting his more malevolent impulses, or reshaping them. He uses his violence to fuel his passion for enterprise and his competitive nature to nourish his creativity. All of his attempts at "goodness" are rejected by his father, whom he is desperate to please. He can't seem to conform, like his brother Aron, and is punished for it, but it's not for lack of trying. Jeremy Leatham of Baylor University suggests in his piece from *East of Eden: New and Recent Essays*, titled "Out of Eden: Dualism, Conformity, and Inheritance in Steinbeck's 'Big Book'," that Cal's inability to earn his father's affections stems from Adam's damaging habit of imposing on both his sons "...expectations in a way that denies their individuality and reduces them according to his preconceived opinions" (128). As soon as Adam made the decision to love Aron more than Cal, even though it was probably an unconscious decision, he set Cal up for failure, and only Adam himself can change that, much to Cal's frustration and in spite of his best efforts. This forced dualism perpetrated by Adam will also ensure he is unable to understand Cal's capitalistic perspective after the climatic bean investment because he refuses to see any

reality other than the more idealistic one he's created in his head where people come before profit.

The morality of capitalism versus a more communist outlook is seen throughout *EoE*, and it could be argued that it depicts Steinbeck's own attempts to reconcile which was more right or more wrong in a time just before the United States deeply entrenched itself in the anti-communist camp, and wanted to warn people of the danger of that dualistic thinking. Mimi Reisel Gladstein, professor of English and Theatre Arts at the University of Texas at El Paso, has contributed to several anthologies analyzing Steinbeck and his works, including her contribution in *Capitalism and Commerce in Imaginative Literature: Perspectives on Business from Novels and Plays* edited by Edward W. Younkens. Her essay, titled "Steinbeck's Perspectives on Capitalism from *The Grapes of Wrath* to *East of Eden*," discusses Steinbeck's personal affiliations with communism in his early literary career, and how his mindset toward capitalism and big business changed as time went on. Steinbeck recognized the potential pitfall of capitalism that many businessmen throughout history have succumb to: greed for greed's sake. In her piece, Gladstein describes the vicious cruelty of those seeking profit in a capitalist America in *The Grapes of Wrath*, referring the reader back to a scene Steinbeck wrote where, in the name of keeping supply limited and prices high in a period of high demand, "all surplus fruits are dumped on the ground, squirted with kerosene and burned while a million hungry people are on the roads" (Gladstein & Younkens, 261). Truly a deplorable action that even the staunchest capitalist should feel uncomfortable defending; but, by the time he has crafted *EoE*, Steinbeck seems to come to appreciate these individuals are an exception, rather than the rule. He is so forgiving and willing to say "not all capitalists," that he features his own uncle and real-life, savvy businessman, Will Hamilton, in *EoE*, and depicts him in an overwhelmingly positive light.

Will, while representing a real person in Steinbeck's family, could have been written in a way that would have maintained Steinbeck's skepticism of honest, decent businessman. Instead, as Gladstein discovers, Will becomes a central figure in a community resistant to big business, and has close interactions with the fictional, central Trask family (Gladstein & Younkins, 264). He warns Adam against going into the refrigeration business and predicts exactly what ends up happening: a rotting disaster with crippling losses. Adam, ever the idealist and uninterested in the market for its own sake, ignores Will. Cal, however, does not, and eagerly agrees to be Will's partner in their bean venture when he asks Will to help him make money. Will Hamilton nurtures Cal's competitive nature in a more constructive manner, and Cal flourishes (Gladstein & Younkins, 265). Seeing capitalism encouraged through Steinbeck's writing shows readers that the writer himself grew to appreciate the shades of gray in economic theory.

Another analysis of Steinbeck's quest to find the best of capitalism and communism later in his life comes in the form of "'Nothing good was ever created by two men': Parallel Passages in Ayn Rand's *The Fountainhead* and John Steinbeck's *East of Eden*." Contributed by Virginia Tech's Shoshana Milgram Knapp and found in *John Steinbeck's Global Dimensions*, edited by Kyoko Ariki, Luchen Li, and Scott Pugh in response to the Sixth International Steinbeck Congress in Kyoto, Knapp's piece analyzes the similarities between both books as they discuss the superiority of individualism over collective action. While Steinbeck's earlier works championed the everyman and the power of collective movement, Knapp discusses how *EoE* presents ideas on individualism that closely align, even paraphrase, Ayn Rand's climactic speech in *The Fountainhead* (Milgram Knapp, Ariki, Li, & Pugh, 25). Taken from the beginning of chapter 13 of *EoE*, Steinbeck praises the creative genius of the individual, the erosion of that creativity through collectivism, and the urgent need, therefore, to protect individualism

(Steinbeck, 131). As Knapp notes, Rand's speech, given by her protagonist in the eleventh hour, describes these same ideas with strikingly similar language, and suggests throughout her work that, even if there was no strong personal relationship between Rand and Steinbeck, though they were contemporaries, Rand's work in *The Fountainhead*, which predates *EoE*, must have left a significant impression on Steinbeck as he went on to create his magnum opus (Milgram Knapp, Ariki, Li, & Pugh, 28). Whatever the case, it is clear Steinbeck saw the virtues and vices of communist theory as well, and was trying to remain as bipartisan about the two opposing factions as possible.

So then, how might Steinbeck's views of capitalism and its alternatives influence his discussions of good versus evil in *EoE*? There are certainly different reactions to the free market depending on which character is chosen. Cathy took advantage of the lawless West trope and murdered, blackmailed, and manipulated her way into a prime position on the black market. Adam attempted to take the moral high road, and innovate the market not for his own interest, as would be rational, but for the ideal of bettering mankind. Cal, and to an extent Will Hamilton, motivated by what casual readers would call greed and selfishness, actually take resources from a market where they achieve low utility, a war-free Salinas Valley, to a market where they achieve high utility, a war-torn and hungry Europe. These characters choose to participate in the market in different ways, motivated by different forces, and constrained by various degrees of ethical mindfulness. Their response to capitalism could be seen as their response to the presence of good or evil in their world. Classical economists argue that ethics and altruism do not directly affect the market, but behavioral economics tries to understand these other motivations that result in irrational decision making. Analyzing each character archetype in *EoE* through an economic

lens will further expand on the notion that good and evil fall on a spectrum, and that perfect market behavior is neither all good nor all evil.

Cathy Ames, also called Kate later in the novel, is not what one would consider to be a good person. She is, in the book and in every visual portrayal of her character, mentally unstable in an increasing degree as her life progresses. She is never officially diagnosed with any neurosis or mental illness, not like such a thing happened often, or at all, in that time, but Steinbeck makes it abundantly clear something is off about her from a very early age, calling her a monster as she commits various acts no child should even be remotely attuned to the nature of, not the least of which being setting her own house on fire and murdering her parents (Steinbeck, 71-85). So, yes, Cathy is not a paragon of virtue, is probably the most obviously amoral, sadistic, “did it just because they could” character ever penned, and seems to have no redeeming qualities whatsoever, but she can run a successful business with the best of them. The fact that she runs a brothel that she killed someone for ownership of notwithstanding, Cathy is extremely good at what she does. And her establishment is not the only one in Salinas, or even the only one on its street. Salinas has a very profitable prostitution ring and several owners keep houses and girls deceptively close to the town’s center. Once again turning to *East of Eden: New and Recent Essays*, but this time tapping Georgia State University’s Florian Schwieger and his piece “Mapping the Land of Nod: The Spatial Imagination of John Steinbeck’s *East of Eden*,” where he discusses how “the prostitution economy of the (early 20th) century is therefore... a highly specialized and accepted element of the urban service sector” (Schwieger, Meyer, & Veggian, 67). While not exactly legal, these places of debauchery have been granted a level of tolerance by the law and the general public because they fill a need no one else can. Any student of introductory economics worth their salt should be familiar with the idea of price ceilings and

black markets. If the government says to the suppliers of housing, in the interest of promoting social welfare, that they cannot charge rent above a set rate, and the natural market before the ceiling was operating at a higher equilibrium price than that set rate, the price may be driven down by the ceiling, but so does the number of legally supplied housing units and the quality of those units provided. There are now more people in need of housing than there are units legally available based on the new rate. Slum lords can then create a black market, charging higher prices than even the original equilibrium for very low quality, illegal housing to people desperate enough to pay whatever they are asked. This black market, while perhaps considered unethical, is filling a hole in the market that the market cannot fix on its own, thanks to legislation and the price ceiling. Cathy and the other brothel owners do the same thing with their girls. They fill a need the law makes impossible for the natural market to cater to. Cathy, for all her sociopathic tendencies and overall negative personal impact on other people's lives, came in to a market, recognized a potential for profitability in said market, and created a service that consumers would value at a higher price than it cost her to create that service, thereby creating producer surplus and increasing the economic "pie" of Salinas, no matter how many people frowned upon the moral degradation of the local men.

Adam is Cathy's equal and opposite reaction in all ways. She sees the vices of people and exploits them for personal gain and their potential detriment, while Adam stubbornly blinds himself to the impurities in people, and has no sense of competition to drive him to interact much with the market. Adam is what people would call a dreamer, and does not, as Leatham says later in his same piece from *East of Eden: New and Recent Essays*, "measure (himself) against others by standards of money" (Leatham, Meyer, & Veggian, 136). This would be all well and good, Adam would just live his life not really caring about money, and the other, more capitalistically-

minded people in his life would continue doing what they do while he plays with refrigeration. The point of contention arises because Adam refuses to accept the fact that just because he does not do things for money, does not mean no one else does. Adam buries his head in the sand to avoid the fact that he lives in a reality where people, more importantly people in his family, participate in a market to seek personal gain. Worse, if anyone does use the market for self-interested reasons, he is revolted by them, crippled by his coping mechanism of altruism and moral superiority. Adam arrives in Salinas Valley riding the high of being newly wed and leaving behind the depressing environment of his brother's farm. But he does not go to California to seek fortune or become an immensely successful farmer, instead he is trying to find paradise, his Eden, a place where he believes he can reclaim the innocence and moral wholesomeness that he lost during his youth, fighting in military campaigns he did not believe in and surviving living with a brother who resented him. When Cathy's resentment of his fever dream reaches its boiling point and she leaves, Adam receives a rude awakening. Perhaps the Eden he sought cannot be achieved, but he cannot quite let go of the prospect. Surely, even if his own life cannot have the perfect happiness he is after, he can still leave the world better than he found it. So, he starts playing with ice. He does not try and ship his lettuce cross-country so he can innovate the market and get fresh produce from a low-utility market in California to a high-utility, high price market in New York. He is very forthright with Cal when he refuses the gift of money at the Trask Thanksgiving: "And the lettuce – I don't think I did that for a profit. It was a kind of game to see if I could get the lettuce there, and I lost" (Steinbeck, 541). He was attempting to revolutionize the industry for his own entertainment and ideals about advancing mankind. This attempt at altruism proved, as it often does in economics, disastrous. The shipment runs into a series of delays and by the time it reaches New York, it is inedible. Adam

loses a large amount of his fortune, and though exactly how much is never disclosed, it is enough to set both of his sons on their misguided tracks to making up for it. Aron retreats into religion and academia, and Cal throws himself at the market with a vengeance.

Cal knows he has destructive, competitive tendencies, and the impulses and urges he gets scare him. After seeing what his mother does for a living and how she acts as a person in chapter 39, he is comforted that he is not exactly like her, and accepts the fact that: "If I'm mean, it's my own mean" (Steinbeck, 462). It is this meanness and its associated vices that keep him from being contented with life, and drive him to succeed. An interesting insight into this passion Cal possesses lies in an analysis of Steinbeck's use of *Timshel* in the novel. Steinbeck uses this phrase to demonstrate the constant choice to overcome evil, and Cal is the primary target of this concept, not because he has evil in him he must suppress, but more to show that he can learn to control it and use it for good. In his piece for 2015's second issue of *Steinbeck Review*, David Levin, avid Steinbeck fan and holder of a Ph.D. in Chemistry from Cambridge, describes how, per certain Jewish teachings, evil is a very useful thing in the creative process. His essay, *John Steinbeck and the Missing Kamatz in East of Eden: How Steinbeck Found a Hebrew Word but Muddled Some Vowels*, discusses how Steinbeck misspelled *Timshol* when transliterating Hebrew to come up with *Timshel*, but more importantly, talks about the creativity of evil. Levin explains that "this urge to wickedness can actually also have a beneficial influence if it is controlled. For, once harnessed and controlled, the (evil) contributes the motivation, drive, and passion to achieve and create." Similar to Steinbeck's rants in the beginning of Chapter 13 about the creative genius of the individual, and that there are forces in the world that are trying to kill that creativity, Levin insists "human-kind's greatest artistic, literary, and scientific achievements can in many cases be attributed to anguish and obsessive compulsion, driven by (evil), provided

it is controlled.” Cal uses the meanness inside him to achieve success in the market, and he hopes his success, his support of his brother, and constant attentiveness to his father will help him win some of Adam’s affection. That is why he goes into the bean venture with Will Hamilton. He explicitly tells Will he wants to use the money to buy his father’s affection (Steinbeck, 477).

There is no denying Cal enters the market fueled by self-interest, but it is not greed. The premise of the bean venture is that Cal and Will invest thousands of dollars in bean seeds. They sell these seeds to farmers in Salinas when the market for beans is only three cents a pound and promise anyone who signs a contract to pay five cents a pound for the mature plant. The farmers, seeing a two-cent profit, agree, sign the contract, and grow their beans, which they sell to Cal and Will, who then turn around and sell the produce to British exchange officers who want food for British and Allied soldiers fighting in World War I. These officers pay at least ten cents per pound, meaning Cal and Will make profit themselves. Everyone wins, though the wealth is not distributed equally. This is a classic example of the market connecting buyers and sellers to maximize utility. It also exemplifies a triumph over risk, since not only could the bean crop have failed, but also the price for the beans from the exchange office could have dropped below what Cal and Will spent on the seed, resulting in a loss. The fact that Adam rejects Cal’s offering of money made off the beans because he considers it stealing is unfortunate for Cal’s mental well-being, but is a misnomer of a perfectly rational use of classical economics. Cal’s self-interest does not make him a villain, even though he made more money off the venture than the farmers who actually grew the beans and his pursuit of wealth ostracizes him from the other people in his life, just as Adam’s disinterest in money does not make him a saint or any better than those who use war to make money. The market in and of itself is not a good or evil force, and the people who use it to maximize their own utility are neither good nor evil.

Analyzing how Cathy, Adam, and Cal all interact with the market in different ways for different reasons represents the archetypes of the good and evil spectrum. This is a reflection on their personalities, not the nature of the market itself, which just facilitates transactions for rational, self-interested people. Ethics and altruism are not necessarily the primary concern in classical economics, but behavioral economics branches into that side of irrational decision making that would explain someone like Adam and his interactions with the market and his reactions to other people who use it, like Cathy's abuse of a market hole and Cal's utility maximizing venture that makes money off of war. Steinbeck shows his own struggles with the pros and cons of capitalism and a more collectively-based system by demonstrating the extremes and the middle ground in these characters, and seeing that the extremes are not paths to take for lasting success, warns readers of subscribing to extreme trains of thought that reinforce society's dualistic views. If everyone in society chooses a camp and refuses to consider the possible virtues of the opposition is missing out on the possibility of bettering society as a whole. Good cannot thrive without evil to encourage it, and evil loses its poignancy if good is nonexistent. It's the grays, the middle ground, where the most vibrant shifts in society occurs, where the outliers and ostracized do their business. Society runs the risk of stagnating if it does not periodically evaluate what is good and evil and reassign virtues and vices. People still profit off of war a hundred years later, and that still upsets people. People still sell their bodies, which is illegal in a lot of places, but an understood event. People still dream and try to innovate an industry, ignoring warnings to leave well enough alone, and those innovations fall flat, and they still try innovation again and again because it wasn't ever about the money. These actions still exist, and the dichotomies that shape how society views them as "good" or "bad" still exist, despite Steinbeck's best efforts to get people to stop. Dichotomies still shape how people view their

world, and the question that remains is what sort of event must occur to get that mindset to change, if warnings are ignored or ineffectual. Or maybe humanity will continue to make decisions based on the power of two into perpetuity, as it has done throughout history up unto this point.

Works Cited

East of Eden. Dir. Elia Kazan. Perf. James Dean. Warner Bros., 1954.

Gladstein, Mimi Reisel. "Steinbeck's Perspectives on Capitalism from *The Grapes of Wrath* to *East of Eden*." *Capitalism and Commerce in Imaginative Literature: Perspectives on Business from Novels and Plays*. Ed. Edward W. Younkins. N.p.: Lexington, 2016. 259-69. Print.

Leatham, Jeremy S. "Out of Eden: Dualism, Conformity, and Inheritance in Steinbeck's 'Big Book'." *East of Eden: New and Recent Essays*. Ed. Michael J. Meyer and Henry Veggian. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013. 123-143. Print.

Levin, David. "John Steinbeck and the Missing Kamatz in *East of Eden*: How Steinbeck Found a Hebrew Word but Muddled Some Vowels." *Steinbeck Review* 12.2 (2015): 190-98. *Project MUSE*. Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

Milgram Knapp, Shoshanna. "'Nothing good was ever created by two men': Parallel Passages in Ayn Rand's *The Fountainhead* and John Steinbeck's *East of Eden*." *John Steinbeck's Global Dimensions*. Ed. Kyoko Ariki, Luchen Li, and Scott Pugh. N.p.: The Scarecrow Press, 2008. 25-38. Print.

Schwieger, Florian. "Mapping the Land of Nod: The Spatial Imagination of John Steinbeck's *East of Eden*." *East of Eden: New and Recent Essays*. Ed. Michael J. Meyer and Henry Veggian. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013. 59-86. Print.

Steinbeck, John. *East of Eden*. New York: Penguin, 2002. Print.

Steinbeck, John. *Journal of a Novel: The East of Eden Letters*. New York: The Viking Press,

1969. Print.

The Bible. New International Version. Biblica, 2011.

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

2. The second part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

3. The third part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.