

Spring 2019

Building Worlds Out of Inadequate Materials: Infrastructure and Affect in John Dos Passos' Manhattan Transfer and John Steinbeck's the Grapes of Wrath

David Scott Mathews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mathews, D. S. (2019). *Building Worlds Out of Inadequate Materials: Infrastructure and Affect in John Dos Passos' Manhattan Transfer and John Steinbeck's the Grapes of Wrath*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/5276>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

BUILDING WORLDS OUT OF INADEQUATE MATERIALS:
INFRASTRUCTURE AND AFFECT IN JOHN DOS PASSOS'
MANHATTAN TRANSFER AND JOHN STEINBECK'S *THE GRAPES OF
WRATH*

by

David Scott Mathews

Bachelor of Arts
The University of the South, 2009

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

English

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2019

Accepted by:

Catherine Keyser, Director of Thesis

Seulghee Lee, Reader

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by David Scott Mathews, 2019

All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I thank Claire Wang for making sure I stay healthy and focused during this arduous, incredible process. I thank Cat and Seulghee for their insight and care in helping me to give shape to this work. Finally, I extend that gratefulness outwards as far as my selfish imagination can conceive, to family and friends, and mentors, and the systems of accident and artifice that have brought all of us together.

ABSTRACT

The beginning of the 20th century in America featured the rapid economic and infrastructural development of New York City, recently dubbed the “second metropolis.” The technological advancements in electric power and automobility made it possible, and economically desirable, for a larger and larger community to have access to the promise of good fortune that being connected to the metropolis signified. The result of this promise was the formation of the subway system and the highway system. Both John Dos Passos’ *Manhattan Transfer* and John Steinbeck’s *The Grapes of Wrath* explore the space between these poles. In this essay I argue that these two novels explore how the infrastructural systems of the metropolis and the highway attempt to funnel human affects into desires that reinforce the power of capital and commerce. These affects, however, resist the desires reified by said structures, ultimately resulting in, for *Manhattan Transfer*, explosive rejection of the structures themselves or, for *The Grapes of Wrath*, reapplication of those structures for alternative modes of sociality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Hot Affect in the City.....	3
Chapter 3: Route 66: A Site for Sore I's.....	16
Chapter 4: Conclusion.....	30
Bibliography	31

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The academic narrative surrounding modernism and modern writers has conceptualized the movement as a turning inward, characterized by literary attempts to grapple with one's own subjectivity. This makes a measure of sense of course: psychoanalysis was coming into its own in the early 20th century, after all, and the emergence of gas-powered transportation and infrastructural technologies necessitated a new understanding of the individual's place in increasingly large and complex communities. And yet this was also an age where such systems presented an irresistible temptation for some authors to move away from those subjectivities in favor of those systems; after all, sociology as a field of academic study was also coming into its own.

However, in both cases, one thing was clear: the household as a unit of communal identity was compromised. The American dream no longer revolved around a mantel and terminated in a backyard; rather, the expansion of highway systems and proliferation of electric grids funneled American desires from the furthest reaches of the continental U.S. into the metropolis. This leads me to the question I wish to pose for my paper: how do modern writers imagine the circuits of desire that extend beyond the household? And how are the new infrastructural technologies that makes these expansions possible contextualized by writers interested in these transformations?

In considering these questions, I turn to two novels that, together, attempt to delineate the formations of desire and its affective repercussions both in the city and outside of it: these are John Dos Passos' *Manhattan Transfer* and John Steinbeck's *The*

Grapes of Wrath. The former is concerned with the circulations of desire and affect in the metropolis of Greater New York via the subway and the taxi, while the latter is concerned with said circulations on the road, specifically around Routes 66 and 99. These novels represent both relatively early meditations on their respective infrastructures and powerful literary considerations on their consequences. Interestingly, the characters in these novels seem to have little political recourse or historical context when trying to locate their subjectivity in these drastically altered landscapes, and they are left with the affective responses that seem to come unbidden from their desires and frustrations. Consequently this paper considers how infrastructures in the city and beyond are built in an attempt to regulate the affects of the characters in these novels. And yet, in both novels, these emergent technologies — the subway, the grid, and the highway — are used in ways that resist those regulations, providing a vital social backdrop where these affects can be explored and, ultimately, potentially playing an active role in exposing the inability of capitalism to satisfy desire. All of this is made possible by the affective economies that come out of their usage.

CHAPTER 2: HOT AFFECT IN THE CITY

On May 12, 1896, Governor of New York Levi Morton signed a bill that paved the way for seven independent municipalities, including what was then the city of Brooklyn, to be annexed by the municipality of New York City. This would nearly double the municipal area of what became known as Greater New York, and more than double its population. It is in this backdrop of municipal subsumption and metropolitan boom that Dos Passos' *Manhattan Transfer* introduces Ellen Thatcher, whose birth coincides with Morton's bill¹. One of the two main protagonists, Ellen's significance is inextricably tied to "the second metropolis" from birth. (11)

But what exactly does Greater New York signify, and for whom? As I have stated above, the promise of financial and social prosperity that the metropolis represented seemed more tantalizing than ever due to the new technologies in infrastructure that connected communities to the city center. What's more, there was speculation that the effect of the city doubling in both size and population would by virtue of the fact alone lead to a boom in property value and cultural capital, seemingly irrespective of the value of the properties annexed or cultures subsumed². In order for these communities to have any meaningful financial and cultural connections — that is, in order keep up with the

¹ "MORTON SIGNS THE GREATER NEW YORK BILL" (Dos Passos 11). The text is taken from the May 12, 1896 *NY Times*. See also: MILLIONS IN A UNION. (1896, May 12). *New York Times* (1857-1922).

² Governor Morton is quoted in the *Times* as saying that "the very fact of a municipality so largely increased in population and in boundaries will of itself advance the value of property, invite capital, enlarge commerce, and in innumerable other ways increase the potential power inherent in so large a community."

speculative bubble that was the metropolitan promise — the emergent technologies of the electric grid and the subway system were adopted by private companies hoping to cash in on the fervor. And yet, years before these technologies were fully functional, the promise of prosperity was on display for the world to see.

As far as for whom this siren calls, Dos Passos provides a diverse, seemingly unconnected, cast of characters, ranging from the upstate hick Bud Korpenning to the tomcatting lawyer George Baldwin, all of whom run the gamut in terms of social mobility and financial security. Trying to organize the paths of these subjectivities in a novel as complex and seemingly disorganized as *Manhattan Transfer* is as difficult as it is inviting, and scholars Cecelia Tichi and Alix Beeston have convincingly argued that the form of *Manhattan Transfer* invokes by synecdoche the movements of complex machinery, with characters representing, according to Tichi, “parts interchangeable³” (202). Beeston, in turn, expands on this conceit by trying to answer exactly what the purpose of the complex machine is (outside of representation of the city), with her answer being specifically to deconstruct Ellen and recreate her as an automaton⁴.

³ Tichi provides Dos Passos with the epithet of “writer-engineer” whose desire to unite modern technological and infrastructural aesthetics with his literary form inspired the structure of *Manhattan Transfer* (Tichi 201). In service to this argument, Tichi further claims that the characters in *Manhattan Transfer* are “replicable [...] each an everyman from a stock inventory” (202) in service to the aesthetics of machinery. While my own reading does not go so far as to say that there is “no individuation of character” (202), I find Tichi’s argument to be useful for interrogating the systems in the novel which attempt to streamline characters into types..

⁴ Beeston does an excellent job of elucidating how Dos Passos’ novel represents the object of desire at the center of the city as feminine, while the drive that propels is masculine: “Jimmy’s march ‘around blocks and blocks’ not only conveys the nonteleological tedium of his path but also shows the degree to which, in the block-by-block topography of its streets as in the ‘tinselwindowed’ architecture of its highrises, Dos Passos’s New York—and the narrative that encodes it—is gridded with girls” (Beeston 642). Building on Tichi’s argument, Beeston also qualifies the type of machine the city represents: a machinized Ellen, staged for all of New York to see by “the supervisory apparatus shared by the Follies stage, the industrial factory, and the modern city, according to which the body is oppressed and dominated in space. Just like a Follies girl, just like a factory worker, she becomes a machine as she is gazed at” (Beeston 647). In his considerations of the cityscape, Michel de Certeau notes that spatial mediation in the city works via

And yet I do not think it would be too literal to take the conceit further. What exactly fuels this machine? And, more importantly for my focus, how fuel-efficient is the machine? Certainly the logic of capital plays a significant role in forming the metropolis and determining communal paths, but I do not think the answer, for Dos Passos or Steinbeck, is that money fuels this machine, but rather that human beings do — more specifically, human affects. In *Manhattan Transfer*, these affects are indicated and explored specifically through metaphors of fire. It is through these metaphors that we can develop a stronger understanding of the affective lure of the metropolis, which in turn can give us a better understanding of Ellen and the infrastructures that mobilize her and those around her.

It is first worth noting that the kind of fire metaphor *Manhattan Transfer* is concerned with is not the arresting warmth of the hearth, but specifically the flame of combustion. The second chapter immediately negates the possibility for a fire that would arrest motion. After Ellen's birth, her father, Ed Thatcher, is alone in his New York apartment while his wife recuperates in the hospital. Being lonely, Ed performs an imagined conversation in front of, even with, the coal grate of his apartment:

“And dad wanted me to stay in his ole fool store in Onteora. Might have if it hadnt been for Susie Gentlemen tonight that you do me the signal honor of offering me the junior partnership in your firm I want to present to you my little girl, my wife. I owe everything to her.” In the bow he made towards the grate his

“synecdoche and asyndeton” (de Certeau 101), the former which we can see at work via the gridded girls that take part in Ellen's body, and the latter via the male gaze that breaks Ellen down into composite parts.

coat-tails flicked a piece of china off the console beside the bookcase. The head of the blue porcelain Dutch girl had broken off from her body⁵. (*MT* 11-12)

The grate itself presents an illusion of hearths past, which required those who would enjoy its warmth to feed it regularly, but the gas jet that “[purrs] comfortably like a cat” (11) is part of a larger system that requires no upkeep from Ed⁶. Finally, when Ed hears about a tenement fire a block away, the room becomes “stifling hot,” (12) which Ed associates with a “tingling to be out.” In contrast to the fire of the hearth, with its provision of stability and warmth, Ed associates the conflagration at the tenement with a “romancandle,” with its provision of unstable wonder and spectacle. The episode culminates in Ed running into a man whose clothes “smell of coaloil:” when Ed looks at the man’s face, a gaunt figure with “tallowy sagging cheeks and bright popeyes,” he is sure the man is “the firebug,” and Ed’s “hands and feet [go] suddenly cold.” (13)

The episode performs four distinct functions whose consequences are felt by the cast of *MT*. The first is that it ties desire for capital to bodily desire, as in Ed’s absolute devotion to his wife Susie’s wishes bringing him to the city. The second is that it dramatizes that the desire is unrealizable because the infrastructure of the city renders it

⁵ In *Racial Indigestion: Eating Bodies in the 19th Century*, Kyla Wazana Tompkins points out that the practice of speaking to a hearth is indicative of its roots as “a place of masculine reverie, as Vincent Bertolini has argued, [while] it is also [...] a site associated with comic orality.” (34) In this moment by himself, Ed’s performance betrays both his premodern, upstate conceptions of the hearth — indicated by his roots in Onteora — and its misplacement in the cityscape. What’s more, it is clear that, since he is speaking towards the coal grate, that locus becomes an imagined masculine audience. Ed is able to recuperate his sense of inferiority and alienation in the city by speaking to the grate. And yet the apartment is simply too small to accommodate his sweeping gestures and his boastful rhetoric.

⁶ To his credit, Dos Passos does not leave it at that in *Manhattan Transfer*. While staring out the window of his apartment, a young Jimmy Herf witnesses a “[furnaceman] who stood [...] with his bare grimy arms crossed over his chest.” (67) We are undoubtedly meant to recall Ed’s naivete in personifying the steam that heats his home, unaware of the work that is placed on the shoulders of unseen bodies. Tompkins traces the practice of forgetting the labor involved in fueling the body of the house to the separation of the hearth into the living room and kitchen: “the emergence of the kitchen as a newly separate and abject space [from the parlor] coeval with the increasingly class-stratified American culture meant that the kitchen became that space in the middle-class home most closely associated with class difference.” (*RI* 43)

impossible, as in Ed's humorous yet foreboding gesture that breaks the porcelain doll. The third is that it redirects the affective force of the desire towards the metropolis itself, as in Ed's running out into the night to be part of the crowd. And the fourth is that it demonstrates how overwhelming affective force ends up breaking down the very infrastructure that attempts to harness it, as in the tenement fire caused by the firebug⁷. I believe that Dos Passos is not only accurately portraying infrastructural dangers associated with tenement living⁸, but also locating strong affective forces that fuel the city's infrastructure in the homes of these subaltern communities. The firebug is a prime example of a subject whose affective drive has overwhelmed political and communal desire. Ed's desires, being still governed by social and personal goals, feel cold by comparison, which is why his hands and feet go numb. Ed never recovers from this initial experience of facing the overwhelming destructive force of the firebug, spurred on by the very desires that the city provokes out of individuals; by contrast, his homely desires, represented by his absolute devotion to his wife — even after her death — and daughter make him an outsider in the metropolis. The last we see of Ed, he is heading to Spring Lake, New Jersey for vacation alone, having failed to convince Ellen to come with him (*MT* 169).

Manhattan Transfer, then, is a novel obsessed not just with the routes and circulations that new technologies make available to communities, but also with the

⁷ Being “narrowwindowed” (12) and assuming the 1896 timeline, this was probably a dumbbell tenement, a poorly regulated fire hazard of a building whose windows, according to historic building preservationist Andrew Dolkart, often looked out into shafts that did little more than serve as trash chutes or, calamitously, “flues in a fire.” (“Living Together”)

⁸ Dolkart points out that even though “laws mandated that there be a fire escape on a building [and] that it have a strong, fireproof party wall [...] little else was mandated, and even those rules that were on the books were largely ignored by owners because there was no way of making sure that these rules were followed.” (“Living Together”)

affective responses that these technologies make possible. It is through these responses that Dos Passos exposes the false promise of the metropolis.

Since Dos Passos makes a point of Ellen and Greater New York sharing a birthday, it is worth meditating on how the novel follows up on its presentation of the city as a site of masculine desire for the feminine form, as well as how this desire is deconstructed by Jimmy in particular. Since Dos Passos makes a point of Ellen and Greater New York sharing a birthday, it is worth meditating on how the novel follows up on its presentation of the city as a site of masculine desire for the feminine form, as well as how this desire is deconstructed by Jimmy in particular. Dos Passos' description of Jimmy dancing with Ellen render Jimmy completely unable to govern his emotions, and he seems to lose his very sense of self:

His arm was like plaster when he put it round her to dance with her. High ashly walls broke and crackled within him. He was soaring like a fireballoon on the smell of her hair [...] He was crumbling plaster with something that rattled achingly in his chest, she was an intricate machine of sawtooth steel whitebright bluebright copperbright in his arms. (*MT* 193-4)

In this description, Jimmy's flimsy internal structure is no match for Ellen's renovational influence. His chest, which stands in for his desires, protest the renovations, but they too give in to Ellen, and as easily as that Jimmy's ambitions to be a wartime correspondant (193) are redirected toward Ellen. And yet Jimmy is given the unique ability to evaluate this moment later and remark on the ubiquity of this kind of desire in the city: "obsession of all the beds in all the pigeonhole bedrooms, tangled sleepers twisted and strangled like the roots of potbound plants" (200). Importantly, Jimmy's musings stress the importance

of the boundaries which make these desires so similar: the plants being “potbound” causes their strangulation, and the bedrooms being like “pigeonholes” force the gaze in one direction. By regulating the spaces of living, the city can regulate the desires of its inhabitants.

Nothing encapsulates the association of capital with desire than Jimmy’s encounter with a man named Tony. After his affective overload in the presence of Ellen — and not having enough money to take a taxi — Jimmy decides to hoof it home with Tony in tow. As a character, Tony is unimportant and is introduced merely as an “arm [that hooks] into [Jimmy’s]” (197). In fact, it seems as though Tony’s character comes into being only because Jimmy cannot pay for a cab. Not only that, the setting itself (the middle of the night in the pouring rain in Brooklyn) makes it possible for Tony Hunter confesses to Jimmy that he is gay. As they walk in the rain, Tony mentions that he “used to think [Jimmy] were like [him]” (198). There has been no point in *Manhattan Transfer* where Jimmy intimated his sexuality until this chapter: the only indications we have about Jimmy are that his ambitions run counter to the capitalist desire for wealth⁹. In fact, the reason Tony is confused is because sexual desire for women is subsumed into metropolitan desires and converted into desire for the city. Jimmy’s ambitions are not tied to the “revolving doors grinding out his years like sausage meat” (101), representing the normative metropolitan path that his Uncle Jeff plans for him. Importantly, Jimmy points out that “there’s lots of people in the same boat. The stage is full of them” (198). But Tony’s sexuality, like everyone else’s in *Manhattan Transfer*, is tied to his subject

⁹ When accused by his down-on-his-luck cousin, Joe Harland, of not “going anywhere [because of his] attitude”, Jimmy replies he “doesn’t want to get anywhere”; and yet, when accused of not being ambitious, he retorts “I didn’t say I wasn’t ambitious” (209). Of course, any ambition that is not associated with motion in the metropolis is dead on arrival.

position within the metropolis — he has “worked hard to get where [he] is”. To further connect Tony’s sexual despair to the city, he completely shuts off when Jimmy places the cause to “all the hushdope about sex” (199). The goodness of sexuality is not in question in Tony’s mind, and nor is the function of the capital that gives form to the city; instead of continuing to walk with Jimmy, he opts to wait in the subway station despite having “to wait hours for a train”. The transportation system is not functioning for Tony in his moment of affective outbreak, but he cannot abandon it. The desire of the city is proven false, and yet the subway that was built out of that desire keeps Tony dry. On the other hand, Jimmy is all too happy to cool down after being overtaken by his desire for Ellen. Jimmy’s position toward the city is similarly antagonistic, leading him ultimately to abandon it entirely.

We have seen how the city responds to outsiders coming in via Ed, and we have determined that Dos Passos’ city is connected to masculine desire for the feminine form. What, then, do we make of Bud Korpenning, a man whose wanderings seem not to fall into that kind of desire? Bud is obsessed with trying “to get to the center of things” (*MT* 4), a desire seemingly associated with having been denied the warmth of his former home by his abusive father, whom Bud killed by “[mashing] his head in with the grubbinhoe [...] like when you kick a rotten punkin.” (103) With no return possible, Bud desires a fresh start. Importantly, Bud mentions how, when he was young, he and his childhood flame would “talk about how we’d come to New York City and git rich,” (103) tying his initial movement to New York City (as opposed to another city or state) to the same impetus as Ed’s desire to please his wife, and ultimately to desire fueled by the feminine form.

But he quickly learns in the city that there is no center for him. In his attempts to find the arresting warmth of a hearthfire¹⁰, Bud instead is forced to participate in the propulsive combustion of the engine. After finding no rest in the Great White Way, Bud wanders aimlessly, shoveling coal, working at a kitchen, and attempting both social and sexual intercourse¹¹.

Whatever remnants of Bud's former hopes that he entertains disappear entirely when he, automatically, offers to load coal for a woman. (54) The exchange begins cordially, and it seems as though the woman respects Bud's upstate roots. She shares with him her lamentation that "fine strong men leave the farms and come into the cities" and even feeds him. But the fare is not up to standards: "a plate of cold stew [...] half a loaf of stale bread and a glass of milk that was a little sour." (54-5) It is little more than fuel for his wanderings, for, to add insult to injury, she then only pays Bud a quarter of what she had originally offered him, crying "ingratitude" when he protests and threatening to call the police. Bud is then forced to run away, using his newfound sustenance for locomotion: "something flamed and glowed like the sunset seeping through his body" (55). After escaping, Bud is only grateful that he doesn't throw up the subpar food he had no choice but to eat: "thank Gawd I aint agoin to lose it."

In the coal episode, Bud is both allowed to play out his fantasy of providing for a family and then expelled forcefully from that fantasy. By loading coal into the house of a

¹⁰ Special attention is given to the state of Bud's feet as he wanders about the city. When he first gets off the ferry, he pays extra for a shoe shine. (*MT* 15) Yet as his wanderings find no terminus, his feet become more and more automated, until he moves "with the laces flickering around his shoes," as though he were a firework (*ibid* 104). I draw the conclusion that Bud's humanity is tied to his desires to remain comfortable in one place, which is exemplified by the hearth.

¹¹ In particular, Bud's short stint working at a kitchen forces him to grapple with his roots as an upstate potato farmer being all but erased, and even his white identity being called into question. While sorting through the dirty dishes, Bud himself states that "this ain't no job for a white man." (36) See Tompkins in footnote 5.

woman — with no man in sight — Bud is taking on the mantle of the man of the house. This is his very first entrance into the domestic sphere in *Manhattan Transfer*, and the woman herself is aware of the potential for danger at this intrusion: “you’re probably a burglar’s accomplice, but I cant help it I’ve got to have that coal in Come in my man” (54). The woman appears helpless and needs Bud’s masculine strength, calls him “my man”, lets him in, and prepares a meal for him. For a moment, Bud is again connected to his initial dreams of being a husband who provides for a wife and lives in domestic bliss. It is the woman who initiates his removal by placing the quarter in his hand, “with his mouth [still] full.” (55) His dream to get to the center of things, the domestic hearth, is shattered for a song. The furnace that he ensured would not want for coal consumes his desires as well.

His hopes crushed, Bud is left only with the affects that fueled them. In his final scene, Bud begins feeling cold and desperately “[wants] to stop trembling” (102). Suddenly the affective force that was driving his wanderings flare up without their outlet. He ends up confessing the murder of his father and working himself up to the point that the man he is speaking to in the flophouse warms that he will “[go] blooy if [he keeps] up like this” (103). While on the bridge where Bud jumps to his death, he loses control of his desires completely, which take off in a fantastic crescendo: “In a swallowtail suit with a gold watchchain and a red seal ring riding to his wedding beside [his childhood flame], riding in a carriage to City Hall with four white horses to be made an alderman by the mayor [....] Alderman Bud riding in a carriage full of diamonds with his milliondollar bride.... Bud is sitting on the rail of the bridge” (105). Right before Bud leaps, the narration declares that “the windows of Manhattan have caught fire”. Bud’s suicide

participates in the acts of arson that litter the novel: both are fueled by affective forces that have outgrown their metropolitan outlets or exposed them as false.

Like Bud and here are a multitude of characters whose city wanderings seem to revolve around Ellen; however, only Stanwood Emery possesses an affective force capable of resisting, and even dominating, the promise that a relationship with Ellen offers. And Stan is crazy. A man who was born on third base, Stan's primary desire seems to be to head to the dugout and have a drink. A man who recklessly spends his father's wealth on staying in motion and staying drunk, Stan's own movements are better in tune with the composite desires of the metropolitan dream than anyone else's. As a result, his every action seems to underscore the falsehood instantiated in the metropolis. As Stan says: "why the hell does everybody want to succeed? I'd like to meet somebody who wanted to fail. That's the only sublime thing" (148). To be clear, Stan has not come to this conclusion through careful philosophical and social inquiry, but through his intuitive understanding of infrastructure itself. So great is his affinity for the inanimate objects that give motion and direction to animate forms that he names his car Dingo (150), dances with a chair (183), and privately exclaims "Kerist I wish I was a skyscraper" (214). Most tellingly, the narration of the scene of his death is replete with personification of the objects in the apartment, including his lock actively trying to prevent Stan from coming into his apartment¹². This intimate relationship with the objects of New York City lead Stan to the teleological conclusion that infrastructure, and the

¹² Chapter VII is chock full of inanimate objects being treated as though they were animate: Stan witnesses to a ferry while the city offers a "rasp and a humming" (212), and, in the apartment, rather than Stan throwing the furniture, we get descriptions of "the chair [wanting to fly]", "the china closet [jumping] on the table", and terrifyingly "the kerosene [licking] him with a white cold tongue" (214). People, on the other hand, are referred to in dehumanizing ways, e.g. "a thicket of fists" or "upturned faces like a load of melons" (212-13).

money put into it, moves toward its own destruction: “A thousand dollar fire, a hundredthousand dollar fire, a million dollar fire. Skyscrapers go up like flames, in flames, flames”. At no point does the narration here veer from the assumed wishes of the apartment to be set alight; it is as if Stan’s narration conceives of the apartment complex itself as a failure of the promise of capital to live up to its hype. The apartment, after all, is a living space that makes living closer to the center possible and at the same time denies its own centrality. The only thing that Stan provides is the flame itself, both the affective force that brings inanimate objects seemingly to life and the release of energy as the infrastructure that tries to convert this energy into capitalist desire fails to contain it.

Stan, then, presents the limitations of the city more starkly than any other character, both by his ability to spend money indefinitely and his exposure of the affective inadequacy in the act of spending. He pours money into objects, which, like the skyscraper he wishes he were, seem to rise upward endlessly without finding equilibrium. It is no surprise that, according to his wife-of-a-week Pearline, he “wants to be an architect” (215). But where does this intimacy come from? I had mentioned previously that he merely “intuits” it, but, if we consider Ellen to work synecdochically with the metropolis (a la Beeston), then we should consider why Ellen is attracted to Stan to begin with, this being his brown skin and musculature¹³. While it may be possible that this is meant merely to highlight his difference with Ellen’s other admirers, I believe it more directly recalls the descriptions of the subaltern groups that shovel coal and perform the labor that keeps the infrastructure running. These groups are most directly associated

¹³ Ellen mentions the color of Stan’s skin nearly every time she comes in contact with it (e.g. *MT* 128). Even Jimmy chides Stan for using what he calls “nigger-talk,” (149) a response to Stan suggesting that Jimmy to make good his desire to “[set] off a bomb under the Times Building”, as well making fun of Jimmy for being afraid of acting on his desires.

with the powerful affects that destroy New York infrastructure¹⁴. For Ellen, Stan effectively represents a longed-for harmony between those that accrue and spend capital and those that labor to give physical shape to that spending. Later, when Ellen attempts to keep Stan from watching an apartment fire, (183) he denies that any such harmony exists: not even Ellen, the representative of the metropolitan *telos*, can harness his affective energy, and he complains that Ellie is “sore at [him]” (182).

¹⁴ Besides those already mentioned in this paper, others include Anna Cohen, a textile worker who is horribly burned in a factory (337) and the third firebug, who is black and whose arms are compared to “broken cables” after being brutalized by the police (97).

CHAPTER 3: ROUTE 66: A SITE FOR SORE I'S

The infrastructure in Dos Passos' *Manhattan Transfer* completely participates in the culture of the city itself: it may even be argued that the infrastructure is the single most important influencer of behavior in the novel, and the result gives a sense of what it means to be a Dos Passos New Yorker. In other words, even Bud becomes as much part of the metropolis as anyone. This unity of purpose is the reason that the infrastructure hijacks a multiplicity of human desires so effectively yet is unable to govern many of the human affects, which ultimately short-circuit the systems. But there is neither one city nor one state that can claim ownership of route 66: the system cuts across those borders¹⁵. What's more, in this early stage of American automobility, there was not yet a unified ideological push surrounding highways, as would occur in cold war America¹⁶. It is only logical, therefore, that the identities of those making use of the highway cannot so easily be subsumed into one particular culture. This is where Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* can offer insight on how these infrastructures must necessarily result in different kinds of

¹⁵ As the U.S. National Park Service states, "the path of Route 66 was a cobbling together of existing local, State, and national road networks" ("The Origin of Route 66"). As the route became more widely used, federally funded improvements to the road encouraged both more travel and commerce along its path (ibid). At the time Steinbeck's characters travel to California, route 66 would have been well established as a site for relatively convenient travel.

¹⁶ In "Crafting Autonomous Subjects", Cotten Seiler describes the process of giving a "propaganda function" to the Interstate Highway System (Seiler 71) in the struggle against communist ideology. This system intended to encourage praise of individuality within a collective corporate identity (ibid 90). Obviously, the Interstate Highway system is put into place well after route 66 had been established, but Seiler's argument implies that the highway itself had not yet been located as a site for propagating national ideologies before the existential communist threat inspired it. The highway, then, was a site of comparatively unregulated signification during the Joads' journey to California.

use, though still running on the same affective fuel. These different usages effectively circulate in what Sara Ahmed calls “affective economies,” systems of affect that “stick” to certain associations, even as they “slide” between bodies (Ahmed 120).

Every character in *MT* is subject to the infrastructural shackles of the metropolis that results in affective overload, while the characters in *GoW* develop alternative affective economies that exist alongside capital but are not necessarily subsumed by it. The municipality of Dos Passos’ Greater New York is the singularity that capitalist desires flow towards via the infrastructures that are mobilized by diverse human affects. Steinbeck’s Route 66, on the other hand, does not have such control over the direction desires flow. In fact, Steinbeck’s characters make wonderfully creative use of the municipal systems that attempt to connect region to the metropolis, and the manifold attempts to regulate their movements vary greatly in their results.

The form of Steinbeck’s novel can be split into two discrete parts: the narration of systems and the exploration of those systems by the characters. The system-narration parts, often called the “interchapters”, feature a narrator who attempts to trace the causes and effects of the migratory movements of the Okies. This narrator’s aetiological bent and moralizing tone¹⁷ contrast greatly with the impersonal, descriptive narrator that follows the movements of the Joads themselves. It is important to set these two narrators apart from each other for my reading, because the totalizing narrative of the one does not have control over the rhizomatic potentiality of the other. And yet, while I am more interested in the affects produced in the latter, I also recognize the importance of the former in setting up a reading of affect in this novel, for the former does provide the

¹⁷ Peter Valenti has pointed out that the style of what he calls the “intercalary” chapters (which I have called the interchapters) recall “the traditions of nineteenth-century naturalists” such as Aldo Leopold (Valenti 93).

scope required to consider the economies of affect that the infrastructures of routes 66 and 99 make possible. One might even say that they provide the infrastructure for such a conversation.

To set up the infrastructural/affective conceit in *The Grapes of Wrath*, I explore two of the systems-narration chapters, with the first being the tortoise's crossing in chapter three. In this episode, the narrator's description of the animal and vegetable life is replete with potential energy associated with what the narrator calls "the anlage of movement¹⁸" (14).

sleeping life waiting to be spread and dispersed, every seed armed with an appliance of dispersal, twisting darts and parachutes for the wind, little spears and balls of tiny thorns, and all waiting for animals and for the wind, for a man's trouser cuff or the hem of a woman's skirt.

Despite the common factor of being equipped with such appliances, the description of the vegetable life is quite varied in how these appliances facilitate movement. We can imagine that this 'anlage' does not present a particular form or expression, but instead propagates in myriad ways. When the chapter describes the animal life, there is a similar celebration of variety within the immediate locale of the roadside — the list includes

¹⁸ While the term 'anlage' is generically used in biology, I believe that Steinbeck's particular usage probably comes from Alfred Adler, who, in 1908, while "searching for a principle that would unify psychological and biological phenomena and still fall within the framework of an acceptable instinct theory," theorized "the aggressive drive [...] a unitary-instinct principle in which the primary drives, whatever they might be, lose their autonomy and find themselves subordinated to this one drive" (Dennen). Adler believed that "the aggressive instinct [was] was the biological 'Anlage', or source, of psychic energy utilized when individuals overcome their organic inferiorities through compensation." Aggression obviously plays an important role in the Joads' journey to and through California, and the novel spends a lot of time theorizing where the aggression comes from. Interestingly, the term 'anlage' comes up only twice in the novel: the one above connotes the generic biological usage, while the other in chapter 14 is specifically associated with the cause of aggression: "Keep these two squatting men apart; make them hate, fear, suspect each other. Here is the anlage of the thing you fear" (Steinbeck 151). Steinbeck's instinct to associate biological phenomena with psychological phenomena aligns with Adler's own project.

“ants and ant lions, [...] grasshoppers,” until finally settling on the aforementioned “land turtle¹⁹.”

At first, the description of the tortoise crossing focuses on the danger and toil of crossing the road (15). The description itself is painfully detailed and invites the reader to empathize with the creature. However, what happens next is both a stark reminder of the dangers of crossing the highway and a hopeful augury of the potential energy that can be released from the dangerous encounters thereafter. The tortoise is nearly killed twice by vehicles taking the highway: one is “a sedan driven by a forty-year-old woman,” another a “light truck” driven by a man. The woman swerves so as not to hit the tortoise, nearly crashing in the process: “two wheels [lift] for a moment.” But the man actively “[swerves] to hit” the creature, and his “front wheel [strikes] the edge of the shell, [flipping] the turtle like a tiddly-wink, [spinning] it like a coin, and [rolling] it off the highway.” Seemingly unharmed, and now safely on the other side of the road, the tortoise continues his journey, but not before effectively planting the wild oat seeds that were stuck in his shell (16).

In this episode, we first have the road itself, whose presence has already altered the animal and vegetable life around it. Second, we have a character, the tortoise, whose direction runs counter both to the desired infrastructural flow and whose body becomes, by accident, a vehicle for the strange movement of the weeds that have for so long taken advantage of human commerce. Third, we have the vehicles that flow with the

¹⁹ In “A Journal, the Turtle, and the Interchapters,” Susan Shillinglaw notes that Steinbeck was especially happy with this chapter (Shillinglaw 35). Shillinglaw also intimates that the tortoise episode sets up the scope of and purpose of the interchapters as a whole: “the slow reader recognizes the significance of both the turtle and the emblematic seed he sows.” (ibid) The interchapters certainly provide brief moments of reflection and careful consideration of the Joad episodes and their import, though I would argue that they do not take full control over interpretation of those episodes.

infrastructure reacting to the tortoise's alternative path, both rejecting the tortoise's presence either by avoidance at all cost or annihilation. Fourth, we have the unintended consequence of the latter encounter, which actually accelerates the tortoise towards his goal of crossing the street. Finally we have the return to the vegetable world, with the ecosystem both altered by the tortoise's unorthodox journey and yet re-established by it.

It is an easy thing to connect this chapter to the wanderings of the Joads. The tortoise, being slow and unwieldy, carrying precious cargo (the tortoise's subjectivity²⁰ and the seed) along a dangerous path where its presence seems to call into question what the highway is actually meant to do, i.e. facilitate the exchange of goods and the profitability of commerce, is not unlike the jalopies that transport the Okies toward California. But what are the politics of fear and aggression that force the woman who sees the tortoise to nearly die in trying to avoid it, or the man to accidentally help in trying to destroy it? How does the infrastructure itself enable these diverse interactions to exist alongside each other?

Both route 66 and the metropolis make it impossible for those just entering their premises to maintain the habits and conceptions that had constituted their subjectivities. As previously stated, *MT*'s Bud Korpenning has his desired masculine ability to provide heat and food for a family challenged by being forced to wander the streets of New York until he explodes. And certainly the Joads have this done to them as well, though not on

²⁰ Colleen Boggs traces a historical connection between human, animal subjectivities, and pedagogy in western liberal tradition to John Locke: "Locke sets up an analogy by which parents' treatment of their children mirrors children's treatment of animals; this analogy functions as a literal chain of creaturely hierarchy by which the more powerful exercise control over the less powerful and [...] as a chain of metaphoric substitutions by which each component of the chain represents the other." (Boggs 139) Boggs maintains that the affects generated from this chain of being necessitate its organizational rupture, with animals, children, and adults switching positionality, especially in poetry and fiction (ibid 143). We can see a similar unsettling occurring in the tortoise episode of *The Grapes of Wrath*.

the same terms (more on this later). But, as the tortoise episode foregrounds, the first lesson of the road is one taught via roadkill. In fact, having been set up by the tortoise's brush with death, the politics of roadkill serves not only to underline the precarity that life on the highway entails, but specifically to call into question the habits of homemaking that the Joads had grown used to in Sallisaw. Particularly noteworthy is young Winfield's reaction to the Joads' dog being run over on the highway:

“Winfield gloried in the scene. He said boldly, ‘his guts was just strowed all over — all over’ — he was silent for a moment — ‘strowed — all — over,’ he said, and then he rolled over quickly and vomited down the side of the truck. When he sat up again his eyes were watery and his nose running. ‘It ain’t like killin’ pigs,’ he said in explanation.” (132)

The youngest children in the Joad family, Ruthie and Winfield bore witness to the slaughter of the young pigs before the Joads left. What makes this slaughter different? Notice Winfield does not say *why* exactly it isn't like killing pigs, and his refrain that the guts are “strowed all over” is not more gruesome than Steinbeck's description of the pig slaughter: “the black blood made two trails in the dust” (105). What's more, Winfield's initial response to the scene resists empathizing with the creature, and so I find it difficult to believe that the difference in species relationship is the *only* reason Winfield's response is so mixed. I believe that the difference primarily resides in the unfamiliar structure of the road itself. Winfield would never empathize with a pig being slaughtered because the social norms in Sallisaw do not afford him the opportunity to do so, but those social norms no longer act as a barrier against these potential changes in subject positioning. Ruthie and Winfield's exuberant reactions to “killin' pigs *and* goin' to

California” is followed by a macabre mime by Winfield of a pig being slaughtered:

“Winfield was reduced to madness. He stuck his finger against his throat, made a horrible face, and wobbled about, weakly shrilling “I’m a ol’ pig [...] Look at the blood, Ruthie!” (103, emphasis in text) It is clear from the narration, as far as the children are concerned, the focus here is on the reactions the pig slaughter produces in the children, rather than on its use value. For the children, the road is a classroom where they can re-evaluate their relationships to the animal kingdom, and by extension to social systems they had taken for granted.

We can further place how the politics of roadkill influence the novel by turning to Ruthie and Rose of Sharon’s reaction to the event, both of which resonate with other parts of the novel. Ruthie comes across the grisly scene after finding “sof’ eggs” in the cornfield (131). After “inspecting [the dog],” Ruthie “[throws away] the gray reptile eggs in her hand” (131). In this moment, Ruthie’s subject position recalls the tortoise from chapter 3 (itself a reptile), the carrier of the bearded oat seeds, but Ruthie rejects her cargo. Seeing the dead dog, she conjectures that survival requires selfishness, and later in the novel, she is publicly shamed by children in the Weedpatch Camp for trying to force her way into the group’s game of croquet (317-8). Rose of Sharon, on the other hand, experiences a moment of extreme empathy when the dog is hit: “I felt it hurt. I felt it kinda jar when I yelled.” (130) Her husband, Connie, intervenes in this moment, assuring her that “it wasn’t nothin’” (130) and reinforcing the primacy of their relationship as a couple. This normative sociality, however, is entirely broken by the trials of the road, and Connie leaves. And yet Rose of Sharon’s compassion remains at the end of the novel; having miscarried, she chooses to breastfeed an middle-aged man who is starving in an

abandoned barn: “her hand moved behind his head and supported it. Her fingers moved gently in his hair.” (455) In this, the final moment of the novel, Rose of Sharon’s compassion, stripped of its social context, resonates with an affective force that yields a new form of sociality²¹. And the conditions of possibility for this new sociality were structured by the strangeness of route 66.

If the road has taught the Joads that their subject position is as precarious as the roadkill that litters the highway, how does that lesson apply to interhuman social and class formations? Certainly, the things that they had taken for granted before (the sacrifice of animals for sustenance or entertainment) is a lesson which can be applied to their interactions with people, and chapter 19 of *The Grapes of Wrath* in particular illustrates Steinbeck’s narrative conception of social formations as they apply to the American journey west — both in history and in the Okie migration. In chapter 19, the narrator traces a history of how European settlers began to identify as Americans by virtue of their ability to take land from others and, by producing crops on the land, claim ownership of it. The narrator begins with the Americans — for that is what they called themselves — “[pouring] in” to California, then a territory of Mexico (231). The Americans were able to do this because “the Mexicans were weak and fed” (231). Having “[stolen] Sutter’s land,” Americans proceeded to become more and more comfortable with the process of selling their goods, until this became the primary motivation for land ownership. The narrator then declares that, “farming [having become] industry [...] the owners followed Rome, although they did not know it. They imported slaves, although

²¹ It is worth noting, however, that Rose of Sharon does insist that everyone leave the barn before she breastfeeds the man (454). These moments where habits associated with former modes of living qualify the revolutionary modes of living imbue the novel with its own affective force and exemplify Steinbeck’s artistry in worldbuilding.

they did not call them slaves: Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Filipinos. They live on rice and beans, the business men said” (232). From this historical perspective, the narrator naturally moves to the eventual enslavement (though not called such) of the Okies, who, despite rallying around their identity (which is itself in the process of being deconstructed), are still the “dispossessed” (233). The narrator then forebodingly predicts the eventual uprising of the Okies, who have recovered the fierceness of the original takers of Californian land:

Our people are good people; our people are kind people. Pray God some day kind people won't all be poor. Pray God some day a kid can eat. And the associations of owners knew that some day the praying would stop. And there's the end. (239).

In *The Nature of California : Race, Citizenship, and Farming Since the Dust Bowl*, Sarah Wald argues that the crux of this chapter is dependent on the Okies' self-identification as white, and therefore deserving of land²². And while it may seem that this chapter, with its epic historical scope and moralizing tone, does seem to reify American exceptionalism, the language and logic of affect have primacy over any particular identity. And the lesson of roadkill still applies. Take, for example, the words ‘pouring’ and ‘stole’ to describe those initial Americans who went to California. It is difficult to imagine that the narrator is speaking from any other perspective than the Mexicans who are being invaded when using those words. Furthermore, it is a small step to contextualize the import of “slaves” to California to pick crops to the ‘han’bills’ used to lure the Okies out west in the first place, with their “cars [crawling] out like bugs” (200).

²² According to Wald, “farming becomes a site through which to reify whiteness as synonymous with land ownership and citizenship” (Wald 65). Wald supports this conceit using the American championing of Jeffersonian agrarian ideals, which contrast with the business owners’ farming practices that displaced the Okies to begin with and render it impossible for them to cultivate land purposely allowed to go to seed.

If we read the Joad family as having lost their whiteness, we are encouraged to consider what that whiteness is based on. And while it may be that there is a reification of European hunger for land, the slipperiness of subjectivities in this novel argue against any kind of essentialism outside of the anlage of movement. If we take chapter 19 to be a narration-of-systems chapter, then it seems to me that the function of the chapter is to trace an aetiology of American affective economies. Keep in mind that, in the previous chapter, a migrant returning east introduces Tom to the pejorative term ‘Okie’: “Well, Okie use’ ta mean you was from Oklahoma. Now it means you’re a dirty son-of-a-bitch. Okie means you’re scum. Don’t mean nothing itself, it’s the way they say it” (205-206). The stranger starts by explaining what it “use’ta mean”, and then moves on to what it means “now”. Having seen that the two meanings simply do not share any real connection, he concludes that it has no intrinsic value to it: “don’t mean nothing itself”. This stranger comes to the same kind of conclusion that Sara Ahmed does when she states that “emotions may only seem like a form of residence as an effect of a certain history” (Ahmed 119). In light of this confusing residential displacement, Tom is baffled, as he will be again when he hears about the derogatory term “red” (298).

Land ownership, then, is in fact tied to whiteness, but not because one becomes white when one owns land, but because neither has any permanent residency: both can be as easily displaced as the term Okie, which once determined place, but now determines no-place. We are meant to understand that whiteness cannot be reclaimed because its very existence has been exposed as fickle. As early as chapter 6, Casy prepares Tom for this realization: “Fella gets use’ *to a place*, it’s hard to go [...] Fella gets use’ *to a way of thinkin’*, it’s hard to leave. I ain’t a preacher no more, but all the time I find I’m prayin’,

not even thinkin' what I'm doin'." (51, italics mine). Casy's insight is based on his own wanderings: "I went into the wilderness like [Jesus], with no campin' stuff." (81) What happens when our habits of living, tied to a certain place and to a certain social order, become exposed to new formations of living? This question is at the center of *GoW*, and it is important to expose whiteness as one of the conditions tied to a structure that no longer exists for the Joads. What is left is everything else, which Steinbeck's characters explore ravenously, both on the road, by the roadsides, and in the camps.

From animals to human race to human class, Steinbeck's highway allows for multiple affective economies to interact with each other and interrogate each other. These interactions, while certainly volatile, are not forced into either submission to the will of the metropolis or explosive rejection of it, but instead create a space where alternative modes of living can be attempted. More importantly for this essay, it depends both on the Okies' social explorations and on the antagonistic attempts to regulate those social formations in the spaces of route 66 and 99 that give the lie to the system. Contrast this with *MT*, where the exposure comes from the explosive affects of those who are seeking the promise of the city rather than those trying to safeguard it. The process of discovery depends on both the tortoise/oats and on the car/truck that wish to erase it. It is a two-way street, rather than a spiral toward the center.

In order to explore how the systems of surveillance and antagonistic regulation actually create opportunities to generate different economies of affect, we should first develop a schema of how and where these regulations occur. Generally, the further the Joads move west via route 66, the less they can rely on their common identity and plight for sympathy and trade. While they are still in Oklahoma, the Joads stop for gas at a place

owned by a “stout faced man” who at first looked “truculent and stern,” but quickly became sympathetic when he realized the Joads had money (125-6). By way of apology he explains that many “folks that stops here begs gasoline an’ they trades for gasoline.” (127) The Joads quickly defend the people who beg and trade: “how’d you like to sell the bed you sleep on for a tankful a gas?” This moment in particular makes the man place the blame on “what the country’s comin’ to” that such a thing would be necessary for survival. We also see in this exchange that the shop owner understands the value of these things being traded, even though they cannot be exchanged for capital. The shop owner identifies with the things enough to ultimately have pity on those who provided them. Even the shop owner admits that his family “was already talkin’ about packin’ up an’ movin’ west” (128). He has not lost his home yet, but he is at a kind of affective bordertown where he can trade with those whose place has been lost and those who money, which has no originary value to begin with.

Once the Joads enter New Mexico, their identities lose almost all of their value in trade among landowners and proprietors, but they begin to have more value in trade from other subaltern subjects. When the car of the Wilson couple, fellow travelers from Massachusetts who decided to join them, breaks down, Tom and Al have no choice but to spend money on a spare part (165-178). The one-eyed man who works at the junkyard is decidedly not a big fan of the owner, and after being satisfied that Tom and Al are not “from hereabouts”, he takes the opportunity to sell them the parts they need for a steep discount, compared to what the owner would have allegedly charged (181). The one-eyed man’s kindness is based on his perceived common pain with the Joads, but Tom does not extend any sympathy or recognition of commonness with this man: “Ya like to feel sorry

for yaself. There ain't nothin' the matter with you" (180). Tom's accusation of the man's enjoyment of his subject position is harsh since the Joads have given up their place for the promise of a better future. And yet the one-eyed man ultimately receives in return for his fair sales an offer of amicability and recognition were he to ever meet the Joads in California.

Contrast this with Tom's encounter with the proprietor of the camp during their stop in New Mexico, and we see that both the proprietor and the one-eyed man function as counterparts of a system of affects: the landowners and the "goddamn bums" (186). As Tom is always forced to do, he must contend that the label being placed on the Joads does not track with their definition of the word, since they "ain't asked [anyone] for nothin'" (186). Yet in this economy the proprietor is apparently charging "half a dollar a car," (187) rather than per family, because to him the bums have no inherent value outside of their vehicles. Even his concession that "if the same number stays that come an' paid" being "awright" is merely a nod to the value of these subjectivities as a matter of quantity. Finally, when a mysterious man who is "comin' back" from California (188) reveals the calculated exploitation of the immigrants, the proprietor accuses him of being a "labor faker" (190). In this case, the proprietor defines labor fakers as "troublemakers", which could easily be applied to his use of the word 'bum'. In both of these uses of the term, what is at stake is both the capitalist economy he is taking advantage of — the Okies need to keep coming if he is to make money — and the affective economy he is taking part in — the Okies must be lazy and worthless if he is to be okay with exploiting them. Ultimately, when the man "coming back" leaves, the proprietor calls him "shif'less" (191), a term with a much weaker pejorative connotation; his previous

valuations were simply off the mark. Most importantly, the road gives Tom the avenue to escape, and criticize, the proprietor's oppressive system: "No more half-bucks rollin' down the road, I guess," Tom said. "Don't you go a-sassin' me. I 'member you. You're one of these here troublemakers." "Damn right," said Tom. "I'm bolshevisky." (192)

Ultimately the structure of *The Grapes of Wrath* itself is as much of an emergent system as the routes that it is centered around. If we take the characters in *The Grapes of Wrath* as, out of necessity, experimenting with their own subjectivities, then the places within the novel allow for that play to occur. If this is the case, I would argue that the title of the novel is a bit misleading. The famous quote that give the novel its name anticipates the terrible justice of revolution, a time when the Okies might take the land from the business men by force. They are "growing heavy for the vintage" (349) and, if the Okies would prove themselves to be just reapers, they would not allow the grapes to rot (the great sin of the chapter). How, then, do we explain the end of the novel? Certainly the "terrible faith" that presses the Okies on, and still makes it possible for their subjugation, would be "refired forever" (122) by Rose of Sharon's act of love? Wine and milk do not mix, after all. Ultimately, even as the novel calls for revolution, it cannot help but rejoice in the creative forces that nourish the Joads on their harsh journey to the West and through California. Is it that Steinbeck loves his characters too much to force them into a mere moralizing tale, or a mere call for revolution? Whatever the cause, Steinbeck's novel does at least as much work in exploring the affective potentiality of new social formations as it does exposing the injustices taking place in the groves of California made possible by capitalist exploitation.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

Arguing for the structure of *Manhattan Transfer*, Cecilia Tichi states that Dos Passos “needed a way to encompass an arbitrary aggregation of people and symbols even as he faithfully evoked a metropolitan style of life characterized by its fast pace and its disjunctions” (*Shifting Gears* 201). Tichi goes on to say that “structural and machine technology provide” the means for this encompassing (202). If Tichi is correct (and I certainly think so), then the intentionality with which the city is structured in order to direct desires and circulate affects creates a unity of effect that explains the constant repetitions of explosions across the cast. This would also explain how carefully crafted the novel is, with its consistent metaphors of fire and cold and exhaust. The cityscape demands such a unity.

But what then of Steinbeck’s highway, which cuts across and disrupts systems even as it attempts to connect them to the superstructure of the metropolis? Since it participates in multiple economies of affect, since it places so many of those traveling on it in precarious states at uncertain times, would the highway invite a plurality of effect?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beeston, Alix. "A 'Leg Show Dance' in a Skyscraper: The Sequenced Mechanics of John Dos Passos's Manhattan Transfer." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. 131, no. 3, May 2016.

Boggs, Colleen Glenney. *Animalia Americana : Animal Representations and Biopolitical Subjectivity*. Columbia University Press, 2013.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, 1988.

Dolkart, Andrew S. "Tenements." *The Architecture and Development of New York City with Andrew S. Dolkart*, 2003, nycarchitecture.columbia.edu/0243_2/0243_2_s1.html.

Dos Passos, John. *Manhattan Transfer*. First Mariner Books, 2000.

MILLIONS IN A UNION. (1896, May 12). *New York Times (1857-1922)*

National Park Service. "Route 66: 1926-1945". Web. Accessed 04/09/19.

Seiler, Cotten. *Republic of Drivers : A Cultural History of Automobility in America*. University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Shillinglaw, Susan. *On Reading "The Grapes of Wrath"*. Penguin, 2014.

Steinbeck, John. *The Grapes of Wrath*. Penguin, 2006.

Tichi, Cecilia. *Shifting Gears: Technology, Literature, Culture in Modernist America*.
University of North Carolina Press, 2017.

Tompkins, Kyla Wazana. *Racial Indigestion : Eating Bodies in the Nineteenth Century*.
New York

University Press, 2012.

Valenti, Peter. "Steinbeck's Ecological Polemic: Human Sympathy and Visual
Documentary in the Intercalary Chapters of *The Grapes of Wrath*". *Steinbeck and the
Environment*, edited by Susan F. Beegel, Susan Shillinglaw, and Wesley N. Tiffney, Jr.
University of Alabama Press, 1997, pp. 92-112.

Wald, Sarah D. *The Nature of California : Race, Citizenship, and Farming Since the Dust
Bowl*. University of Washington Press, 2016.