



5-1-1986

The Invention of Oz

Janet Faye Daley Lysengen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Lysengen, Janet Faye Daley, "The Invention of Oz" (1986). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2748.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/2748>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact zeineb.yousif@library.und.edu.

THE INVENTION OF OZ

by
Janet Faye Daley Lysengen

Bachelor of Arts, University of North Dakota, 1971

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

May
1986

T1986
L996

621776

This thesis submitted by Janet Faye Daley Lysengen in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Michael Beard
(Chairperson)

Russ Lewis
Pandra M. Donaldson

This thesis meets the standards for appearance and conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title The Invention of Oz

Department English

Degree Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature Janet Lysengen
Date April 22, 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION TO THE INVENTION OF OZ	1
CHAPTER II. THE INVENTOR	
PART A. THE PRE-OZ ERA (1856-1899)	13
PART B. THE OZ ERA (1900-1919)	30
CHAPTER III. THE MACHINERY OF OZ: CHARACTERS AS COGS	
PART A. INTRODUCTION	53
PART B. THE TOKEN HUMANS	60
PART C. THE FRANKLY MAGICAL	71
PART D. FROM SOFTWARE TO HARDWARE	81
PART E. THE TIN WOODMAN: WHAT MAKES HIM TIK-TOK?	94
CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSION: CLANGING SYMBOLS	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	132

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Illustration No. 1:

Major Character Appearances in Baum's Oz Books

59

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee for their guidance and critical gaze: Professor Robert Lewis, Professor Sandra Donaldson, and especially my advisor, Professor Michael Beard. Dr. Beard's unbounded enthusiasm and intellectual energy have been a constant source of wonder and inspiration to me. For her encouragement and for the model she provides in her writing and in her friendship as well, I am grateful to Jane Schreck. Thanks also to all my family for their loving confidence in me, especially my children, Nathan, Lindsay, and Jill, who have grown up with my graduate studies.

I dedicate this thesis with love and gratitude to my husband Larry. His belief in me and his generosity of spirit have sustained me through my writing and always.

ABSTRACT

Since L. Frank Baum published his first Oz book in 1900, Oz has become an integral part of American society; yet, only recently have his books begun to receive critical attention. Critics seem most interested in dealing with them in terms of sociology, popular culture, and psychology, but a few have recognized Baum's contributions to the birth of science fiction, to the depiction of a female hero in Dorothy, and to Baum's imaginative and perceptive examination of what separates humans from machines. This thesis will analyze the literary dimension of the Oz series. The goal will be to perceive the invention of Oz as a process and as a product of imagination.

In the first chapter, I briefly discuss the genres of the fairy tale and fantasy, as well as Baum's goals as a writer of children's books. In the second chapter, I focus on Baum's life as the inventor of Oz, identifying those events from his biography that particularly influenced his invention of Oz. In chapter three, I discuss the thematic and pragmatic function of the actively moving cogs in the invention--his wonderful characters, the pattern of their interaction, how the process of their creation demonstrates Baum's probings

into the questions of identity and the essence of humanity in an age of increasing technology. In the concluding chapter, I examine how Baum's anticipatory vision has altered the genre of the fairy tale and, especially, how his use of the image of technology as a force in a turn-of-the-century children's fantasy anticipated and inspired not only the writers who followed him but perhaps America's image of itself as well.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

"I'll sing a song of Ozland, where wondrous
creatures dwell
And fruits and flowers and shady bowers
abound in every dell,
Where magic is a science and where no one
shows surprise
If some amazing thing takes place
before his very eyes"
(The Patchwork Girl of Oz, 140).

Oz evokes nearly-forgotten memories for me that are inextricably mixed with the stories and the illustrations themselves. I remember not only Princess Langwidere taking off one head to try on another from her mirrored closets housing thirty heads in all, but I also remember the flowers on the wallpaper of the living room where my friend Karoline's mother read to us. I remember Karoline's mother's hands as she held the book, her index finger just catching the corner of the right-hand page, poised for the turn so as not to have to fumble for a moment and miss a beat of the captivating tale. Karoline and I sat on either side of her in a roomy rocking chair and listened to the Oz books--treasures I coveted then and do yet, annual gifts from Karoline's grandparents who lived in Milwaukee. Whether they were read to us in sequence I don't remember. It seems hardly to have

mattered because I read them and reread them, in order and out of order, many times as a child. After a fifteen-year absence, I returned to the Oz books when my son was old enough to enjoy having them read aloud--in which time my critical tastes had been sharpened and I found them better and worse than I remembered. But it was not until I saw The Wizard of Oz by L. Frank Baum on a reading list for one of my graduate courses in English that it occurred to me that my interest in and appreciation of the Oz books was not just nostalgia or a case of arrested preadolescence, but might merit serious study.

As I began my research on L. Frank Baum and the Oz books, I found that I had rather belatedly happened on a wave of critical and scholarly interest that has swelled in the last twenty years. Edward Wagenknecht had published a critical study, Utopia Americana, in 1929, and Oz fans and scholars had started a journal, The Baum Bugle, devoted to Baum and Oz as early as 1957, but the Oz books were not really taken seriously until the late 1960s. Prior to that, they were frowned on by librarians, ignored or deprecated by children's literature anthologists, and undiscovered by scholars. Gore Vidal wrote in 1982:

Although Baum's books were dismissed as trash by at least two generations of librarians and literary historians, the land of Oz has managed to fascinate each new generation and, lately,

Baum himself has become an OK subject, if not for the literary critic, for the social historian (Vidal 1982, 57).

Vidal goes on to wonder if "Baum's survival is due to the fact that he is not taught? That he is not, officially, Literature? If so, one must be careful not to murder Oz with exegesis" (Vidal 1982, 57).

With Vidal's caveat firmly in mind, this thesis will examine the invention of Oz. Invention is defined as "a product of the imagination" and "a device, contrivance, or process originated after study and experiment" (Webster's, 636). In "Preface to Fables, Ancient and Modern" (1700), John Dryden uses the word invention to refer to both the act of imaginative creating--"[Virgil's] episodes are almost wholly of his own invention" (Dryden 1970, 163)--and the creation itself. In discussing the borrowings of Ovid and Chaucer, he notes, "the genius of our countrymen, in general, being rather to improve an invention than to invent themselves" (Dryden 1970, 164). Baum's invention of Oz is both a product and a process because his concept of Oz evolved throughout the series. Like an inventor tinkering with a machine in process, Baum continued to finely tune the inner-workings of his invention over a period of nineteen years. The Oz where Dorothy's house is set down in the first book evolves into a utopian society by the sixth book, but it is a slow and not always consistent process. The humbug Wizard she turns to in The

Wizard of Oz bears little resemblance to the respected, mature, accomplished magician who is one of Ozma's most trusted counselors in the later books. In examining Baum's creative process, I will look for the events in Baum's life that may explain some of the strengths and weaknesses of the product; I will discuss the origins, evolution, and appearance of Oz's most important inhabitants; and the result will prove that Baum's invention needs no patent. Though his death in 1919 spawned a succession of Royal Historians of Oz, none have improved on his creation. His work has captured the imagination of generations of readers and has implications for our modern age of technology and artificial intelligence that are only now being examined.

When L. Frank Baum published The Wizard of Oz (originally titled The Wonderful Wizard of Oz) in 1900, he had no vision of it as the first book of a series, much less the first-born of a family of fourteen Oz books. And yet his original creation of Oz as an imaginary place was carefully enough defined in that first text to allow each successive book to explore and reveal the evolution of its people, history, geography, culture, and government, until Oz became a full-bodied world, unique and identifiable.

The Wizard of Oz, though not consciously written as a prototype, became the schematic model upon which the variations of the invention were based. At the end of

this chapter is a list of the Oz books with their original titles and copyright dates. The abbreviations in parentheses following the book titles will be used throughout the rest of this thesis to identify quotations from the books. The columns of numbers demonstrate how much Baum depended on The Wizard of Oz as a reliable pattern.

The illustration on page 59, developed from the rather instinctive and unpremeditated jottings I made as I reread the original fourteen Oz books, schematically represents the appearance of certain characters in Baum's Oz books. In almost every book, all five of the series' major characters--Dorothy, the Scarecrow, the Tin Woodman, the Wizard, and Ozma--are involved at one time or another, but usually at least two are present in the opening chapters. A problem is introduced which sends a division of them on a journey or quest filled with obstacles and adventures through Oz or to its outskirts. During their journey they are opposed by, introduced to, or joined by, a host of unusual and magical creatures or characters. Often two or three of these characters accompany them back to the Emerald City and become permanent members of Ozma's special circle of friends and chosen set. In addition to the apparent pattern of characters, there are many more telling repetitions--Baum's love of enclosure, with beds, nests, and tents described so vividly and so warmly; his use of fountains and water to signal elegance or

benevolence; the frequent occurrence and description of repasts with a repetitive series of adjectives: "satisfying," "piping hot," "nicely served up," etc.--all subjects that form leitmotifs throughout the series. Many of these repetitions are examples of the kinds of phenomenology Gaston Bachelard describes in The Poetics of Space, particularly Baum's use of roundness as a positive force.

During this preliminary reading, I was introduced to Vladimir Propp's The Morphology of the Folktale, a book which scientifically examines folk or fairy tales according to structure and thereby classifies, compares, and defines them. His morphology rests on the thirty-one distinct functions (the actions the "dramatis personae" perform) observable within the one hundred tales he studied, their sequence, and their relationships to one another. The similarity of Baum's character functions (which, in his case, are often the actions of "dramatis machinae"), his use of transformations and magical agents, parallel Propp's observations about folktales in general. Though Brian Attebery limits his discussion to only the first Baum Oz book, his chapter on Oz in The Fantasy Tradition in American Literature develops a formal proof of the application of Propp's morphology to Baum's writing. He parallels Dorothy's adventures in The Wizard of Oz to Propp's pattern of journey, conflict, return, and reward in traditional fairy tales, placing Baum squarely

in their camp.

Though P. L. Travers praises E. B. White and ignores Baum, one would expect she might disapprove since her essay vociferously discounts the notion of a fairy owning a wireless set as "not only a contradiction of terms but a mixing of worlds mutually exclusive" (Travers 1952, 639). Russel B. Nye disagrees on the effect of mixing machines with magic. He praises Baum's grafting "twentieth-century technology to the fairy tale tradition," his "recognition of the inherent wonder of the machine" (Gardner and Nye 1957, 7).

Both Northrop Frye and J. R. R. Tolkien discuss the similarities of modern fairy tales with the traditions of romance--a connection one can find in Baum's Oz books, especially with the character of Ozma. In his introduction to Utopia Americana, Edward Wagenknecht praises the freedom of romance as the fairy tale's source. He was one of the first critics to call the Oz books Utopian, but he also notes they are not full of social criticism. Instead, they teach "American children to look for the element of wonder in the life around them, to realize that even smoke and machinery may be transformed into fairy lore if only we have sufficient energy and vision to penetrate their significance and transform them to our use" (Wagenknecht 1929, 152). Barry Bauska, whose essay compares Baum to Theodore Dreiser, notes:

Where America herself had once stood for mythic

possibilities, one now had to invent one's Utopias.

Such were the conditions which lay behind the creation of Oz, the first American fairyland, and of The Wizard of Oz, the first native fairy tale. For the land of Oz was everything that the American Dream had promised, everything that America should have been, but too often was not (Bauska 1976, 22).

Bewley, too, sees Oz as "unmistakably an American fairyland. In nothing is this more apparent than in the way Baum transforms magic into a glamorized version of technology and applied science" (Bewley 1970, 261, emphasis his).

Dick Martin describes the eclectic blend that is the wonder of Oz: "ancient folk-tale conventions, archaic pomp and ceremony and medieval black magic juxtaposed with Yankee colloquialisms, cracker-barrel philosophy and the latest electrical machinery--all in harmonious medley" (Martin 1959, 107).

It is this nearly universally recognized quality of the marrying of magic and machine which gives Baum's Oz its undeniable flavor, according to most critical studies. Though Baum perhaps instinctively, perhaps intentionally, adheres to the traditions of folk-tales, and though his Oz books incorporate some elements of romance described by Frye and Tolkien, the invention of Oz appears to be most

neatly categorized by Todorov's study, The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre. In chapter three, Todorov distinguishes between the genres of the fantastic, the uncanny, and the marvelous. Within the latter genre is a subdivision he calls the "instrumental marvelous," explained as a fiction where "we find the gadgets, technological developments unrealized in the period described, but, after all, quite possible" (Todorov 1975, 56): it is a category in which Baum seems to fit quite nicely.

Any observer of American culture who listened to our conversation, read the newspapers, watched the television, or paid attention to the lyrics of popular music would recognize the absorption of Oz and its society into the American culture. "Oz and its inhabitants have become a part of American vocabulary; every public figure from William Randolph Hearst to Everett Dirksen seems to have been likened at one time to the humbug Wizard, while the word 'Oz' itself has become synonymous with wondrous, faraway places" (Greene and Martin 1977, i). "Baum, unlike his predecessors, created a fairyland with such solid outlines that it remains recognizable in reproduction after reproduction, like a drawing still clear after a thousand tracings" (Attebery 1980, 84). Ruth Plumly Thompson, Baum's successor as the Royal Historian of Oz and author of nineteen Oz books herself, asserts, "A child who may not be able to name offhand the

capital of Nebraska or Montana, can tell you in a flash the capitol of Oz and is often more familiar with its principal rivers, mountains, rulers, points of interest, and historical landmarks than with those of his native state. Perhaps because he considers it his native state" (Thompson 1982, 3).

This easy familiarity with Oz is not entirely the result of Baum's literary fame, although The Wizard of Oz and the subsequent Oz books are some of the best-selling children's books both here and abroad, but is due also to the widespread exposure of the American public to the 1939 MGM musical motion picture starring Judy Garland, which is still televised annually. The movie took some liberties with Baum's text, most significant of which was the explanation of Dorothy's trip to Oz as merely a dream; yet, the production wonderfully brought to life the characters of Dorothy, the Scarecrow, the Tin Woodman, and the Cowardly Lion, and of Oz itself, as a place of humor, goodness, and joy, with enough danger and evil mixed in to keep life interesting so that the movie satisfied most of the Baum purists and further popularized the Oz books, a notion that would have pleased Baum himself, a writer who was no less a hustler and a promoter.

Baum set goals for himself with his writing. He wrote "to please a child" (Gardner and Nye 1957, 42). He wrote to stimulate the imagination of his readers: "the

imaginative child will become the imaginative man or woman most apt to create, to invent, and therefore to foster civilization" (Preface to The Lost Princess of Oz). He wrote to create a "modernized fairy tale, in which the wonderment and joy are retained and the heart-aches and nightmares are left out" (Preface to The Wizard of Oz). The introductory letters that served as prefaces in the Oz books were a means for Baum to communicate directly with his readers, explaining there his purposes and sometimes attempting to manipulate their reactions. In these letters, one senses a resistance and compulsion to bask in the love his readers have for his invention of Oz. In writing for a loyal and specific audience, perhaps he feared the risk of his individual craftsmanship becoming a product of the assembly line, one invention indistinguishable from the next. Baum was forced to weigh his goals against the compelling need to support his family by being as productive and marketable as possible. This study will judge Baum against his own goals and will attempt to prove that Baum's invention of Oz is much more than an allegory or a simple children's fairyland, but is instead, a creation that challenges readers to examine their potential and their humanity.

The Physical Structure of Baum's Oz Books

Copyright	Title	#Chapters	#Pages	In Text*
1900	<u>The Wonderful Wizard of Oz</u>	24	261	<u>Wizard</u>
1904	<u>The Marvelous Land of Oz</u>	24	287	<u>Land</u>
1907	<u>Ozma of Oz</u>	21	258	<u>Ozma</u>
1908	<u>Dorothy and the Wizard in Oz</u>	20	220	<u>D & W</u>
1909	<u>The Road to Oz</u>	24	261	<u>Road</u>
1910	<u>The Emerald City of Oz</u>	30	296	<u>E. City</u>
1913	<u>The Patchwork Girl of Oz</u>	28	340	<u>PW Girl</u>
1914	<u>Tik-Tok of Oz</u>	25	272	<u>Tik-Tok</u>
1915	<u>The Scarecrow of Oz</u>	24	288	<u>Scarecrow</u>
1916	<u>Rinkitink in Oz</u>	24	314	<u>Rinkitink</u>
1917	<u>The Lost Princess of Oz</u>	26	312	<u>Lost</u>
1918	<u>The Tin Woodman of Oz</u>	24	288	<u>TW</u>
1919	<u>The Magic of Oz</u>	23	266	<u>Magic</u>
1920	<u>Glinda of Oz</u>	24	279	<u>Glinda</u>
Average Oz book		24	281	

* Abbreviated titles used within the text of the thesis. All references to the Oz books are from the Rand-McNally paperback editions. Only the original copyright dates are used by the publisher.

CHAPTER II

THE INVENTOR OF OZ, L. FRANK BAUM

Part A: The Pre-Oz Era (1856-1899)

Lyman Frank Baum was born on May 15, 1856, a year his biographers describe as "an exciting time to be born . . . an age that would know all the awkward problems of raw new wealth and the temptations of new power" (Baum and MacFall 1961, 17-18). Though the country was still in the throes of the conflict that would culminate in the Civil War, a child born in 1856 would grow up with a nation on the verge of new discoveries--most importantly, the technology and industry that would profoundly affect our American way of life and shape our country's future. Russell MacFall, the first Baum biographer, predicted in 1962 that researchers with a historical perspective would find evidence to show "how closely L. Frank Baum's life touched several of the formative eras of our nation and how his work influenced the course of American musical comedy and fantasy writing" (MacFall, 9). This chapter will focus on those events in Baum's life which most deeply affected his writing and look for the ways his personal history reflects the history of the country.

Though his birth into a wealthy family--his father, Benjamin Ward Baum, made his fortune in the oil fields of

New York and Pennsylvania--allowed him access to the upper-class life, the sort which prompted Mark Twain's appellation of this era as "The Gilded Age," Baum also knew financial hardship. He knew first-hand the aristocratic life of eastern high society and living hand-to-mouth in a little cottage in Chicago with no running water or indoor plumbing. He knew the life of the folks who had summer homes in places like Macatawa, Michigan, the ins and outs of the literary and journalistic fraternity in Chicago, and the suffragists whose feminist views turned some traditional families and some traditional politics upside down. He followed the country's migration patterns, growing up in the East, spending his mid-life in the Midwest, and finally, settling in the West as a Californian. His interest in drama began with an acting career in a traveling theater troupe in small theaters in the East, writing musical extravaganzas in Chicago, and ended with investing in the newly developed film industry in Hollywood. L. Frank Baum was a man of his time, and in his writing, a man ahead of his time.

Baum grew up and received most of his schooling at the family estate called Rose Lawn near Chittenango, New York, where he was born. Because of a congenital heart defect, Baum led a rather quiet and sheltered life until the family doctors determined he was strong enough, at the age of twelve, to be sent to military school, and so for

two years he attended Peekskill Military Academy. He disliked it immensely, but his parents did not relent until he suffered what was either a heart attack or a nervous breakdown after being disciplined for too much daydreaming, and he was allowed to return to Rose Lawn. Baum's one-time experience with the military provided him with a satisfying target for satire in his Oz books while his heart trouble continued to plague him the rest of his life. He managed to make light of the affliction in several instances in the Oz books. For example, in Ozma of Oz, one of Ozma's generals begs off from an ensuing fight because "I and my brother officers all suffer from heart disease, and the slightest excitement might kill us" (Ozma, 220).

At home in Rose Lawn, he developed several interests that were to crop up again in his writing and in his later life. One was the interest in animals, especially fowl; another was the mastery of a printing press, a gift from his father from which he and his brother Harry issued The Rose Lawn Home Journal. This first journalistic experience in 1871 began a writing career that would continue until Baum's death in 1919, but not without interruptions.

As a young man he tried his hand as an actor, sold dry goods, worked for a couple of newspapers, and wrote and produced plays (his most successful was The Maid of Arran, 1882), until, on November 9, 1882, he married Maud Gage, the daughter of one of the spokeswomen of the

suffragette movement, Matilda Joslyn Gage. For the next six years, he accepted the responsibilities of marriage and the birth of two sons by giving up his acting career to settle in Syracuse, selling Castorine oil lubricant, while still maintaining several theaters in the area. There was a series of reversals--his father's failing health and failing business fortunes, a fire which destroyed one of Baum's theaters and all its properties, near collapse of the Castorine company due to the mismanagement of funds by a clerk who soon after committed suicide--and Baum had a decision to make, one that would broaden his horizons and expose him to a rapidly disappearing part of America--the Western frontier.

His wife's sisters, Helen (Mrs. Charles H. Gage) and Julia (Mrs. James D. Carpenter), and her brother Thomas Clarkson Gage, were all living in Dakota Territory, and although To Please a Child reports that "their letters glowed with accounts of the prosperity to be found in the West where, they reported, vast fortunes were being made from cattle raising and wheat" (Baum and MacFall 1961, 57), there was another side to the Western experience, as Baum and his family would discover.

Maud's brother, T. Clarkson Gage, had moved to Aberdeen in 1881 and built a store. As pioneers in the area, he and his wife, Sophie T. Jewell, were the first couple married in the Presbyterian Church in Aberdeen. Their daughter, Matilda Jewell Gage, still lives in

Aberdeen and has possession of many of the Baum papers and photographs. One of these family letters clearly shows Maud Baum's misgivings about the West: "I don't see how you can like the West. I wouldn't be hired to live there" (Gage 1965, 1).

Despite published comments that "Julie [sic] found happiness in South Dakota [she actually lived in what was to become North Dakota] too, with a man who like her brother was in the commercial life of the newly opened territory" (Rivette 1970, 7), a more reliable report can be drawn from Julia Gage Carpenter's diary which Elizabeth Hampsten titled "Frantically Lonely." Julia writes of attending the Gage-Baum wedding in Fayetteville in 1882, of Frank and his son Robert spending July of 1888 with them, but her record resonates her unhappiness, her isolation, and her painfully acute sense of distance from her family in Aberdeen and the comforts of "city" life that they enjoyed, to say nothing of the social life she had known as a girl in Fayetteville, New York. The contrast left her anything but happy, and Hampsten notes that "she failed to thrive" (Hampsten 1982, 208).

When Baum and his family first moved to Aberdeen in September, 1888, he opened a store he called Baum's Bazaar, but because of Aberdeen's hard times and his easy credit, the store folded after only sixteen months, leaving Baum with less capital than he had had in Syracuse and a third mouth to feed, another baby boy. When the

editor of Saturday Evening Pioneer, one of Aberdeen's four papers, offered Baum the chance to buy his paper on easy monthly payments, Baum accepted and in January 1890 became a newspaper editor for the second time in his life.

Baum's Western experience gave him exposure to a rural setting which, though pastoral, was also shaken by the conflicting views of the Indians and the white settlers, the emergence of states from frontiers, and the mechanization of farming. More important to this study, however, is that it is in the West where Baum, for the first time, delineated and developed ideas and opinions in print that would become the pillars of the "philosophy" upon which his fictional country of Oz was based.

Baum's column, "Our Landlady," is the first sampling we have of Baum's literary style, humor, inventiveness, and social philosophy. Baum and MacFall compare Baum's editorials to Oliver Wendell Holmes' The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table. The fictional Mrs. Bilkins, landlady of an Aberdeen boarding house, serves as a device for Baum's commentary on the events of the day. Fred Erisman finds the editorials significant for the clues they give us to

Baum's mind in the context of the real society.

He is a man committed to contentment, simplicity, thrift, practicality, industry and honesty--attributes that he is convinced are essential to life, no matter what other circumstances might bring. Significantly, there

are also the attributes of the American dream. In his young manhood, Baum seems to have attempted to apply these ideals to real life; in his later years, he applies them to his fiction (Erisman 1966, 242-43).

It is in these columns that we see evidence of Baum's uncanny anticipation of scientific invention. His Mrs. Bilkins tells her boarders about seeing an automobile (although she had no name to give it) two years before the first horseless carriage was built in the U. S. She describes her adventures with "'lectricity" at the Downtitch Farm with automatic door openers, moving footpaths, mechanical butlers, a drama by robotic actors with phonographs inside them, and electric blankets on the beds--all run by electricity produced somehow through artesian wells (Baum 1891a, 5).

The magical quality of electricity is one that continues to interest Baum. He wrote about it again in The Master Key, an early science fiction story, and mentions it many times in the Oz books--most poetically in Tik-Tok of Oz in which Erma, the Queen of Light, has six handmaidens--Sunlight, Moonlight, Starlight, Daylight, Firelight, and Electra. Betsy Bobbin observes that Electra must be the youngest of the girls "'Cause electric'ty is the newest light we know of. Didn't Mr. Edison discover it?" The Queen agrees that Edison may have been the first mortal to discover it, but

"electricity was a part of the world from its creation, and therefore my Electra is as old as Daylight or Moonlight, and equally beneficent to mortals and fairies alike" (Tik-Tok, 134). Baum's spectrum of light sources reminds his readers that what may appear to be an artificial invention of humans or a new technology has its origin in nature and thus need not be feared.

Like Erisman, several other scholars have used Baum's South Dakota experience to develop theories about the thematic development of the Oz books. Commenting on the technological commentary of "Our Landlady," Daniel P. Mannix discounts the "prophetic element in these tales, they are told simply as burlesque--or as Baum would have put it, 'banter.' Neither he nor his readers took such ideas seriously, and the stories resemble the typical 'tall tales' of the West more than they do science fiction" (Mannix 1964, 42).

Tom St. John believes the influence of Baum's short stay in South Dakota cannot be overstated. He vainly tries to find support for the notion that Oz is really an allegory for the Indian plight and claims that "the first readers of Baum's book sensed that the Land of Oz reflected the Black Hills of the Dakota Sioux. Baum's utopia corresponds roughly to the present-day states of Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana, and part of Canada. The original popularity of The Wizard of Oz was fired by the desperate public need of the white

middle classes to put a happy face on terror, on the sordid land-grab for that land sacred to the Sioux" (St. John 1982, 351).

An allegory such as St. John's gives more credit to Baum's politics and social consciousness than he probably deserves, and fails to take into consideration that first readers of Oz were more than likely ten year old children who knew next to nothing about the Indian situation in South Dakota or anywhere else in the country. Nevertheless, St. John goes on to claim the source of the Emerald City as the Black Hills (St. John 1982, 354); the Deadly Desert which surrounds Oz as the U. S. Southwest which could become a place for displaced Indians; the Wicked Witch as a symbol for the "late Victorian fears of blacks, Indians, and women" (St. John 1982, 356); and ends with the charge that "future generations of historians did ignore the racial aspects of his work, in the interests of sloughing off that which conscience could not assimilate" (St. John 1982, 359).

The temptation to create referential sub-texts for Oz which became, over the period of nineteen years and fourteen books in Baum's series, an elaborately developed country with its geography, politics, social philosophy, and history carefully delineated, is one from which many scholars and critics cannot be delivered. Like St. John, they seek a literal representation of life in the author's real world in the fantasy he creates, finding pleasure in

the one-to-one equation which neatly supports the allegory the critic wishes to decode. Fredric Jameson, in an essay on the Utopian discourse in Louis Marin's Utopiques, sees the value of narrative analysis not in the stage of reconstructing the referential sub-text but rather in the understanding of this neutralization (the process by which the topical allusion neutralizes the referential sub-text) as a "process, as energeia, enunciation, productivity, and implicitly or explicitly to repudiate that more traditional and conventional view of Utopia as sheer representation, as the 'realized' vision of this or that ideal society or social ideal" (Jameson 1977, 6).

No doubt Baum's writing was influenced by the events of his day and by his personal life experiences, but this study will attempt to discover less about the model (the "real" world) and more about the invention of Oz, bearing in mind Jameson's warning that "utopia's deepest subject, and the source of all that is most vibrantly political about it, is precisely our inability to conceive it, our incapacity to produce it as a vision, our failure to project the other of what is . . ." (Jameson 1977, 21).

To return to the Indian question as a possible referential sub-text, Baum had written a column on December 6, 1890, in which he

turns inside out the official American line that the Sioux Indians were getting ready to massacre all the whites. Baum pretends to interview an

Indian chief who tells him that the Indians are terrified of being massacred by the whites. Two weeks after this story was published, the U.S. Seventh Cavalry slaughtered three hundred Indian men, women, and children at nearby Wounded Knee" (Vidal 1982, 63).

Another significant aspect of Baum's writings for the Aberdeen paper is his growing awareness of rural problems, particularly the dependence on a beneficent Mother Nature to provide rainfall. The drought that afflicted South Dakota during the Baums' stint there certainly contributed to their economic struggle. Baum, however, maintained a characteristic sense of optimism throughout. Mrs. Bilkins informed one of her discouraged boarders who contemplates leaving:

There's been hard times here, that goes without tellin' but the hard times is about over. We are as sure o'gittin a crop next year as we are o' livin til the time comes. It might a ben better to hav' gone away two year ago, when the troubles begun, but to go now, when they's about over, is rank foolishness. Before you can hardly git settled in some other locality, you'll be startled by the news o' the crops in South Dakoty, by reports o' the thousands flockin' in to the most fertile country on the

yearth, of the artesian wells goin' down until the ground is like a pepper box, of the rapid rise in real estate until in no other country will land bring so high a price as in the basin o' the Jim river (Baum 1891b, 5).

Baum's constant reference to artesian wells reflects his belief in irrigation as a means of insurance against the inconstancy of nature, again a view of technology as friendly rather than threatening.

Brian Attebery sees Baum's description of Kansas in The Wizard of Oz as "evidence that he was sensitive to the problems of his rural neighbors; it is a one-sided picture of the hardships of life on the prairies. The land of the Winkies [in Oz] is again a reflection of pioneer life, with an element of optimism transforming gray waste into golden plenty" (Attebery 1980, 89). To Attebery, the Wicked Witch of the West is a symbol of malevolent nature which, once she is vanquished, flourishes in the same way South Dakota would if the drought were to end and the brown grasslands were to turn green again.

Critics tend to concentrate on the opening chapter of The Wizard of Oz when they seek Baum's perspective on rural America, but if real life on the prairie were as unremittingly bleak as Baum depicts Kansas in his Oz books, we would have to see all of Mrs. Bilkins' optimism as mere bravado. Michael Patrick Hearn suggests, "The scenes in this chapter are largely Baum's recollections of

the great gray prairie of the Dakota Territory. . . . One wonders how often he stared off into the lonely gray sky in hope of escaping to a fairyland like Oz" (Hearn 1973, 93). Baum's description of the plight of Uncle Henry and Aunt Em on the farm grows steadily worse as the series continues. By the sixth book, Baum has quite a list of miseries to recount:

It was not a big farm, nor a very good one, because sometimes the rain did not come when the crops needed it, and then everything withered and dried up. Once a cyclone had carried away Uncle Henry's house, so that he was obliged to build another; and as he was a poor man he had to mortgage his farm to get the money to pay for the new house. Then his health became bad and he was too feeble to work. The doctor ordered him to take a sea voyage and he went to Australia and took Dorothy with him. That cost a lot of money, too.

Uncle Henry grew poorer every year, and the crops raised on the farm only bought food for the family. Therefore the mortgage could not be paid. At last the banker who had loaned him the money said that if he did not pay on a certain day, his farm would be taken away from him (E. City, 21-22).

What those critics--Hearn, Attebery, and others, who compare Baum's rural outlook to the likes of Hamlin Garland, Stephen Crane, and Sinclair Lewis--overlook is the opening to Baum's fourth book, Dorothy and the Wizard in Oz. In it, Dorothy is in California, on her way from San Francisco to a ranch owned by Aunt Em's sister. Baum wrote this book while living in Coronado, off the coast of southern California, so he had certainly seen the beauty and bounty that California offers; yet, the setting he describes is no more appealing than Kansas. "The gray dawn was breaking in the east . . . The shed at Hugson's Siding was bare save for an old wooden bench, and did not look very inviting. As she [Dorothy] peered through the soft gray light not a house of any sort was visible near the station." When she wakes the driver of a horse and buggy, he has "blinking gray eyes" (D & W, 1-3). The repetition of "gray" in this opening buttresses Martin Gardner's note on the opening to The Wizard of Oz: "Baum is clearly contrasting the grayness of life on the Kansas farm, and the solemnity of Uncle Henry and Aunt Em, with the color and gaiety of Oz" (Gardner and Nye 1957, 197) more than providing a commentary on life in rural America. Baum continues the thematic impact of color in Ozma of Oz, as well. When the Nome King transforms his captives into ornaments, he makes the people from Oz green and plans to make Dorothy gray. We hear an echo of Mrs. Bilkins' voice, however, in the character of the Shaggy Man in

Oz, who describes himself as "a rover." He defends the value of rural life to Scraps, the Patchwork Girl:

"There's a freedom and independence in country life that not even the Emerald City can give one. I know that lots of the city people would like to get back to the land. The Scarecrow lives in the country, and so do the Tin Woodman and Jack Pumpkinhead; yet all three would be welcome to live in Ozma's palace if they cared to" (PW Girl, 185).

There is a foreshadowing of the humbug Wizard as well as the Hungry Tiger of Oz who says, "It isn't what we are, but what folks think we are, that counts in this world" (Road, 185), and perhaps a good-humored poke at Baum himself, in the following column in which Mrs. Bilkins says:

Here we are in a country where the sile is richer and deeper than in another part of Americky; where the poor eastern farmers have found peace and plenty, where the bankrupt eastern merchant has found a good trade and a good livin'; where clerks has blossomed into store-keepers and penny-ante men into bankers, and convicks inter lawyers, an' salvation army dodgers inter ministers, an roustabouts inter real estate and loan agents. An' they all fell

inter soft snaps as though as they was great men in disguise, an' they'd never let their neighbors know the truth about the matter (Baum 1890, 5).

Though he wrote with affection and optimism about Aberdeen, his paper was not a success. He could not afford to follow Mrs. Bilkins' advice to stay in "South Dakoty," so in the spring of 1891, now with four young sons in tow, he moved his family to Chicago.

To Easterners, South Dakota was the West despite its being in the middle of the country geographically, so it is logical that Chicago was considered a western hub of the frontier. In 1893, Chicago hosted the World Columbian Exposition and was home to a "Chicago renaissance" of writers and artists who were spokespersons for the western experience. Brian Attebery, like St. John, finds the geography of Oz a referent for Baum's reality, but he equates Oz to Baum's personal geography--Chicago to the Emerald City. His Chicago "was not the jungle of Upton Sinclair's shocking exposes, nor the brawling hog-butcher of Carl Sandburg's apostrophes. It was the shining, hopeful White City, built on the shores of Lake Michigan for the great Columbian Exposition" (Attebery 1980, 90). In The Master Key, Baum's protagonist, a boy named Rob, flies over Chicago and decides to land to form "the acquaintance of this most wonderful and cosmopolitan city" (Baum 1901, 421).

It is in Chicago, after trying his hand again at newspaper work, managing the crockery section of a department store, and drumming glassware to retailers on the road, that Baum had the opportunity to have some of the stories published which he had been telling his children for years and which he had begun writing down during his long absences away from home with his job. In 1897, the same year that he started a new enterprise, The Show Window, a magazine for window dressers, Baum's first book for children, Mother Goose in Prose, was published. The book is described as "the slender thread that would lead Baum out of the labyrinth of the Gilded Age. . . . the clew that stretched to his goal. Henceforth he would make children happy" (Baum and MacFall 1961, 89).

"Henceforth" hints that the future was smooth for Baum's writing career, but such was not the case. From 1897 until his death in 1919, L. Frank Baum was able to give up all the other hats he had worn in order to support his family and to concentrate on his writing career, but his early love of the theater continued to inspire and tantalize him, with its promise of acclaim and financial reward, jeopardizing the family's financial security more than once in the years to come with his investments in musical extravaganzas of his Oz books and in the modern outgrowth of the traditional theater--Radio Plays and the newly born film industry.

Baum followed Mother Goose in Prose with Father

Goose, His Book in 1899, illustrated by the man who would collaborate with him in The Wonderful Wizard of Oz, W. W. Denslow. Father Goose "became the best-selling American picture book of its day" (Hearn 1983, 21). It was followed on May 15, 1900, by the publication of Baum's most famous and enduring book, The Wonderful Wizard of Oz.

Part B: The Oz Era (1900-1919)

Baum's success with The Wizard of Oz appears to have offered him little temptation to repeat the story's formula with a sequel. In between the first book and the second in 1904, Baum wrote five other non-Oz children's stories and also worked enthusiastically on a musical stage version of The Wizard which opened in Chicago in 1902, moved to Broadway, and was still showing as late as 1911 in Boston (Baum and MacFall 1961, 1-10). The stage show was produced by Julian Mitchell and required some revision of the book--Toto became Imogene the cow, the poppy field came to life as a chorus line of petal-covered showgirls--but, nonetheless, the show was a sensation. Baum learned a lesson from his involvement with the production.

The people will have what pleases them, and not what the author happens to favor, and I believe that one of the reasons why Julian Mitchell is

recognized as a great producer is that he faithfully tries to serve the great mass of playgoers and usually succeeds. My chief business is, of course, the writing of fairy tales, but should I ever attempt another extravaganza, or dramatize another of my books, I mean to profit by the lesson Mr. Mitchell has taught me, and sacrifice personal preference to the demands of those I shall expect to purchase admission tickets (Baum and MacFall 1961,13-14).

Baum was a crowd-pleaser and if what pleased turn-of-the century Americans were circuses, vaudeville shows, player piano music, pretty girls, and slapstick comedy, he would give it to them, on stage, and in his fairyland as well. In The Hudson Review, Roger Sale describes Baum's success with The Wizard of Oz as a Horatio Alger story except for Baum's unwillingness to limit himself to what his readers wanted--more Oz books. He notes:

Baum should have realized that he had happened upon an idea that could make him rich forever. He had always thought along lines of what would sell, and it would have been easy to rework and repack the formula of Dorothy Gale and the Land of Oz and make a fortune. . . . until we understand the way he loved and hated writing Oz books we will not be able to get used to or to

account for the great deal of slapdash, careless, and silly writing that mars and even destroys some of the Oz books (Sale 1972-73, 572-73).

His ambivalence about patenting the Oz formula is clear from the time lapse between the first Oz book and its sequel. Four years went by without another Oz book, though Baum continued to write and publish. His second Oz effort, The Marvelous Land of Oz (1904), though set in Oz and using some of the characters from The Wizard, had no Dorothy, no American visitor to Oz at all, and includes elements that might easily be translated to the stage. The Emerald City is overtaken by General Jinjur and her all-girl army who march around in colorful uniforms armed with knitting needles; the satire on suffragists is one of the most topical of all his plots. The transformation of the main character, Tip, from his role as a Munchkin boy to the beautiful Princess Ozma is as much theatrical tradition as it is integral to the plot line. "Dramas of the period were strongly influenced by the English pantomime tradition, in which the leading boy is played by a woman, who appears in female clothing at the end" (Greene and Martin 1977, 18-19).

Replacing W. W. Denslow with John Rea Neill, a young, Philadelphia born newspaper illustrator, also enhanced the theatricality of the Oz books. According to Maud Baum, "Mr. Denslow got a swelled head (pardon the phrase)

and felt no Oz book would succeed unless it was illustrated by him--hence the change" ("Dear Sergeant Snow" 1982, 11). Neill's work "reveals a similarity [to Denslow's] in its bold, poster-like quality, and use of heavy outline and black borders, comparable to those of stained glass windows" (Fisher 1975, 68), but differs in its emphasis on beauty and grace unlike Denslow's cartoon-like interpretation of Oz. Neill's illustrations of Dorothy and Ozma are never static. Their hair, dress, and even posture change with the style in vogue at the time the books were published and yet remain timeless. Neill's reign as the illustrator of Oz lasted through thirty-five Oz books: all of Baum's except the first, the nineteen books of Baum's successor, Ruth Plumly Thompson, and three of his own, written after Thompson retired in 1939. Jack Snow notes, "The Neill style is one which combines rare beauty with great charm and a captivating sense of humor" (Snow 1954, 274).

In the musical adaptation which predictably followed the book, Baum focused on one of the oddest characters in the book's entourage of unusual creations, H. M. Wogglebug, T. E. Unfortunately, the show, which opened in 1905, failed miserably and was damned by the Chicago press as humorless, weak, and dull (Hearn 1974, 19). In the book the highly magnified (H. M.) insect who claims he is thoroughly educated (T. E.) is an obvious satire on the flaws of higher education and, as such, is too one-

dimensional to support the plot. Hearn finds the choice of the Woggle-Bug as the major character for the show proof that Baum had "little understanding of his own work" (Hearn 1974, 20). The bitter taste of failure stayed with Baum for many years after, and he did not offer another stage production until 1914.

In addition to his two Oz books and the two musicals, Baum produced several more books during this time. The book which has the most to do, technologically, with Oz is The Master Key: An Electrical Fairy Tale (1901). Long out of print, it was recently anthologized in A Treasury of Fantasy, edited by Cary Wilkins, with the disclaimer:

"The Master Key," a work first published in 1903 [sic], contains some racial and ethnic references that may be offensive to modern readers. Readers should be aware, however, that these do not reflect the attitudes of the publisher of this edition and that they merely reflect the language, and its usage, of the early twentieth century" (Wilkins 1984, note).

The racial and ethnic references are to the foreign shores inhabited by Turks, Orientals, and African cannibals the story's protagonist, a boy named Rob, visits as he explores the possibilities of the electrical inventions given to him by the Demon of Electricity whom he accidentally summons during one of his experiments at

home. Baum dedicated the story to his son, Robert, who was interested in science and often used the Baum home as a site for his experiments. In a preface to his readers, Baum writes

The impossibilities of yesterday become the accepted facts of today. Here is a fairy tale founded upon the wonders of electricity and written for children of this generation. Yet when my readers shall have become men and women my story may not seem to their children like a fairy tale at all. Perhaps one, perhaps two-- perhaps several of the Demon's devices will be, by that time, in popular use. Who knows?

(Baum 1901, 347).

The Demon of Electricity gives Rob several gifts: a box of tablets capable of nourishing a human body for a full day; an electrically charged tube which will render an enemy unconscious for one hour; a machine the size of a watch which can carry a person anywhere by means of polar electric forces; an undergarment of protection similar to a bullet-proof vest; a television-like machine called a Record of Events; and spectacles that allow the wearer to read people's character vibrations to determine whether they are good, evil, wise, foolish, kind or cruel. As science fiction, Baum demonstrates an adventuresome spirit as well as a humorous instinct for self-preservation. The

Demon's Record of Events, for example, allows Rob to tune in to a Sarah Bernhardt play without going to the theater. Rob feels guilt for not having purchased a ticket and foresees the problems the modern entertainment industry is facing: "Yet it seems to me if these Records get to be common, as the Demon wishes, people will all stay at home and see the shows, and the poor actors'll starve to death" (Baum 1901, 386).

In the end, Rob understands the dangers inherent in these devices in the wrong hands and gives them all back. He explains, "I'm not wise enough. Nor is the majority of mankind wise enough to use such inventions as yours unselfishly and for the good of the world. If people were better, and every one had an equal show, it would be different" (Baum 1901, 431). Though he fears some would call him a fool, the young hero decides "It's no fun being a century ahead of the times!" Despite its faults as a "routine adventure spiced by early twentieth century American chauvinism," The Master Key is recognized as an "early science fantasy, important pioneering attempt to adapt current science to traditional fantasy to create an American fairy tale" (Molson 1981, 344).

"In the first six years of the new century he had created a half dozen magic worlds for the children" (Baum and MacFall 1961, 167) and only one was Oz. Baum's interest in exploring other worlds and other options is clear. Even after his return to Oz in 1907 with Ozma of

Oz, Baum had settled on a course that would allow him to produce a prodigious quantity of books without diluting the Oz market. He began writing under a variety of pseudonyms--Schuyler Stanton, Suzanne Metcalf, Captain Hugh Fitzgerald, Edith Van Dyne, Laura Bancroft, John Estes Cooke, Floyd Akers; he experimented with a variety of genres--adult fiction, boys' and girls' series books (similar to Tom Swift), travel books, and other fantasies. The Dictionary of Literary Biography lists over sixty-four titles published under Baum's name or his pseudonyms. Most of the pseudonymous books have fallen into obscurity; they are described as

readable, interesting, and undistinguished: they are repetitious, episodic, and filled with stock characters and situations. They have, however, one redeeming virtue. They are Baum's only efforts to communicate to his young readers a picture of the modern world (Erisman 1966, 243).

Erisman uses Baum's Aunt Jane's Nieces series, a fictional referent but firmly immersed in the problems of twentieth century America, as a point of contrast with the idealized world of Oz: "In his recognition of the difference between the real and the ideal, Baum can almost be said to embody the plight of the modern American" (Erisman 1966, 278).

The activities of the Baum family demonstrate their

improved financial standing from the success and sheer quantity of Baum's literary efforts: they moved to a bigger, better house in Chicago; they summered in Macatawa Park, Michigan, where Baum built a cottage he named "The Sign of the Goose" from the royalties from Father Goose; Baum joined the Chicago Athletic Club. As their four sons, Frank Joslyn, Robert Stanton, Harry Neal, and Kenneth Gage, grew up and the older two married, Frank and Maud were freed from the parental responsibilities they had always taken seriously. Frank and Maud took a trip abroad in 1905-06; in 1907-08, they spent the winter on Coronado off the coast of San Diego. Maud's book about their trip abroad, In Other Lands Than Ours, makes L. Frank sound like one of Mark Twain's tourists in The Innocents Abroad and reveals something of their relationship as well. She wrote, "L. F. grieves me. He says 'he can tell one old master from another as soon as he reads the name on the frame,' and makes other slighting remarks when I grow enthusiastic; but he seems as eager to study the picture as I am" (Baum, Maud, 145). The trip was a working vacation. She wrote from Sicily, "We plan to stay here three weeks, for L. F. must finish a book in order to save his publishers the expense of a cable every few days demanding the manuscript" (Baum, Maud, 84). Maud's description of Baum at the opera in Florence reveals him as always the showman: "L. F. says that Americans would not tolerate such shabby costuming or

crude stage settings; but the music was grand and inspiring" (Baum, Maud, 145). About her husband's enthusiasm when he described the Statue of Liberty in the harbor on their return home as the best sight of the trip, Maud noted, "He thinks too much of his comforts, for Europe is not very comfortable. We live better and more sensibly in America" (Baum, Maud, 181).

During this time Baum wrote Dorothy and the Wizard in Oz (1908)--a most depressing, atypical Oz story. It is the shortest book in the series, unhappy and impatient in the telling. In the preface, Baum complains, in what he tries to make sound a congenial fashion: "The children won't let me stop telling tales of the Land of Oz. I know lots of other stories, and I hope to tell them, some time or another; but just now my loving tyrants won't allow me."

His next Oz book is almost unanimously named by critics the weakest, most unfocused of the series--The Road to Oz. An explanation for the failures of these books was Baum's more compelling interest in a new technological theatrical venture he was involved with at the same time called the Fairylogue and Radio Plays. Baum's project had nothing to do with radio but used instead a patented process from the Selig Polyscope Company involving "a series of hand-tinted moving films . . . showing scenes from Baum's books, while he stood by as narrator" (Moore 1974, 65). The films were well-received but too expensive to produce. The venture lasted only through part of 1908

and left Baum heavily in debt, eventually forcing him into bankruptcy. The risks one takes as a performer were familiar ones to Baum. In The Master Key he wrote: "Familiarity with any great thing removes our awe of it . . . the great actor who is called before the curtain by admiring audiences is often waylaid at the stage door by his creditors" (Baum 1901, 356).

In 1910, Frank, Maud, and their two youngest boys moved to California permanently, settling in Hollywood in a house Baum named Ozcot. Baum's writing reflects every place he ever lived from Rose Lawn to Aberdeen to Coronado, but his exposure to California is given the most critical attention by those interested in mapping referential sub-texts for the geography of Oz. Jordan Brotman sees the move to southern California as Baum weaving "his own life into the design of Oz, for as an early arrival in 20th century California, Baum was living out an Oz dream. He was also sharing it with thousands of others to come, and anticipating by several decades the time when America at large, taking southern California as its model, would come to look more and more like Oz" (Brotman 1965, 67). His interpretation of this point of reference is that Baum's description of Oz (as southern California) gave him an "influence on the children [that] was probably incalculable" (Brotman 1965, 73).

In a nice example of art imitating life, Baum moves Dorothy, Aunt Em, and Uncle Henry to Oz permanently with

The Emerald City of Oz (1910), the same time he moved into Ozcot. Getting Dorothy settled eliminated the elaborate contrivances she had needed to transport her back and forth from earth to Oz and seemed an appropriate form of closure to the books. Baum used the threat of airships invading Oz's airspace and of outsiders who might overrun Oz as motivation for Ozma's decision to ask Glinda to make Oz invisible to all outsiders and thereby cut Oz off forever from the outside world. Baum asked the children not "to feel grieved, for we have had enough of the history of the Land of Oz to fill six story books" (E. City, 295-6). His preface is another plea for continued loyalty, regardless of his decision to quit Oz: "My readers know what they want and realize that I try to please them. . . . I hope, my dears, it will be a long time before we are obliged to dissolve partnership."

Three years later, Baum succumbed to his readers' knowledge of what they want (and his financial pressures as well) and wrote another Oz book, The Patchwork Girl of Oz (1913), explaining in the preface that a reader suggested using the wireless telegraph to communicate with Dorothy, and it worked. At the same time, Baum's membership in the Los Angeles Athletic Club led to the acquaintance of a theatrical producer, Oliver Morosco, which led to the 1913 production of Baum's last stage extravaganza, The Tik-Tok Man of Oz. The material for this production was reworked into his 1914 book, Tik-Tok

cf Oz. This show was a success, in part because of the music by Louis Gottschalk, a debt Baum acknowledged in the dedication to Tik-Tok: "To Louis F. Gottschalk, whose sweet and dainty melodies breathe the true spirit of fairyland."

A group of men, including Baum and such notables as Will Rogers and Darryl F. Zanuck, who were all friends from the Athletic Club, formed a new club called the Uplifters. Out of this group came the Oz Film Manufacturing Company with L. Frank Baum as its president and whose purpose it was to produce Oz fantasies for the screen. In September 1914, Paramount Pictures was persuaded to release the company's first film, The Patchwork Girl, in its theaters. The company made four more films while the first was in release, but it did so poorly that selling the rest was impossible, and the enterprise folded in less than a year. Baum lost only his time and his pride in this effort; no money. His biographers see Baum's failures as his "repeated inability to look beyond his work and judge the entertainment demands of adults" (Baum and MacFall 1961, 263), but it seems to be just as true that with both the Radio Plays and the film company, Baum was unable to resist the desire to be on the cutting edge of the new technologies developing in entertainment. The lure of the magic lanterns, movie cameras, and special effects was so fascinating to him in its potential that he forgot that

the entertainment industry is a business and his goal must be to entertain the audience, not necessarily himself. In this, he is like Smith & Tinker, the makers of the mechanical man, Tik-Tok. So pleased were they with their art and invention that they were, in one case, destroyed, and in the other, cut off from the real world--in other words, they did not recognize the barriers that exist between art and reality--a separation that Baum, with a family to support, was forced to make. Baum's wife facilitated his desire to explore his options by taking the responsibility for managing the family's financial affairs. According to his biographers, Maud actually owned Czcot, she was assigned all Baum's copyrights as they were issued, she deposited all checks and paid all expenses (Baum and MacFall 1961, 276). An insight into the tightly knit bonds of the two comes from Maud's niece, Matilda J. Gage, who reminisced about the year she spent visiting the Baums in California in a 1984 interview in Aberdeen, South Dakota. She described returning home from an outing with Uncle Frank and finding Maud lying stiffly on the couch with her back to them. Concerned that she was ill, they approached her, only to discover she was angry about being left out of their plans. But Baum was grateful for his wife's managerial abilities, for the strengths she offered seemed to compensate for his weaknesses. On his deathbed, he declared to Maud, "All my life, since I first met you and fell in love with you--I've been true to you.

There has--never been--another woman in my life--or thoughts" (Baum and MacFall 1961, 274). Maud's own evaluation of their marriage was also positive: "Our home life was ideal--we were congenial--peace and harmony reigned in our home always" ("Dear Sergeant" 1982, 9).

After 1915, Baum contented himself with his golf game, his interest in gardening (winning prizes for his dahlias and chrysanthemums), and his writing. Matilda Gage described Baum's writing process: "After lunch, Uncle Frank would sit on a straight-back chair tilted back against the porch wall and write his books. Then he would type them next morning" (Gage 1984). He had resigned himself, finally, to his role as Royal Historian of Oz. In the preface to The Scarecrow of Oz (1915), he wrote, "When the children have had enough of them, I hope they will let me know, and then I'll try to write something different."

Pressed for time with his commitment to movie-making, he reworked a non-Oz fairy tale from around 1905 into an Oz book, Rinkitink in Oz, for his 1916 annual. He prepares his readers in the preface: "You will find this story quite different from the other histories of Oz, but I hope you will not like it the less on that account." Hearn praises the story but damns the reworking: "it is a shame Baum prostituted this fine story with the too pat Oz type of conclusion" (Hearn 1983, 22).

The Lost Princess of Oz (1917) was written just as

Baum's health, never good, was beginning to fail badly. He was suffering from gall bladder attacks which finally resulted in surgery in 1917, and for his remaining life, he was virtually bed-ridden and suffering, though still producing his annual Oz book.

If there is any point in Baum's biography in which a referential sub-text clearly exists, the most poignant to me is the change in mood and message one finds echoing through his last three Oz books. The Tin Woodman of Oz (1918) is the story of the Tin Woodman's quest to recover a part of his past, but the underlying pulse of the book is the immortality in Oz: "In the Land of Oz, no one can ever be killed" (TW, 29); Dorothy takes comfort that a woman being punished for magical powers "can't starve to death in the Land of Oz" (TW, 184, emphasis his).

There is a hint that Baum feels twentieth century America has finally caught up to the dreams and possibilities he had already made an imaginative reality in Oz. In the preface to The Magic of Oz (1919), he voices a concern that "in the events which have taken place in the last few years in our 'great outside world,' we may find incidents so marvelous and inspiring that I cannot hope to equal them with stories of The Land of Oz." In addition to those events marvelous and inspiring, his dedication of The Magic of Oz to "The Children of our Soldiers, the Americans and their Allies, with unmeasured Pride and Affection," indicates his inability to separate

himself or his Oz books from the terrible and violent incidents either. Dying from the "long and confining illness" that he tells his readers has kept him from answering their letters, and nearly out of dreams, this second to the last book reflects quite personally on the constraints immortality puts on a fairyland, and, in a larger sense, that war has put on America, and raises doubts as to its universal application or desirability:

Because it is free from sickness and death is one reason why Oz is a fairyland, but it is doubtful whether those who come to Oz from the outside world, as Dorothy and Button-Bright and Trot and Cap'n Bill and the Wizard did, will live forever or cannot be injured. Even Ozma is not sure about this, and so the guests of Ozma from other lands are always carefully protected from any danger, so as to be on the safe side (Magic, 83).

Later when Cap'n Bill wards off a dangerous creature threatening Trot, a beast called a Kalidah, he stakes him to the ground since "no living thing in Oz can be killed" (Magic, 108). While Cap'n Bill and Trot are rooted to the soil of a magic isle where they have gone to pick a beautiful flower for Ozma's birthday, Bill contemplates his lot in life, including his wooden leg:

"There's lots o'things folks don't 'preciate," replied the sailor-man. "If somethin' would 'most stop your breath, you'd think breathin' easy was the finest thing in life. When a person's well, he don't realize how jolly it is, but when he gets sick he 'members the time he was well, an' wishes that time would come back. Most folks forget to thank God for givin' 'em two good legs, till they lose one o' 'em, like I did; and then it's too late, 'cept to praise God for leavin' one" (Magic, 175).

On the isle they meet the Lonesome Duck, a creature who echoes the plight of the Struldbuggs in Gulliver's Travels. He complains, "I've lived a long time, and I've got to live forever, because I belong in the Land of Oz, where no living thing dies. Think of existing year after year, with no friends, no family, and nothing to do! Can you wonder I'm lonesome?" (Magic, 178). It seems clear that in his pain and illness, Baum had discovered the burden of immortality he had thought, like Gulliver, would make life perfect.

There may be a leap of imagination required to get from the Lonesome Duck to Wallace Stevens' narrator in "Sunday Morning," but their question is the same.

Is there no change of death in paradise?

Does ripe fruit never fall? Or do the boughs

Hang always heavy in that perfect sky,
Unchanging, yet so like our perishing earth,
With rivers like our own that seek for seas
They never find, the same receding shores
That never touch with inarticulate pain?

. . .

Death is the mother of beauty, mystical,
Within whose burning bosom we devise
Our earthly mothers waiting, sleeplessly.

L. Frank Baum died on May 6, 1919, but he was survived by one last book, Glinda of Oz, published in 1920, based on notes he had made in the months prior to his death. The book is less about Glinda, the good witch of the South, than it is about Ozma's increased maturity as the ruler of Oz and her sober understanding of the limitations of her magical powers. Like the United States which had just entered World War I (the Baums' eldest son, Frank, was stationed in France), war has come to Oz as well. The two battling tribes, the Flatheads and the Skeezers, live too far from the country's hub to have benefited from Ozma's peaceful influence, so she and Dorothy decide to go and mediate the conflict. Glinda hesitates to let Dorothy go for fear of the risks a mortal runs in Oz.

[She] might possibly be destroyed, or hidden
where none of her friends could ever find her.

She could, for instance, be cut into pieces, and the pieces, while still alive and free from pain, could be widely scattered; or she might be buried deep underground, or 'destroyed' in other ways by evil magicians, were she not properly protected (Glinda, 29-30).

This extensive catalogue not only includes potential death rites for a man like Baum (cremation or burial), but also lists the mythical ways of disposing of gods who, though killed, are never really dead.

In another scene that is eerily reminiscent of the reports survivors give of their near-death experiences, Ozma and Dorothy encounter in their journey a valley filled with a floating mist, and beyond it, a beautiful grassy hill. Both girls hesitate and are somewhat afraid until Ozma summons the Mist Maids she suspects live there. She asks,

"Will you please take us to the opposite hillside? We are afraid to venture into the mist. I am Princess Ozma of Oz, and this is my friend Dorothy, a Princess of Oz."

The Mist Maids came nearer, holding out their arms. Without hesitation Ozma advanced and allowed them to embrace her and Dorothy plucked up courage to follow. Very gently the Mist Maids held them. Dorothy thought the arms

were cold and misty--they didn't seem real at all--yet they supported the two girls above the surface of the billows and floated with them so swiftly to the green hillside opposite that the girls were astonished (Glinda, 49-50).

The scene is remarkable, not only for its vision as a death experience, but also because, on this rare occasion, Ozma confesses to being afraid. Her confidence in her power is ebbing simultaneously with Baum's.

One of the warring tribes, the Skeezers, live on an island which is raised and lowered by a very complex mechanism: " a mass of great cog-wheels, chains and pulleys, all interlocked and seeming to form a huge machine; but there was no engine or other motive power to make the wheels turn" (Glinda, 257-58). Others of their defenses are their under-water boats, obviously a kind of submarine. When Dorothy and Ozma become trapped underwater in the submerged dome where the Skeezers live, Ozma worries that if the dome were flooded, Dorothy's Magic Belt would protect her from death and she "would have to lie forever at the bottom of the lake. 'No, I'd rather die quickly,' asserted the little girl" (Glinda, 139), another indication of the emotional conflict Baum must have been undergoing, fearing death while welcoming its release. Although the island's elevating mechanism is elaborately described and its powers highly advanced, none of the group can make it work to raise the island from its

underwater captivity until they discover that its activation depends on the correct magic word--the return to the fantastic Baum often resorts to in order to remind his readers that this is a fantasy after all.

In some ways, the mechanism also seems a fitting symbol for Baum's invention of Oz. He created a highly detailed structure whose operation depends on the inter-workings of the characters who function as cogs in the machine. The American children who are accidental tourists in Oz take second place to the imaginative fairyland creatures of Oz whose humanity forces us to examine our own, who challenge our expectations, turn our stereotypes upside-down, and teeter on the outer edges of possibility. All the while, Baum never lost sight of the reason he entered Oz in the first place--for the adventure. Ozma admits to Dorothy that

I am not all-powerful. . . . some fairies can do magic that fills me with astonishment. I think that is what makes us modest and unassuming--the fact that our magic arts are divided, some being given each of us. I'm glad I don't know everything, Dorothy, and that there still are things in both nature and in wit for me to marvel at (Glinda, 58).

Like Ozma, Baum knew his limits. His talents as a writer were not all-powerful, but he did some magic with his

invention of Oz that has filled us all with astonishment.

CHAPTER III
THE MACHINERY OF OZ: CHARACTERS AS COGS
Part A: Introduction

The semantics necessary to discuss and analyze Baum's contributions to science fiction, a genre whose form he incidentally helped create, were unavailable to the critics of his era, even had they had the opportunity to recognize his originality and his imaginative exploration of the inevitable conflict between humans and the technological world they were building for themselves. Despite his label as a writer for children and his deceptively simple style, Baum's Oz books raised the very complex philosophical question of what it means to be human by presenting and contrasting characters who range from human beings like Dorothy to those who are essentially mechanical, and all the possibilities in between. In The Wizard of Oz, Dorothy first meets a live Scarecrow, then a Tin Woodman, and finally a talking Cowardly Lion, all of whom accompany her on her quest to find the Wizard in the Emerald City. The first and last of these three are obviously only possible in a fantasy and not unlike creatures who have been brought to life or given humanized personalities in fables and fairy tales. The Tin Woodman, however, is an original and complex representative of the

middle ground between humanity and machinery; a being who originated as a "normal" man (though a citizen of the fairyland of Oz, not our real world) but who, through a series of unfortunate accidents caused by an enchanted axe, has lost different parts of his body which have been replaced by tin prostheses until he becomes entirely made of tin--the original Bionic Man. Serving as the Tin Woodman's foil is another man-like creature made of metal named Tik-Tok who is introduced in the third book of the series, Ozma of Oz. The fundamental difference between the two is not only their intrinsic source of being--one alive and the other not--but also the responses each evokes in his human companions.

The difficulties we encounter in attempting to arrange Baum's characters on a spectrum marking degrees of personhood soon brings us to the realization that his ingenuity in character invention challenges the value system we might have expected to use. If human beings are next to God and thus at the top of the scale, do those from the real world (if the Kansas from which Dorothy blew is real) rank above or below those citizens of Oz who seem human? And is it fair to rate the two characters who are both made of metal, the Tin Woodman and Tik-Tok, by their appearance, or their origin, their behavior or by their valuation by their companions? And what of those creatures who are frankly magical?

This chapter will analyze the major characters of the

Oz series to examine each one's function in the inner-workings of the invention of Oz, focusing in particular on their origins and their symbolic functions.

This question of identity--how it is established; where in the body one's "soul" or "being" or "personality," that which separates one person from another, resides; what it is that makes us each unique--these are questions Baum explores with his characters in the Oz books. His Oz books demonstrate that, though we fear technology may strip us of our humanity, in fact, technology has the potential to enhance our humanity by forcing us to articulate what it is that separates us from machines and from each other. If one doubts the relevance of Baum's exploration, consider Martin Gardner's note about the Tin Woodman and his counterpart, the tin soldier Capt. Fyter, in his scantily annotated edition of The Wizard of Oz: "The histories of these two remarkable personages raise profound metaphysical questions concerning personal identity" (Gardner and Nye 1957, 198). These same questions become infinitely more pertinent to us in this age of modern medicine when the kind of body part replacement the tinsmith performed on the Tin Woodman is not so very different from the organ transplants so common today. When surgeons can replace one person's heart, liver, kidneys, and ultimately, perhaps one's brain with another's makes the question of where our own humanity begins even more relevant now.

The Tin Woodman, the Scarecrow, Dorothy, and the Wizard are the four characters introduced in The Wizard of Oz who reappear throughout the series, lending an important sense of continuity to the Oz books and identifying Oz more clearly than the location itself does. The Cowardly Lion is also part of the initial trio of traveling companions Dorothy acquires in the first book, but his function is as a differential--the animal required to complete the vegetable, animal, mineral triad these three companions represent. As a "meat creature" (Baum's term for those flesh-and-blood characters who must eat and sleep to survive and who are potentially mortal, were they not inhabitants of Oz), the Cowardly Lion becomes Dorothy's counterpart--vulnerable like her to the powerful aroma of the poppy field and the physical hazards of their journey. The Cowardly Lion becomes king of the forest at the end of The Wizard of Oz and falls into relative obscurity for the rest of the series.

The Wizard's role, though intermittent, is ongoing and often important to the action; he appears in eleven of the fourteen books. When he is absent, his function as the male adult figure is filled by others--Cap'n Bill and the Shaggy Man, for example, who have also been transplanted from the United States to Oz.

Baum seems to have considered doing away with Dorothy as a continuing character in the series when, in the

second book, he leaves her in Kansas and introduces Tip/Ozma as the child protagonist. Acknowledging her popularity with his readers, however, Baum brought her back in the third book which he dedicated "to all the boys and girls who read my stories--and especially to the Dorothys," and never left her out again, though she is sometimes given only a superficial mention in the actual adventure, and the child protagonist function is served by some other youngster--Tip/Ozma in The Land of Oz, Ojo in the first half of The Patchwork Girl, Betsy Bobbin in Tik-Tok, Trot in The Scarecrow of Oz, and Prince Inga in Rinkitink of Oz.

The illustration on page 59 charts the presence in each of the fourteen Oz books of these four "regulars"--Dorothy, the Tin Woodman, the Scarecrow, and the Wizard--as well as the Princess Ozma who, after she regains her rightful identity in The Land of Oz, appears in each of the remaining Oz books. There is a rhythmic synchronization to the appearance of the characters when they are represented graphically, a design not unlike the carefully wrought plan the inventors Smith & Tinker must have used in fashioning Tik-Tok, the mechanical man. The first section of this chapter, Part B, deals with the humans in Oz who sometimes appear to be present only as tokens of what is purported to be real. Parts C and D examine those creatures in Oz who are somehow alive but neither human nor mechanical, emphasizing the Tin Woodman's dichotomous

partner, the Scarecrow. The final sections of this chapter will focus on the Tin Woodman, analyzing his character function by contrasting him with Tik-Tok.

Part B: The Token Humans

The appeal and enchantment of Baum's Oz characters and even the fairyland itself are effected partly by their contrast to the presence of the children whose exploration of Oz forms the basis of each book. Not only is Dorothy the best-known, best-loved, and Baum's most often used protagonist, but also she has won Baum an honored place among feminist critics. At the same time Brian Attebery is making a case for the pattern of The Wizard of Oz as exemplary of the morphology of traditional folk tales which concern Propp, two feminist scholars are finding Dorothy's quest to be an example of The Female Hero in American and British Literature. Pearson and Pope attack the premise that "heroism is a male phenomenon." They argue that "on the archetypal level the journey to self-discovery is the same for both the male and female hero" (Pearson and Pope, viii). Briefly, they outline the steps of Dorothy's quest in The Wizard of Oz as classic stages of the archetypal journey: Dorothy's flight (from Kansas), slaying of the dragon (the Wicked Witch), meeting a mentor (Glinda), finding a savior (the Wizard), destroying the myth of romantic love and inflated patriarchy (unveiling the Wizard), and meeting again a female rescuer (Glinda) who identifies her as the holder of her own power. Dorothy returns home to a new farmhouse, "new life, fertility, and love" (Pearson and Pope 1981, 71).

Baum's preference for female heroes, to use Pearson and Pope's terminology, has led many critics to examine Baum's attitude toward feminism. Several analyses link his fictional invention to the influence of his mother-in-law, Matilda Joslyn Gage, a leading nineteenth-century suffragist. Robert Luehrs has written an essay examining the relevance of Gage's 1893 book, Woman, Church, and State, to Baum's fiction. He notes, "Gage called for a rebirth of the matriarchate, and that is precisely the nature of Oz" (Luehrs 1983, 5).

As the father of four sons, this preference for female protagonists rather than males may have been the fictional fulfillment of a dream to have a daughter. Or, since his essay, "Modern Fairy Tales," expresses strong admiration for Lewis Carroll's creation of Alice, while criticizing the story itself as "rambling and incoherent" (Baum 1909, p. 237), he may have been creating an American imitation. Since he raised the issue himself, it is not surprising that the two female heroes are often compared. Martin Gardner writes, "Like Alice, Dorothy Gale is a healthy, bright, attractive, outspoken, unaffected, supremely self-confident and courageous little girl" (Gardner 1969, 153). In "The Amazonia of Oz," Vogel claims, "There is nothing that approaches the characterization of Dorothy in the entirety of children's literature, with the sole exception of Lewis Carroll's Alice" (Vogel 1982, 5). Michael Patrick Hearn sees a

difference: "unlike Lewis Carroll's Alice, Baum's Dorothy seems always in control of her circumstances" (Hearn 1983, 22).

Brian Attebery connects Dorothy to the Western pioneer woman, an ideal Baum had written about in his Aberdeen paper. Selma Lanes calls Dorothy "a sort of American tourist in fairyland--eager, innocent and likable--but . . . constantly homesick" (Lanes 1971, 97). Dorothy is praised for her calm approach to the wonders of Oz, "accepting each new detail with the same unshakable curiosity with which she faced the last" (Sale 1972-73, 578). Hearn's description of Dorothy summarizes all of these critical analyses of Dorothy--her American identity in contrast to an English one, her pluck, her self-confidence. He writes

[Dorothy] is a practical, clear-sighted modern child; she is an American child, full of mother wit and grit. One would never expect Baum's Dorothy to cry a pool of tears. She thinks and reacts like a real child. When she lands in Oz, she does not go off to seek her fortune; she wants to go home and, despite the odds, she will get home. Wicked witches do not frighten her; the beauties of the Emerald City do not dazzle her from her purpose. She is from Kansas after all (Hearn 1983, 22).

Baum's characterization of Dorothy is as much a part of the American flavor of his Oz books as is his use of technology. There is something in her and in all the the transplanted American children Baum sends to Oz that readers find narcissistically familiar, and their recognition holds a kind of nationalistic pride. Baum's depiction of Kansas as gray and dismal is important not only as a contrast to Oz, but also because it provides Dorothy with a hard-knocks environment which has made her self-sufficient, enterprising, and so unaccustomed to grandeur that she is incapable of a false response.

From the moment she lands in Oz, Dorothy's reactions ring true. She is dismayed at the dead witch under her house but only half-frightened; she is full of questions; she is practical about her personal toilette and getting her meals; she makes friends easily and is not easily surprised about anything. Though she is well-mannered and respectful, her basic honesty requires her to call a spade a spade and a humbug a humbug. Her exchange with Princess Langwidere, the lady with thirty heads, demonstrates the sort of democratic spirit which critics and children readers alike respond to as American. Dorothy is in the process of making friendly introductions when Princess Langwidere commands her to stop.

"How dare you annoy me with your senseless chatter?"

"Why, you horrid thing!" said Dorothy, who

was not accustomed to being treated so rudely.

The Princess looked at her more closely.

"Tell me," she resumed, "are you of royal blood?"

"Better than that, ma'am," said Dorothy. "I came from Kansas" (Ozma, 69).

When the Princess wishes to exchange her No. 26 head for Dorothy's, she responds, "Well, I believe you won't! . . . I'm not used to taking cast-off things, so I'll just keep my own head" (Ozma, 69-70).

The other trait that makes Dorothy remarkable is her fierce loyalty. Her overriding motivation in The Wizard of Oz is to get home to Aunt Em and Uncle Henry, but her concern is more than just her emotional bond to them. She knows that if she doesn't get back quickly, "Aunt Em will surely think something dreadful has happened to me, and that will make her put on mourning; and unless the crops are better this year than they were last I am sure Uncle Henry cannot afford it" (Wizard, 231) In the third book, she simply states, "Uncle Henry needs me" (Ozma, 256). In the fourth book, she has been away from Kansas so long that she sees in Ozma's Magic Picture that Uncle Henry and Aunt Em are in mourning already. "'Uncle Henry and Aunt Em need me to help them,' she added, 'so I can't ever be very long away from the farm in Kansas'" (D & W, 219). Finally, in The Emerald City of Oz, Baum moves them all to

Oz permanently so the struggle for home is no longer an issue. Dorothy Gale's refrain that there is no place like home set the tone for movies like E. T. whose emotional appeal comes from this invisible umbilical cord connecting travelers to their homeland.

The reunion of Dorothy and her family in Oz was an attempt by Baum to close the Oz series. When three years later, he returns to Oz, Dorothy is only a peripheral character, part of the essential environment of Oz but given, as the chart on page 59 demonstrates, little opportunity to develop further. Instead, Baum introduces two other American girls as heroes--Trot and Betsy Bobbin.

Trot is the heroine of two non-Oz books Baum wrote in 1911 and 1912, just after taking leave of Oz. In a recent character analysis, "The Tribulations of Trot," Barbara S. Koelle explains that Trot's mother is alive and well in California while her father is away at sea. Her constant companion, Cap'n Bill, had been a boarder at Trot's mother's boarding house until the two of them are swept away in a whirlpool and end up in Oz in The Scarecrow of Oz. Koelle notes that though Em and Henry were transported to Oz, Baum "could hardly seek the same solution for all the relatives of his young American protagonists" (Koelle 1977, 5), so Trot shares little of Dorothy's anxiety about home. Her touch of home comes from the presence of Cap'n Bill. Koelle describes their relationship as "not authoritarian but egalitarian . . .

[He is] her great friend, mentor, companion, and (sometimes) follower" (Koelle 1977, 5).

The other American protagonist, Betsy, arrives in Oz via a hurricane with her pet mule, Hank, in a manner too strikingly similar to Dorothy's entry with Billina in Ozma of Oz to be mere coincidence. The Oz Scrapbook explains that Tik-Tok of Oz "began as Baum's 1908-9 dramatization of Ozma of Oz" (Greene and Martin 1977, 40), and when Baum had the book published, he didn't bother to create a new contrivance for Betsy's transport. Betsy's history is sketchy, her personality unexplored, her function is to be a surrogate through which the readers can see Oz. She might as well be Dorothy except that Baum needs someone less familiar with the wonders of Oz in order to evoke new amazement and require some recapitulation of past adventures for her introduction to Oz. In an exchange that is exactly like what we might expect from Dorothy, Betsy Bobbin meets the threatening Nome King, in Tik-Tok of Oz:

" . . . how dare you bring that beast here and enter my presence unannounced?"

"There wasn't anybody to announce me," replied Betsy. "I guess you folks were all busy. Are you conquered yet?"

"No!" shouted the King, almost beside himself with rage.

"Then please give me something to eat, for

I'm awful hungry," said the girl. "You see, this conquering business is a good deal like waiting for a circus parade; it takes a long time to get around and don't amount to much anyhow" (Tik-Tok, 172-73).

The girls all appear together in The Lost Princess of Oz (1917) with Princess Ozma, and, in the illustrations, they have become almost indistinguishable, except for Ozma's crown and Trot's boyish cap. The original title for this book had been Three Girls in Oz, but Baum reconsidered (Greene and Martin 1977, 40). He sacrificed their individuality at the expense of the smooth operation of their function, the token humans in Oz.

In his last book, Glinda of Oz, Baum returns to his first and best characterization. Dorothy's youth and naivete are in sharp contrast to Ozma's burden as the ruler of a country where peace has been interrupted. Instead of being accompanied by their usual adult male protector, Dorothy and Ozma set off on their expedition to arbitrate the war between the Skeezers and the Flatheads alone. Baum, at last, allows the two girls their bildungsroman, and their role as peacemakers celebrates the best of their feminine spirit--empathy, grace, sensitivity, kindness, the ability to be facilitators and, most importantly, treasured friends to one another.

The most important of these human male protectors is the Wizard of Oz. His role is central to many of the

plots, and his characterization develops and matures more than any other in the series. In The Wizard of Oz, he is revealed as a humbug, an Omaha-born circus balloonist who accidentally floats to Oz on a runaway balloon and is accepted as the country's ruler. Kenneth J. Reckford's excellent article, "The Wizard's Magic," describes the evolution of O. Z. Diggs (his nine names form the acronym OZ PINHEAD, so he dropped all but the first two initials) from a humbug wizard to a skilled and able magician who, under the tutelage of the sorceress Glinda, is capable of wonderful and beneficent magical deeds.

In a thematically consistent vein, he is seldom seen without the tools of his trade, carried in a black bag like a doctor who makes house calls. The dependence of a craftsman on his tools is a leitmotif of the Oz series, and in this case, the craft is wizardry. Dorothy observes, "He can't wiz a single thing if he hasn't the tools and machinery to work with" (D & W, 149). Later, when he finds himself without his bag of tools, he compares himself to a carpenter who can't work without a hammer and a saw. Not until the final book, when all of his and Glinda's efforts, including the use of a instrument called a skeropythrope and Glinda's magic recipe No. 1163, have failed, do they succeed with only an incantation and no tools at all. The increasing power of his magic alters his function from being a rather impotent companion to Dorothy, a humbug protector, to a deus ex

machina, capable of controlling events as they occur.

The most powerful fairy in Oz is Princess Ozma, but she, too, relies on the skills of the Wizard and Glinda since their abilities are diversified. Ozma, like the Tin Woodman, is a marginal character, difficult to categorize. She does not rightly belong in the token human section since she is a fairy princess, but our first introduction to her is as a human, a young Munchkin boy named Tip. The sexual metamorphosis in The Land of Oz, where Tip unexpectedly finds himself/herself returned to his/her natural state as the girl ruler of Oz, Princess Ozma, is a striking example of Baum's apparent lack of concern with gender. At first Tip objects to undoing the transformation he had undergone as a baby, but the Tin Woodman assures him, "it don't hurt to be a girl, I'm told; and we will all remain your faithful friends just the same. And, to be honest with you, I've always considered girls nicer than boys" (Land, 266). So Tip is convinced and assumes his/her rightful identity as "a young girl, fresh and beautiful as a May morning" (Land, 270).

Critics have made much of this sex-reversal, particularly because, early in the book, Tip brings to life a pumpkinhead man who identifies him as "father"--a relationship Tip isn't altogether comfortable with either, but which complicates his becoming a female even further. Does this make him Jack Pumpkinhead's mother? Jordan Brotman describes the Tip/Ozma reversal as "unsentimental

and childlike; Baum delighted as much as his child audience in upsetting the identity of things as given by the adult world" (Brotman 1965, 72). A more pragmatic, less satisfying explanation is that The Land of Oz was written as the basis for a musical comedy, and Tip's transformation into Ozma is "a variant of the Principal Boy in theatrical tradition" (Hearn 1973, 27). That explanation is echoed by Gore Vidal who also notes Baum's interest was in children as a category rather than male or female. He supports Baum's stand, asserting that "what matters most even to an adolescent is not the gender of the main character who experiences adventures but the adventures themselves, and the magic, and the jokes, and the pictures" (Vidal 1982, 73).

Carl S. Vogel carries Baum's minimizing of sexual differences in children one step further and claims:

A generation before Woolf in Orlando, Baum uses the device of a sexual transformation to make the point that human personality is, essentially, androgynous; the same character can be Tip and male or Ozma and female without any alteration in personality. Or, as Jack Pumpkinhead remarks after the transformation, Ozma is "the same--only different!" (Vogel 1982, 8).

The evidence is clear almost immediately, though, that

Ozma is not the same as Tip had been. As a boy, Tip was a character reminiscent of Tom Sawyer, but as Ozma, he/she speaks "with sweet diffidence" (Land, 271), and takes her role as a ruler much too responsibly to enjoy playing tricks and taking wild rides on a saw horse, as Tip once did. Baum's decision to restore Ozma as the rightful ruler of Oz does seem a conscious decision to let the females rule, and her gentle dominion affirms his good sense.

Part C: The Frankly Magical

As the major characters pursue their quests and adventures, they meet and collect a menagerie of companions whose imaginative personalities and persons serve a comic as well as a symbolic and satiric function in Baum's Oz books. Brian Attebery ranks the non-human creatures in a spectrum from A to D. "Class A figures [are] bold, humorous, unforgettable, characters who nearly assume hero status" (Attebery 1980, 99) and include the Tin Woodman, the Scarecrow, and Jack Pumpkinhead. His Class D figures are those who ought to have been "left out of the story" (Attebery 1980, 103). His ranking relies a great deal on the size of the character's role (major or minor) as well as its likeability. Jack Snow's Who's Who in Oz (1954) catalogues 640 characters in the Oz books from 1900 to 1954 in a strictly alphabetical order, and a cursory survey shows that more of them are non-human than

not. That there are a multitude of unusual, non-human but animated characters in Oz is not evidence of Baum's originality. Filling the canvas of Oz with animated creatures one might not normally expect to be alive is one concession he makes to the "old-time fairy tale" which he sought to modernize with the publication of The Wizard of Oz. The characters discussed here as frankly magical are those whose magical creation L. Frank Baum describes as a systematic process of invention, as a bringing to life that readers witness, like being present in a labor room. This eliminates those "of woman born" (all the humans, including the Tin Woodman), and also those mechanical inventions like Tik-Tok.

While Baum's life-giving scenes are graphic and detailed, the natural antithesis, death, is denied or couched in euphemistic terms--deactivation, destruction, or spoiling. The life and death dichotomy serves as a metaphor for Baum individually and for the United States generally. In the Oz books, Baum's characters have the experience of awakening to a world entirely new to them and the result usually reflects a comic appreciation of the importance of clear, understandable language and the pitfalls of doublespeak, as well as the joy of personal experience as life's best teacher--lessons Baum's characters and his own writing style reinforce. Baum's fascination with newness may translate, in a large sense, to the frontiers the United States still felt it had left

to conquer, the history it had only begun to write, unhampered by Old World culture or caution. On the other hand, the worst fears some of these characters articulate are those same fears Baum sought to conquer and which the country had to turn back and face with our entry into World War I.

The device most frequently used to awaken these magically embodied characters is the Powder of Life, the result of a seven-year creative process by an old magician, Pipt. He is illustrated as a bony, crooked old man, stirring pots and beakers with his hands and feet in a laboratory-like setting. Wonderful as it may seem, Dr. Pipt acknowledges the limitations of his power. His first Powder of Life subject, a cat named Bungle who was brought to life as a pet for his wife, Dame Margolotte, asks if humans who grow are magical. Pipt answers, "Yes; but it is Nature's magic, which is more wonderful than any art known to man. For instance, my magic made you, and made you live; but it was a poor job because you are useless and a bother to me; but I can't make you grow" (PW Girl, 48). Through some illicit dealings, the Powder of Life comes into the hands of a witch named Mombi, is stolen by Tip who uses it first on Jack Pumpkinhead, and later on the Saw-horse and the Gump. Several books later, Pipt is reintroduced and brings to life a Patchwork Girl named Scraps.

That the character of Tip is the giver of life as he

sprinkles Dr. Pipt's precious powder becomes ironically and biologically appropriate when, at the end of The Land of Oz, we discover that Tip is no one's father, symbolically or literally. Tip as Ozma becomes a maternal figure, not paternal. Baum has made, for whatever reason, a sort of biological correction to the process.

The first two of Tip's "children"--Jack Pumpkinhead and the Saw-Horse--are similar in their creation and awakening. The Gump is singular, unique in both his manufacture and his reaction to life. He is a hastily assembled conglomeration of objects, thrown together to make an escape vehicle for Tip and his friends. The Gump's head is a mounted trophy of an animal somewhat like an elk with the beard of a billy-goat which hangs above the mantel, his body two sofas tied together, his wings four palm leaves, and his tail, a broom attached to the back. Note the terminology Baum employs as the Scarecrow surveys the Gump's components: "Well, if friend Nick [the Tin Woodman] can manufacture, from this mess of rubbish, a Thing that will fly through the air and carry us to safety, then I will acknowledge him to be a better mechanic than I suspected" (Land, 188). After Tip sprinkles him with the Powder of Life (its power undercut by its being stored in a common pepper-box), the Gump's first reaction is mortification.

"This," said the Gump, in a squeaky voice not at all proportioned to the size of its great

body, "is the most novel experience I ever heard of. The last thing I remember distinctly is walking through the forest and hearing a loud noise. Something probably killed me then, and it certainly ought to have been the end of me. Yet here I am, alive again, with four monstrous wings and a body which I venture to say would make any respectable animal or fowl weep with shame to own. What does it all mean? Am I a Gump, or am I a juggernaut?" (Land, 195).

To which Tip replies, rather unsympathetically, "You're just a Thing with a Gump's head on it" (Land, 195).

Because his head has once been alive as part of a living creature in the forest, the Gump feels shame to have been reincarnated in such a hodge-podge construction and begs to be taken apart after he has served his purpose. He notes, "I did not wish to be brought to life, and I am greatly ashamed of my conglomerate personality. Once I was a monarch of the forest, as my antlers fully prove; but now . . . I beg to be dispersed" (Land, 278). He feels that to be alive is not enough; one must also be able to take pride in the propriety of one's being, a view not always supported by the other characters.

Jack Pumpkinhead, introduced in The Land of Oz, was created when Tip, the Munchkin boy, "decided to manufacture the form of a man" (Land, 4) and brought him to life with a magic Powder of Life stolen from Tip's

guardian, the witch Mombi. Jack is a naive, child-like creature whom Gore Vidal calls "a comic of the Ed Wynn-Simple Simon school" (Vidal 1982, 70), while others have noticed his marked resemblance to Nathaniel Hawthorne's Feathertop. His awakening to life is similar to the Scarecrow's and to another Powder-of-Life recipient, the Patchwork Girl, all of whom demonstrate the tabula rasa approach to human nature, an unmolded personality which only takes shape after experiences leave their mark.

After his awakening, Jack Pumpkinhead responds to the question of what he knows now that he is alive: "Well, that is hard to tell for although I feel that I know a tremendous lot, I am not yet aware how much there is in the world to find out about. It will take me a little time to discover whether I am very wise or very foolish" (Land, 17). Unlike the Tin Woodman, the Scarecrow, or even Tik-Tok, Jack has the sense to doubt his intellect-- "he is a wise fool, a Touchstone, revealing the inconsistencies of those around him" (Attebery 1980, 102).

In contrast to the Scarecrow's tenacious dependence on his head as a source of his being, the character of Jack Pumpkinhead presents an opposite perspective. He continually fears that his head will rot, and eventually he settles on a farm where he grows his own pumpkins so that "he might change his head as often as it became wrinkled or threatened to spoil" (E. City, 261). Jack Pumpkinhead defies death (rotting) by insuring his own

immortality (freshly grown pumpkin heads), but in a thrust that is typically Baumian, Jack regularly offers his guests pumpkin pies as a repast. Of course he never eats them himself because he notes, "Were I to eat pumpkins I would become a cannibal, and the other reason is that I never eat, not being hollow inside" (E. City, 262). The inverted logic in the ordering of his reasons makes clear Baum's intention to jar his readers' sense of propriety. Will any of us ever eat a pumpkin pie again without some perturbation?

Jack Pumpkinhead and the Saw-Horse are brothers not only because Tip gave them both life. Both are made from wood, hand carved by Tip and minimal in design, and both are pleased to be alive, unlike the Gump.

All of these newly awakened characters have the capacity for instant language comprehension and speech, but the Saw-Horse shows the most need for clear explanation of language. His reaction to the first spoken sounds he ever hears is to run away until he steps into a gopher-hole and falls over.

"You're a nice sort of a horse, I must say!" [Tip] exclaimed. "Why didn't you stop when I yelled 'whoa'?"

"Does 'whoa' mean to stop?" asked the Saw-Horse, in a surprised voice, as it rolled its eyes upward to look at the boy.

"Of course it does," answered Tip.

"And a hole in the ground means to stop, also, doesn't it?" continued the horse.

"To be sure; unless you step over it," said Tip.

"What a strange place this is," the creature exclaimed, as if amazed. "What am I doing here, anyway?" (Land, 45).

Like Jack Pumpkinhead, the Saw-Horse acquires the same sense of sensibility, with his growing experience: "I seem to learn very quickly, and often it occurs to me that I know more than any of those around me" (Land, 126).

This self-assurance and pride in one's originality is one reason critics have accused Baum of an un-American class-consciousness. The Tin Woodman evaluates Jack Pumpkinhead and determines "you are certainly unusual, and therefore worthy to become a member of our select society" (Land, 120). For the same reason, he accepts the Saw-Horse as a comrade: "A live Saw-Horse is a distinct novelty, and should prove an interesting study" (Land, 126).

Another facet of this dismissal of common folks comes from the American representative, Dorothy, who discourages her pet hen Billina from associating with "those common chickens" because they might spoil her manners and she would no longer be respectable (Ozma, 112). Billina, however, defends her right not only to associate with those common chickens but to fight with them as well

because she says, "I was raised in the United States, and I won't allow any one-horse chicken of the Land of Ev to run over me and put on airs, as long as I can lift a claw in self-defense" (Ozma, 112).

Billina's stance is reinforced by the Tin Woodman who, in discussing his army with Dorothy, notes wryly, "officers usually fight better and are more reliable than common soldiers. Besides, the officers are more important looking, and lend dignity to our army" (Ozma, 115).

A certain snobbishness or worse yet, prejudice, can be inferred from the creation of the Patchwork Girl who was originally made to be a servant to Dr. Pipt's wife. Dame Margolotte purposely sews her from a crazy quilt so that "she will find herself to be of so many unpopular colors that she'll never dare be rebellious or impudent, as servants are sometimes liable to be when they are made the same way their mistresses are" (PW Girl, 32). The Patchwork Girl's wild appearance only makes her a more colorful and memorable character, and her origin as a crazy quilt seems appropriate to her scatter-brained but comforting attitude toward life. Incidentally, Ojo, the boy protagonist in The Patchwork Girl of Oz, in a democratic gesture, surreptitiously gives her more than the planned dose of character qualities, which alters her personality from the one her makers envisioned. Of the bottles of Brain Furniture labelled Obedience, Cleverness, Judgment, Courage, Ingenuity, Amiability, Learning, Truth,

Poesy, and Self Reliance, her mistress thought that Obedience, Amiability, and Truth were all a servant needed. At the last minute, she adds a dose of Cleverness which gives Scraps a double dose, an excuse for Baum to allow her to spout nonsensical verse and make terrible jokes.

When the Patchwork Girl is brought to life, she is full of energy and independence. Her response to the world is "Just let me discover myself in my own way" (PW Girl, 72). Her light-hearted approach to self-reliance is similar to Dorothy's, although Dorothy has little of Scraps' madcap sense of humor.

Russel B. Nye sees no evidence, not "a whisper of class-consciousness in Oz (as there is in Alice's Wonderland)" (Gardner and Nye 1957, 16), and cites these lines from The Emerald City of Oz as a defense: "To be different from your fellow creatures is always a misfortune." Baum's strongly individualized characters speak more loudly and consistently than this modest disclaimer. Even villains are respected for their individuality. Ugu, the overly-ambitious magician who steals all the magical tools in Oz, is respected by the Wizard. "This Ugu must be a man of ideas, because he does things in a different way from other people" (Lost, 252). Gore Vidal notes, "The dreamy boy with the bad heart at a hated military school was as conscious as any Herman Hesse youth that he was splendidly different from others"

(Vidal 1982, 78).

Indeed, it is the strong sense of individual characterization one finds in Baum's inventions that comprises their charm and reinforces the philosophy that we can all be different--splendidly. That there is no mistaking one of these magical characters for another, when his human girls in Oz--Trot or Betsy or Dorothy--sometimes appear to be interchangeable is part of the dilemma Baum presents. Even the frankly magical characters are not spared the fear that makes us all equal, however--the fear of losing our lives. It seems the Gump's voice has a rare sense of proportion, after all.

Part D: From Software to Hardware

"My life has been so short that I really know nothing whatever. I was only made day before yesterday. What happened in the world before that time is all unknown to me. Luckily, when the farmer made my head, one of the first things he did was to paint my ears, so that I heard what was going on. There was another Munchkin with him, and the first thing I heard was the farmer saying,

'How do you like those ears?'

'They aren't straight,' answered the other.

'Never mind,' said the the farmer, 'they are ears just the same,' which was true enough.

'Now I'll make the eyes,' said the farmer. So he painted my right eye, and as soon as it was finished I found myself looking at him and at everything around me with a great deal of curiosity, for this was my first glimpse of the world.

'That's a rather pretty eye,' remarked the Munchkin who was watching the farmer; 'blue paint is just the color for eyes.'

'I think I'll make the other a little bigger,' said the farmer; and when the second eye was done I could see much better than before. Then he made my nose and my mouth; but I did not speak, because at that time I didn't

know what a mouth was for. I had the fun of watching them make my body and my arms and legs; and when they fastened on my head, at last I felt very proud, for I thought I was just as good a man as anyone.

'This fellow will scare the crows fast enough,' said the farmer; 'he looks just like a man.'

'Why, he is a man,' said the other, and I quite agreed with him (Wizard, 43-44).

Like that of the frankly magical characters described in the previous section, the Scarecrow's creation is both a mechanical and an artistic process. He is made by a Munchkin farmer to frighten the birds from the field, but his maker appears to take pride in his work and, although Baum never explains what it was that the Munchkin farmers did while they were constructing this particular scarecrow to give him life and animation, there is an affirmation of life in the farmer's signification, "he is a man." This Scarecrow, who is Dorothy's first acquaintance on her journey to the Emerald City, relates his coming to life experience in the sort of Einstein-like "thought experiment" process Baum uses again and again in his writing to explore the question of identity and origin.

A scarecrow is a figure with which Dorothy would be well acquainted since she is a farm girl from Kansas. The animation of this scarecrow is a signal to Dorothy that things are not what they seem here in Oz; Oz is no Kansas. This scarecrow is a genius loci, exemplary of the kind of fantasy Dorothy should learn to expect and even take for granted in the Land of Oz. The Scarecrow is soft, stuffed with straw that often falls out and gives him an unsteady,

wobbly gait; his face is a small sack with the features painted on, one eye larger than the other; his clothes are hand-me-downs from an old Munchkin farmer. One might assume that since Oz is a fairyland, all the scarecrows hanging on poles in the farmfields also might have life if someone like Dorothy would just come along and take them down, but he seems to be unique, even in Oz. The reaction of the Oz citizens is proof of that. They are proud to be governed by the only living scarecrow in the country, and like the Tin Woodman, the Scarecrow prizes singularity: "I am convinced that the only people worthy of consideration in this world are the unusual ones. For the common folks are like the leaves of a tree, and live and die unnoticed" (Land, 182).

The Scarecrow's remembrance of his beginning is described as a wonderful "description of the awakening of a new mind, the first initial marks made upon the tabula rasa" (Sackett 1960, 281), a reference to Locke's belief in the mind as a blank page with no innate ideas or inherited memories with the result that "the individual's environment will completely mold his personality . . . If his environment is Utopian, if he experiences nothing but love, his personality will be molded in the direction that this environment and these experiences indicate to him" (Sackett 1960, 281).

The illustration on page 59 makes clear the importance of the Scarecrow in his relationship to the Tin

Woodman. They nearly always appear in tandem in the Oz books and are only absent in one, Tik-Tok of Oz. Beginning with The Wizard of Oz, they are presented as two sides of one coin--the Scarecrow in search of a brain, the Tin Woodman in search of a heart--a classical confrontation between reason and emotion, intelligence and happiness. While the Tin Woodman's chief concern appears to be with emphasizing his humanity despite his machine-like appearance, the Scarecrow has to fight constantly the literal struggle to keep body and soul together. We might expect the character whose strongest quality is his compassion to be "soft," but Baum takes delight in presenting instead the shiny, hard, sharply contoured figure of the Tin Woodman. The character who depends on the hard-nosed approach of intellect, thinking things through without regard to emotion, is the comically bedraggled Scarecrow, the sort of joke Baum loved.

In The Annotated Wizard of Oz, it is suggested that the two companions "could easily represent the opposing view of the Age of Reason and the Romantic Movement" (Hearn 1973, 141). Raylyn Moore agrees but claims that Baum's loyalty was with the Tin Woodman and his heart in the heart versus head argument because he "correctly saw himself as a romantic in a rationalistic age" (Moore 1974, 88). Hearn disagrees, noting that "Baum suggests that both reason and emotion are necessary; the Scarecrow and the Tin Woodman remain inseparable friends throughout the

series" (Hearn 1973, 141).

So harmonious was their relationship that Gore Vidal describes the pair as "rather like an old married couple" (Vidal 1982, 79). In fact, as their characters develop throughout the series, one senses an almost vaudevillian aspect to their roles, inspired perhaps by the musical version of The Wizard of Oz in 1902 in which the actors who portrayed them "rose to great heights of comedy to put the show over" (Baughman 1955, 27). The dramatic portrayal of the two characters was so highly praised that Baum's second book was dedicated "To those excellent good fellows and eminent comedians, David C. Montgomery and Fred A. Stone whose clever personations of the Tin Woodman and the Scarecrow have delighted thousands of children throughout the land, this book is gratefully dedicated by The Author." With Baum's real enthusiasm for musical comedy and his efforts to have his Oz books brought to the stage, one can appreciate his continuing the combination of these two characters in the subsequent books.

This sense of a comedy team with the straight man/punch line set up pervades much of their conversation, reinforcing their differences and, at the same time, their deep friendship. It also serves as a vehicle for some of Baum's characteristic reliance on puns and word play. For example, after the Scarecrow receives his brains from the Wizard, the Tin Woodman asks, "Why are those needles and pins sticking out of your head?" The Cowardly Lion

provides the punch line, "That is proof that he is sharp" (Wizard, 185).

In The Land of Oz, the Scarecrow goes to visit his friend in his tin palace and is told that the Tin Woodman has recently been nickel-plated. "Good Gracious!" the Scarecrow exclaimed at hearing this. "If his wit bears the same polish, how sparkling it must be!" (Land, 117).

One of Baum's most cleverly sustained pieces of satire occurs with the Scarecrow's introduction to another recently awakened character, Tip's creation, Jack Pumpkinhead. The two of them don't think they can understand one another since they come from different parts of Oz, so they talk over the need for an interpreter. The following exchange gives new insights to our modern interest in language as sign:

"Won't you take a chair while we are waiting?"

"Your Majesty forgets that I cannot understand you," replied the Pumpkinhead. "If you wish me to sit down you must make a sign for me to do so."

The Scarecrow came down from his throne and rolled an armchair to a position behind the Pumpkinhead. Then he gave Jack a sudden push that sent him sprawling upon the cushions in so awkward a fashion that he doubled up like a jack-knife, and had hard work to untangle himself.

"Did you understand that sign?" asked His Majesty, politely.

"Perfectly," declared Jack (Land, 69).

In The Wizard of Oz, the Scarecrow has the stuffing knocked completely out of him by the Wicked Witch's Winged Monkeys who attacked Dorothy and her three companions. They had torn all the straw out of his clothes and head and made a bundle of his boots, hat, and clothes, but after Dorothy melted the Wicked Witch and rejoined her friends, the Lion and the Tin Woodman, they retrieve the Scarecrow's clothes and restuff them with straw, and "behold! here was the Scarecrow, as good as ever, thanking them over and over again for saving him" (Wizard, 156-157).

It is one of Baum's inconsistencies that the Scarecrow suffers much the same fate--losing his stuffing--in the next book but sees the accident as fatal. In The Land of Oz, an oddly assorted entourage of characters is flying in a Gump to escape from General Jinjur who has overtaken the Emerald City. They crash land in a Jackdaw's nest by mistake and are attacked by the huge and fierce birds who live there. When the birds make off with the Scarecrow's stuffing, his head, which seems to be the source of his being, calls to the Tin Woodman to save him. After the birds are driven off, the Tin Woodman takes up the head and bemoans his friend's "untimely end." At the same time, the head immodestly declares, "I am glad that I

perished in so noble and unselfish a manner" (Land, 216). Though he has lost his straw stuffing, his companions suggest that they restuff him with the paper currency they have discovered in the nest. The Scarecrow thanks them gratefully:

"I feel like a new man; and although at first glance I might be mistaken for a Safety Deposit Vault, I beg you to remember that my Brains are still composed of the same old material. And these are the possessions that have always made me a person to be depended upon in an emergency" (Land, 218).

The Tin Woodman cannot resist this opportunity to appoint his friend as Royal Treasurer since he "is made of money" (Land, 280). Ozma refuses to be party to their comedy routine and responds with the gentle reminder that both the Scarecrow and the Tin Woodman are rich with "the only riches worth having--the riches of content" (Land, 281).

Though it becomes a developing pattern for Baum to end each book with a moral of sorts which, considered as a body, become the governing law of Oz, Ozma's observation in this book is both a moral and a pun. The word "content" can mean "being satisfied," in which case, Ozma is encouraging her friends to be happy with what and who they are. When the word is taken to mean "what one is made up of," then she may be Baum's mouthpiece to poke fun

at the contents of the Tin Woodman and the Scarecrow--emptiness or straw.

The issue of the source of the Scarecrow's being comes up again in the book reported to be Baum's favorite, The Scarecrow of Oz. Rather than featuring the Scarecrow, the book's plot actually revolves around an unrequited love affair of a gardener's boy named Pon and his love object, the Princess Gloria. The Scarecrow seems, in this book, more warlike, self-important, and domineering than usual and only appears as a deus ex machina to rescue the earth people, Button Bright, Trot and Cap'n Bill, from the evil witch, Blinkie. When Blinkie attacks him, she tears all the straw out of his body leaving only "an empty suit of clothes and a heap of straw beside it. Fortunately, Blinkie did not harm his head, for it rolled into a little hollow and escaped her notice" (Scarecrow, 199). Baum's modifier, "fortunately," implies that had his head been dismantled also and his pins and needles scattered, there would be no reclaiming the Scarecrow although one couldn't say he was dead in Ozian terms, just destroyed.

Later, his head is discovered by Cap'n Bill who has been transformed by Blinkie into a grasshopper (comically still with his original wooden leg). When the grasshopper asks if the Scarecrow's head is alive, his response is enigmatic:

"That is a question I have never been able to

decide," said the Scarecrow's head. "When my body is properly stuffed I have animation and can move around as well as any live person. The brains in the head you are now occupying as a throne, are of very superior quality and do a lot of very clever thinking. But whether that is being alive, or not, I cannot prove to you; for one who lives is liable to death, while I am only liable to destruction" (Scarecrow, 199).

The Scarecrow's eyes, always illustrated by Neill with one larger than the other, are the most important tools of perception he has. Acting as a synecdoche, they focus, so to speak, his intellectual abilities on his ability to see things clearly--his eye becomes I. When the Scarecrow has fallen into a river and becomes soggy and his stuffing ruined, Cap'n Bill (now in his real form again) decides "to empty out all his body an' carry his head an' clothes along" until he can be restuffed. The Scarecrow agrees, "If Cap'n Bill will carry my head on his shoulders, eyes front, I can tell him which way to go" (Scarecrow, 275-276).

This passage verifies that the Scarecrow's vulnerability makes him dependent on others in the same way that Tik-Tok and the Tin Woodman are. Richard J. Jensen finds a political significance to the Tin Woodman's need for human intervention or cooperation. In writing about Littlefield's "Parable on Populism," Jensen observes of

the Tin Woodman what might also be said of Tik-Tok and the Scarecrow:

Alone he is helpless--he cannot oil his joints--but in teamwork he proves effective and compassionate. (The selfish industrial workers, dehumanized by industrialization, need to become aware of their latent compassion, and must cooperate in a farmer-labor coalition) (Jensen 1971, 282-83).

At one point, Aunt Em questions the Scarecrow about his autonomy. It is interesting that it is Aunt Em who asks the question--she is a product of the rural environment of Kansas where self-reliance is the catchword:

"Are you able to re-stuff yourself without help?" asked Aunt Em. "I should think that after the straw was taken out of you there wouldn't be anything left but your clothes."

"You are almost correct, madam," he answered. "my servants do the stuffing, under my direction. For my head, in which are my excellent brains, is a bag tied at the bottom. My face is neatly painted upon one side of the bag, as you may see. My head does not need re-stuffing, as my body does, for all that it requires is to have the face touched up with fresh paint occasionally" (E. City, 260-61).

The Scarecrow allows the sack that serves as his head to be laundered and then "restuffed with the brains originally given him by the Great Wizard" (Land, 126). What he is while he is being cleaned is not clear. It appears that the Scarecrow is clearly a case of clothes making the man, as Earle J. Coleman notes, because unless he has at least his sack with brains intact, he must be inanimate.

Another interesting variation to the Scarecrow's head fixation comes in the person of Princess Langwidere, a minor but memorable character in Ozma of Oz. She is the haughty princess of the Land of Ev, a subsidiary kingdom of Oz which she was supposed to be ruling after the wicked Nome King had enslaved the Queen of Ev and her ten children. However, her name, a Baumian pun (she is too "languid, dear"), underlines her laziness and unwillingness to actually assume any responsibility. Instead, Princess Langwidere spends her time admiring herself and her interchangeable thirty heads. Every morning she unlocks a cupboard door and chooses the head that suits her fancy. It is the head that determines her personality for the day as indicated in the following paragraph:

There was only one trouble with [head] No. 17; the temper that went with it (and which was hidden somewhere under the glossy black hair) was fiery, harsh and haughty in the extreme, and it often led the Princess to do unpleasant

things which she regretted when she came to wear her other heads (Ozma, 82-83).

Unlike Jack Pumpkinhead who can replace his old head with another with no apparent change in his being, the bad temper of head No. 17 causes Princess Langwidere to order Dorothy to prison when she is unwilling to trade heads with her. Another interesting thing is that Princess Langwidere functions quite well without any head and usually sleeps headless, presumably to avoid mussing her beautifully coifed hair--a concern for appearance over personal individuality described as a parody of the Gibson girls of the early 1900s (Greene and Martin 1977, 27).

The Scarecrow's excessive confidence in his intellect is one of the signals we have that he is not actually as smart as he thinks. When Ozma's kingdom is threatened by the Nome King, a jealous villain of the underground, the Scarecrow claims to have thought of a solution. Dorothy's doubt seems well-founded when she thinks to herself: "he is only a Scarecrow . . . and I'm not sure that his mixed brains are as clever as he thinks they are" (E. City, 274). At the same time when the Scarecrow immodestly observes, "I consider my wisdom unexcelled", Tik-Tok agrees: "You are cer-tain-ly ve-ry wise . . . For my part, I can on-ly think by ma-chin-er-y, so I do not pre-tend to know as much as you do" (E. City, 280).

Tik-Tok's use of the word pretend may be a satirical reference to the Scarecrow's pretense to intelligence or

to his own more reliable self-knowledge that allows for no misguided appearance. Either way, the Scarecrow has set himself up for the Tin Woodman's reproof for his friends: "My tin brains are very bright, but that is all I claim for them. . . . Yet I do not aspire to being very wise, for I have noticed that the happiest people are those who do not let their brains oppress them" (E. City, 280-81). Together, the Scarecrow and the Tin Woodman, with their Wizard-given brains and heart form a well-balanced complement of intelligent and compassionate leadership.

Part E: The Tin Woodman: What Makes Him Tik-Tok?

"As we, or mother Dana, weave and unweave our bodies, Stephen said, from day to day, their molecules shuttled to and fro, so does the artist weave and unweave his image. And as the mole on my right breast is where it was when I was born, though all my body has been wove of new stuff time after time, so through the ghost of the unquiet father the image of the unliving son looks forth" (James Joyce, Ulysses, 194)

"For example, whether a man grown old be the same man he was whilst he was young, or another man; or whether a city be in different ages the same or another city. Some place individuity in the unity of matter; others, in the unity of form For if, for example, that ship of Theseus, concerning the difference whereof made by continual reparation in taking out the old planks and putting in new, the sophisters of Athens were wont to dispute, were, after all the planks were changed, the same numerical ship it was in the beginning; and if some man had kept the old planks as they were taken out, and by putting them afterwards together in the same order, had again made a ship of them, this, without doubt, had also been the same numerical ship with that which was at the beginning; and so there would have been two ships numerically the same, which is absurd" (Thomas Hobbes, quoted more fully by Earle J. Coleman in "Oz as Heaven and Other Philosophical Questions," 19;

earlier and more fully still in W. T. Jones' The History of Western Philosophy, 640-641. One might ask: Is this the same quotation when it is used by three separate writers, or is it different because it appears in three different texts? And so it goes).

In the seventeenth century, Thomas Hobbes was writing about "the beginning of individuation, namely, in what sense it may be conceived that a body is at one time the same, at another time not the same as it was formerly" (Jones 1952, 640). In 1816, E. T. A. Hoffmann wrote a story called "The Sand-man," in which a young man, Nathaniel, falls in love with a beautiful girl, Olympia, who turns out to be an automaton. Freud used Hoffmann's story as a basis for his investigation of the phenomenon of "The Uncanny" (1919) and concluded that, on one level, it stirred the sense he calls the uncanny because of the intellectual uncertainty raised for the reader about the identity of the girl, which he psychoanalytically dismisses: "This automatic doll can be nothing else than a materialization of Nathaniel's feminine attitude toward his father" (Freud 17:232). On a second level, Freud is more interested in "The Sand-man" as a fictional narrative about one man's castration complex--Nathaniel's fear of having his eyes torn out by the Sand-man equates to his fear of castration, Freud postulates. In a 1976 article that holds Freud's psychoanalytic techniques in "The Uncanny" up to a mirror to expose Freud's own fears, Helene Cixous writes, "Fiction resists and returns,

Hoffmann more and more distinctly becomes Freud's double (through substitution or cleavage)" (Cixous 1976, 540). In her unmasking of Freud, Cixous comments on his use of the number 62, both of them unaware of how the dates she refers to have uncanny applicability to Baum's life (1856-1919) as well. Freud can be seen as Baum's double here:

Especially if you have been born in 1856 and if you are writing in 1919 a text which the instinct (trieb) of death haunts, then you will be the reprieved author, who escapes the announcement of his end, masked by a you where the I becomes identifiable with the reader. Freud is palming off his own death on us, and the reader has become the substitute; and isn't the one who has lived a year beyond the age foreseen for his own disappearance in some what a ghost? (Cixous 1976, 541).

Freud might have discussed Baum's Tin Woodman as easily. Of all of Baum's creations, the Tin Woodman is the most disturbing--in his origin, in his embodiment, and as a symbol.

Words like "robot," "cyborg," and "bionic" which are now generic to science fiction had not yet been coined when Baum was busy creating their prototypes in his Oz books. Robot is derived from the Czechoslovakian word for worker and was introduced to English by Karel Capek in

1921 in R. U. R. (alternately known as Rossum's Universal Robots), a play in which the brilliant Dr. Rossum discovers a formula to mass produce anthropomorphic machines to work in factories and their revolt against the men who manufacture them. The author himself described the play as a comedy about science and truth and the conflict of ideals (Reichardt 1978, 40), but Capek's contemporary theater critics found it anything but comic and had to grope for the vocabulary to describe it. One critic writing for The Nation called Capek's central ideal "the Golem-Frankenstein device" (Lewisohn 1922, 478), the former referring to the medieval Jewish legend in which an automaton is made to look like a human and is brought to life by a magic incantation, and the latter, referring to Mary Shelley's protagonist, Dr. Victor Frankenstein, who discovered the power of life and created an artificial man--a mistaken parallelism since Frankenstein's monster was capable of emotion (what some may refer to as "having a soul") and Capek's robots are, at least in the beginning, without passion or original thought. Jasia Reichardt, in his discussion of the theme of R. U. R. notes:

[T]he theme of the play has become an epitome of many aspects of our relationship with machines. It deals with the condition of both man and machine, each of which is individually unsatisfactory. Man is inefficient and robot

lacks spirituality. Man covets the machine's ability to perform tasks tirelessly and economically and the robot, at a certain stage of his development, wants to acquire man's soul and the rights which such possession must automatically give, that is, that it can be subject to death. Man's inefficiency is, of course, directly related to his needs, such as those for play, fun, contemplation, and creative satisfaction, the very needs which the machine grows to envy (Reichardt 1978, 36).

This same argument is the one advanced by Baum in his introduction of technology into the fantasy land of Oz. His genre of children's literature did not require the attention Baum gave the issue of what separates humans from non-humans. His fairy tales could have relied solely on magic--a wave of a wand or a few well-selected chants, which is similar to the Hans Christian Andersen technique of having toys come alive as in his "Tin Soldier" story. Instead, Baum carefully established the hierarchy of his characters, and through their discussions, examined the same problems which interested Capek, only Baum was twenty years ahead of him.

As is generally true in Baum's Oz, the technology that created Tik-Tok is controlled and basically beneficent. What makes the creation of his mechanical man extraordinary is his accuracy in formulating the qualities which

have come to be considered, in the several decades since 1907 when Tik-Tok was introduced, traditionally inherent to literary robots. Modern scholars recognized the anticipatory vision of Baum's creation, citing Tik-Tok as "the perfect embodiment" of Isaac Asimov's three laws of robotics, a concept Asimov developed in 1940--twenty-one years after Baum's death--to counteract the tendency writers allowed their robots to have of turning on their makers, the very fate Capek's Dr. Rossum experienced.

Asimov's three laws state:

1. A robot may not injure a human being, or, through inaction allow a human being to come to harm.
2. A robot must obey the orders given it by human beings except where such orders would conflict with the First Law.
3. A robot must protect its own existence as long as such protection does not conflict with the First or Second Law (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 77-78).

Asimov himself overlooked Baum's influence when he noted that at "the time Capek wrote his play no one in the world had any idea of how a mechanical brain might be built" (Asimov 1981, 6). Perhaps the intricacies of computer technology were beyond Baum's capabilities or interest, but he nevertheless developed a working model of a robot

that meets Asimov's requirements as well as, and more importantly, becomes an appealing and unforgettable literary character. John R. Neill's illustrations of this pot-bellied, elegantly moustached little soldier with his round, observant eyes, and militarily correct hat and spats help create an engaging personality--quite a feat when Tik-Tok is never allowed to leave his robot-required parameter of emotionless reaction. Though he admits, "I am only a ma-chine, and can-not feel sor-row or joy, no mat-ter what hap-pens" (Ozma, 67), Dorothy describes him in a later book as "my good friend" (Road, 156), a relationship that does not occur accidentally but is skillfully orchestrated, particularly by his contrast with the Tin Woodman.

Though Tik-Tok's mechanical nature is clearly expressed and his prototypic robot behavior defended and explained, the classification or identity of the Tin Woodman is one of the richest enigmas in Baum's fiction. In Road to Oz, Baum highlights the differences between Tik-Tok and the Tin Woodman, not only in appearance but also in the carefully prescribed limits one can feel for a machine versus a person, and perhaps more importantly, the kinds of feelings each of them was capable of.

The copper man and the tin man were good friends, and not so much alike as you might think. For one was alive and the other moved by means of machinery; one was tall and angular

and the other short and round. You could love the Tin Woodman because he had a fine nature, kindly and simple; but the machine man you could only admire without loving, since to love such a thing as he was as impossible as to love a sewing-machine or an automobile. Yet Tik-tok was popular with the people of Oz because he was so trustworthy, reliable and true; he was sure to do exactly what he was wound up to do, at all times and in all circumstances. Perhaps it is better to be a machine that does its duty than a flesh-and-blood person who will not, for a dead truth is better than a live falsehood (Road, 170-171).

E. M. Forster uses the categories of flat and round to separate the development of characters in fiction. Michael Patrick Hearn claims that "Baum's creations are generally what Forster calls 'flat characters,' people 'constructed round a single idea or quality.' The Scarecrow is wise, the Tin Woodman kind, the Cowardly Lion cowardly" (Hearn 1979, 61-62). (To continue his parallelism accurately, Hearn should have allowed the Lion the adjective "brave," since he proves his courage in defending Dorothy even without the Wizard's panacea.) Though one might infer that "flat" as a label is derogatory, on the contrary, Forster defends flat characters as necessary to the novelist's task, and who,

when well drawn, can be recognized, appreciated, remembered, and achieve "effects that are not mechanical and a vision of humanity that is not shallow" (Forster 1949, 109). The same argument with which Forster defends Charles Dickens and his flat characters can be applied to Baum: "His immense success with types suggests that there may be more in flatness than the severer critics admit" (Forster 1949, 109). So though Hearn's application of Forster's labels may be accurate, it seems to me that Baum applies Forster's flat/round dichotomy in an ironically inverted fashion at least in his characterizations of Tik-Tok and the Tin Woodman.

The Tin Woodman does indeed seem to be a "flat" character by every standard. Even before he acquires the heart he seeks from the Wizard, his dominant trait is his kindness and compassion. Emotionally and physically, he is one of the father figures in the Oz series. His father-like role is reinforced by his height: he is tall, at least a head taller than Dorothy, according to Denslow's and Neill's illustrations. His proportions are long, angular, and sharp; his hat is a pointed funnel, his nose, a long pointed cylinder, his jaw square, and his eyes piercing. He is made of tin which gleams brightly but reflects light rather than absorbs it.

In contrast, Tik-Tok's dominant physical feature is his roundness. His body is "round as a ball and made out of burnished copper" (Ozma, 40). He is only Dorothy's

height, an equalizing factor, has large round eyes, and a round brimmed hat. His makers carefully crafted him to look much more human than the tinsmith did in recreating Nick Chopper, giving him hair and sideburns, a heavy moustache, and a vest with many buttons and two superfluous pockets. Though he is also made of metal, Tik-Tok's copper is warmer than the Tin Woodman's tin and made more familiar by Billina the hen, Dorothy's companion, who quickly demystifies the foreignness of his being by comparing him to "the old kettle in the barn-yard at home" (Ozma, 42), creating an immediate sense of comfort and familiarity.

Baum seems sensitive instinctively to the phenomenology of roundness Gaston Bachelard discusses in The Poetics of Space. "Everything round," he says, "invites a caress" (Bachelard 1969, 236). He cites the roundness of a bird, a walnut, and the green sphere of a tree as illustrations of a "permanence of being . . . accidents of form and the capricious events of mobility" (Bachelard 1969, 240-41). It is to the mechanical man Baum gives the quality of roundness, creating a sense of irony that makes us disbelieve Tik-Tok's modesty as he constantly prefaces his identification with the adjective "mere"--"I am a mere ma-chine." Unlike the robots in Capek's R. U. R., Tik-Tok seems disinterested in becoming human, has none of the longing the Tin Woodman and the Scarecrow have for the human characteristics of heart and

brain, demonstrates no jealousy or discontent with his function. In Tik-Tok, we see the advantages to a machine "that does its duty." He is settled, secure, safe, and serene in his self-enclosed rotundity. When Dorothy first finds him, he is immobilized in a rounded rock, so smooth and egg-like that Dorothy has difficulty finding the outline of the door. After she winds up his three mechanisms--his thoughts, voice, and movement--Tik-Tok tells her about his wonderful makers, the firm of Smith and Tinker. His creation was a work of art. No assembly-line product, he was "the on-ly au-to-mat-ic me-chan-i-cal man they ev-er com-plet-ed" (Ozma, 58). It is important to Abrahm and Kenter's discussion that Tik-Tok's creators, Smith and Tinker, are men and not magicians. They find it especially significant that Tik-Tok "is produced technologically even though he exists in a fictional world where most things come about by magic" (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 69, emphasis theirs). They add:

Technology and magic thus come into direct contact in this fiction with the implication that technology, as the better method of accomplishment, will eventually destroy magic. Any robot made by a magician would of necessity have to differ from one made by a man (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 69).

There is a hint, however, of Tik-Tok's limitations, even

if he is man-made, not magical. He tells Dorothy, "I do not suppose such a perfect machine as I am could be made in any place but a fairy land" (Ozma, 50)--a disclaimer she obviously takes seriously since, when she rejoins her Uncle Henry in Australia, she leaves Tik-Tok in Oz, aware "that the machine man would never do for a servant in a civilized country, and the chances were that his machinery wouldn't work at all" (Ozma, 256). One wonders if he wouldn't do because he might be too controversial and perhaps too threatening for Kansas rather than because he might not work. Dorothy's response shows sensitivity to some American resistance to technology, the fear of machines replacing human labor.

Despite Tik-Tok's possible limitations, Abrahm and Kenter claim as evidence of Tik-Tok's robot identity that he has human morphology, "species narcissism"; was manufactured by men rather than magic; requires human intervention in order to function (i.e., he must be wound up to talk, move, or think); has a mechanical voice and exhibits mechanical functions when he operates (i.e., lights flash when he thinks) (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 68). Most importantly, his mind is not capable of irrational or original thought, nor is he capable of any emotional response. Instead he must rely on his memory bank with a corresponding lack of emotion and absence of soul. His inherent friendliness to humans was predicated by his makers. Tik-Tok is well aware of his susceptibility

to incapacitation, either by destruction or deactivation, since both his makers have disappeared. Unlike most pre-Asimovian makers, it is not their creation but their creativity which ironically does them in.

Baum has given us minimal biographies to characterize the inventors, described in Tik-Tok's factual but powerful voice:

Mr. Smith was an art-ist, as well as an in-vent-or, and he paint-ed a pic-ture of a riv-er which was so nat-ur-al that, as he was reach-ing a-cross it to paint some flow-ers on the cp-po-site bank, he fell in-to the wa-ter and was drowned. . . . Mis-ter Tin-ker made a lad-der so tall that he could rest the end of it a-gainst the moon, while he stood on the high-est rung and picked the lit-tle stars to set in the points of the king's crown. But when he got to the moon Mis-ter Tin-ker found it such a love-ly place that he de-cid-ed to live there, so he pulled up the lad-der af-ter him and we have nev-er seen him since (Ozma, 58-59).

Their names are more than just common American surnames; they reflect their work as crafters of metal. In fact, the word "tinker" has come to mean someone who only fools with metal-crafting rather than an expert. First, these two are inventors but their artistry reflects in their

product, Tik-Tok, as well as their other abilities. The other significant message in the Smith and Tinker story is the framing of the artist outside his artistic creation. In the first instance, Mr. Smith is a victim of his artistry by his failure to, literally, stay outside the frame. Mr. Tinker has a more controlled departure, but he separates himself from the rest of the world, by his love of the aesthetic, nevertheless. Perhaps this is the ultimate power of Bachelard's demonstration of the appeal of roundness--the moon's mystical attraction to Mr. Tinker. Tinker is externalized, goes up and lives; Smith is immersed, falls down and dies. Like them, Baum was torn between the ideal and the practical as well. In fact, his plans for the first edition of The Wonderful Wizard of Oz included such beautiful binding, high quality printing, and colored illustrations that no publishing company would accept it. Rather than cut corners, Baum and Denslow paid the initial printing costs themselves and the George M. Hill Co. agreed to promote it.

In another sense, the emphasis on these creators of the ultimate technology in Baum's Oz as artists can be seen as a statement of the optimistic view Baum held for the future of technology in America. Russel B. Nye sees their fate as Baum's comment on "technological over-development, which may undo the unwary in America as it does in Oz" (Gardner and Nye 1957, 8). In his discussion of Lec Marx's book, The Machine in the Garden, Marius

Bewley tests Baum's Oz books against Marx's view of how the pastoral vision versus technology (which Marx equates with power) developed as a central theme and struggle in nineteenth century American literature. Bewley writes:

Now, the tension between pastoralism and technology is one of the things the Oz books are about, whether Baum was conscious of it or not. In the American literature of which Marx writes, technology seems to triumph despite the resistance the authors offer to it. The locomotive turns the garden into a desert. It is a distinguishing mark of the Oz books that a satisfactory resolution of the tension is achieved in them (Bewley 1970, 262).

Tik-Tok's mechanical nature, though eliminating the highs and lows of emotional response, make him a reliable companion, as Baum noted, a creature to be trusted in all situations because he is programmed to be fair if not kind, logical if not wise, and stalwart and loyal, if not brave. However, despite Tik-Tok's mechanical programming, or perhaps because of it, we never know quite what to expect from him. This machine, unlike the characters who were or are "meat people" in Oz, cannot be "expressed in one sentence" as Forster demands unless calling him a machine man suffices. Tik-Tok can be compared to a computer whose programs are unfamiliar. The computer may

be advertised as "user friendly" but you don't know what it will do for you or what response to give it until you've spent some time getting acquainted with it. The Tik-Tok/computer parallel can be appropriately expanded to include Sherry Turkle's study of the relationship people develop with computers in her book, The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit, which examines the impact of computers, particularly on children, and notes that computer toys "become the occasion for theorizing, for fantasizing, for thinking through metaphysically charged questions to which childhood searches for a response" (Turkle 1984, 30). In the same way, Tik-Tok forces the characters around him to respond creatively to him and his potentialities. His designation as "friend" by many of the Oz citizens, not just Dorothy, is one not usually applied to machines but important because it shows how technology can be accepted in a pastoral society as beneficial and desirable rather than threatening and invasive.

Though the humans in Cz in whose service Tik-Tok labors seem genuinely fond of him, he often suffers insults and prejudice from the non-humans he encounters, a result of the biological/social caste in Cz based on "origin" where "socially and philosophically, Tik-Tok is on the bottom of the heap" (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 79). He is described as "an early precursor of those modern robots used as ethnic minority surrogates by science-

fiction writers commenting on social suppression" (Abraham and Kenter 1978, 73).

In the ongoing debates of the Oz characters--whether human, animal, mechanical, or magical--about their source of being and concurrent worth in the hierarchy of life, one senses a defensive reaction similar to that Sherry Turkle describes in The Second Self. When people are asked to distinguish themselves from computers, they cite in themselves what is most more human, emotional, uncodable, or unprogrammable. In other words, they reaffirm their own humanity in making the distinction between themselves as humans and the computer as machine. Turkle describes this as a romantic response provoked by our new technology just as the nineteenth century Romantic Movement was a response to scientific advancement and the rule of reason.

The irony of the following argument comes both from the Tin Woodman's understanding or lack of understanding of what makes him "alive" and from Tik-Tok's apparent lack of concern. He is matter-of-factly confident of his abilities and his usefulness, and, as a symbol of technology, is neither malevolent nor kind. When the Scarecrow and Tin Woodman first meet their new companion, Tik-Tok, they are immediately interested, in a defensive sort of way, in making comparisons:

"Then," continued the Tin Woodman, "I regret to say that you are greatly inferior to my

friend the Scarecrow, and to myself. For we are both alive, and he has brains which do not need to be wound up, while I have an excellent heart that is continually beating in my bosom."

"I con-grat-u-late you," replied Tiktok. "I can-not help be-ing your in-fer-i-or for I am a mere ma-chine. When I am wound up I do my du-ty by go-ing just as my ma-chin-er-y is made to go" (Ozma, 103).

The significance of these debates in which Tik-Tok is given soullessness has been described as a "dance around some of the major elements in the long and twisted philosophical/ theological/scientific inquiry into the issues of what comprises the soul, and how the soul relates to the condition of being alive" (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 74)--the same inquiry the political editor-ialist, George Will, is conducting in a recent column examining the pros and cons of using aborted fetuses in scientific and medical research. He, too, attempts to define what makes us human in the 1980s:

Human beings are neither mindless matter nor minds isolated from the physical matter of bodies. Ideas and even minds may be intangible, but particular ones belong to particular 'embodied' persons--persons with bodily natures. To be human is to be 'embodied,' to have the

form, powers, capabilities and limits of the human body . . . A body is never merely a body, because a human being is never merely a ghost in a corporeal machine (Will 1985, 4).

He goes on to raise the question of whether the conquest of nature by science is the result of increased knowledge or whether the "result will be the surrender of human nature" (Will 1985, 4). Turkle's discussion of the relationship between humans and computers asked the same question of the open-ended potential in the development of artificial intelligence. The ultimate concern is: "Can an intelligence without a living body, without sexuality, ever really understand human beings" (Turkle 1984, 19-20). In some ways, Baum avoids this discussion by minimizing sexuality in all his characters so that his child protagonists are not prototypically male or female, just children, and his adult characters function as adults, the question of sexual identity unimportant to their character development.

The exception to Baum's minimal attention to sexual identity or romantic love relationships is the Tin Woodman. His plans to marry a beautiful Munchkin girl cost him his body and, eventually, his girl. Though he seemed content and even proud of his tin body, the Tin Woodman recognized an insufficiency--he had no heart--which, he explains, made him lose all his love for the Munchkin girl he was supposed to marry. Clearly, if the

Tin Woodman had continued with this line of reasoning, he would not have been able to think either because he did not have his original brains in the tin head the tinsmith, Ku-Klip, had crafted for him, but this would divert him from his function. He says, when he first meets Dorothy, "While I was in love I was the happiest man on earth; but no one can love who has not a heart, and so I am resolved to ask Oz to give me one. If he does, I will go back to the Munchkin maiden and marry her" (Wizard, 58-59). He receives a heart from the Wizard, but at the end of The Wizard of Oz when Dorothy is about to return to Kansas, the Tin Woodman decides to return to the Winkies in the West and be their ruler. He has forgotten his romantic interest. In all other respects, though, he credits the Wizard's heart with making him capable of love, compassion, and kindness.

When Baum compares the Tin Woodman to Tik-Tok, he cites the Tin Woodman's "fine nature" as a reason to love him, without denying that Tik-Tok has the same nature. Baum seems obliged to place a higher value on the character of the Tin Woodman who shares a human origin, but his defense of the hierarchy is weak. Baum ignores in his comparison the love some people have for the automobiles they drive, their houses, or even their computers. What is more true is that we, for the most part, do not expect those things to love us in return. Therefore, the question of relationships with these two

characters is not whether the people of Oz (or the readers) can love them, it is whether they can reciprocate that love.

As the symbol of love, the Tin Woodman's capacity is diminished because his ability to love has no romantic or sexual dimension. His easy forgetfulness for what was once a burning love defuses the power of the Wizard's heart as a symbol. If his tin head is empty, as he admits (but he has no need or desire for brains), then we are forced to question his veracity when he says filling his tin chest with a silk heart full of sawdust gives him the power to love again.

A rather overwrought Freudian analysis of The Wizard of Oz describes the Tin Woodman as "completely artificial" and "a eunuch" (Beckwith 1961, 21). The author sees the Tin Woodman as Baum at a more advanced state in his life, a symbol of Baum's castration anxiety:

The Woodman still loves until his heart is cut through but then he ceases to love. He means to ask Oz for a heart and afterward to return and ask the girl to marry him, when he can love her again. (He forgets all about this, incidentally, after he gets the heart, but maybe that is because it is really a heart that Oz gives him. The woodman is a very delicate person and would be unlikely to call things by their proper names) (Beckwith 1961, 25, emphasis his).

The Tin Woodman is a liminal character--physically, emotionally, symbolically, and functionally. Of all the Oz characters in Baum's invention, the Tin Woodman, as the embodiment of Turkle's "intelligence without a living body, without sexuality," is on the edge.

Part of his liminality comes from the contrast between Tik-Tok's artistic construction and how the Tin Woodman's formation takes place as an act of deconstruction. His human body is mutilated by his enchanted axe but a talented tinsmith patches him up, body part by body part. When Dorothy meets Tik-Tok, she is reminded of her old friend, the Tin Woodman, and in the following quote, describes her understanding of his situation:

I knew a man made out of tin, who was a woodman named Nick Chopper. But he was as alive as we are, 'cause he was born a real man, and got his tin body a little at a time--first a leg and then a finger and then an ear--for the reason that he had so many accidents with his axe, and cut himself up in a very careless manner (Ozma, 42).

Her matter-of-fact attitude toward what might be a nightmarish scene is an echo of the Tin Woodman's own detached view of his fate. Brian Attebery views the Tin Woodman as the Oz character crucial to Baum's articulation of what makes us human. He notes:

Many critics have pointed to the Tin Woodman as the first entry of the machine into the field of fantasy, but the Tin Woodman is not a machine, nor is he ever connected with things mechanical. Baum does bring in a mechanical man, Tik-tok, in the third Oz book, and he is a very different character from the Woodman. The Tin Woodman's distinctive characteristic is the tender human spirit within his hard and shiny body; it makes a rather poignant character, and, since he accepts his fate without self-pity, an admirable one, a symbol of resistance to dehumanization (Attebery 1980, 101).

In agreement with Attebery, Abrahm and Kenter describe the Tin Woodman as "a human essence domiciled in a metal body. Not a personality artificially forged from metal and installed but a natural one corporeally transposed" (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 68). Using the modern terminology that Baum lacked, they classify the Tin Woodman and Capt. Fyter as "the ultimate in cyborgs" (Abrahm and Kenter 1978, 68). The term "cyborg" is a much more modern specification than the word robot, entering the language around 1962 and defined by Webster's Ninth Dictionary as "a human linked to mechanical devices on which his physiological functions depend."

Though Jasia Reichardt does not discuss Baum in his book on robots, his definition of a cyborg as "a being who

is part-machine and part-flesh, a synthesis of nature and technology" (Reichardt 1978, 28) aptly fits the Tin Woodman. A literary character from Martin Caidin's novel Cyborg that later became the TV series, "The Six-Million Dollar Man," is his modern example of a cyborg. Reichardt also cites the problem of identity as the main problem of cyborgs, evident in the titles of two modern cyborg stories--a BBC TV serial called Doctor Who? and a book by Algis Budrys entitled Who? (Ballantine Books, NY & Toronto, 1975). This problem is one the Tin Woodman is forced to deal with in some respects, from the moment Dorothy meets him rusted by the side of the yellow brick road.

Perhaps Baum regretted ever introducing the notion of Nick Chopper's love affair because it is not until much later in the Oz series, in The Tin Woodman of Oz, that Baum really forces the question of identity upon the Tin Woodman. Early in the book, he answers the common inquiry about his origin with an extended and somewhat altered explanation than he offered Dorothy in The Wizard. What took five paragraphs to tell Dorothy takes eight pages in The Tin Woodman of Oz. Now the Munchkin maid has a name, Nimmie Amee, and instead of being the servant of an old woman who asks the Wicked Witch of the East for help in stopping the marriage plans, Nimmie Amee is the servant of the Witch herself. The sequence of his mutilation has changed too. In the first version, the Tin Woodman

remembers losing his left leg, right leg, arms, head, and finally, his body (torso). In the later telling, he loses his legs, arms, and then his body, which the Witch proceeds to chop up into small pieces. As the Tin Woodman calmly relates this gruesome story, Nimmie Ameer picked up his arms, legs, and meat head, and carried him to the tinsmith. Body replaced and still committed to his career as a woodchopper, he goes back to work and, naturally, loses his head, which the Witch carries away and hides. Once again Nimmie Ameer rescues him. In a description that becomes almost comic, the Tin Woodman explains,

[Nimmie Ameer] found me wandering around helplessly, because I could not see where to go, and she led me to my friend the tinsmith. The faithful fellow at once set to work to make me a tin head, and he had just completed it when Nimmie Ameer came running up with my old head, which she had stolen from the Witch. But, on reflection, I considered the tin head far superior to the meat one--I am wearing it yet (TW, 28).

Despite her kindness and loyalty, the Tin Woodman loved her no longer. We learn that his love for Nimmie Ameer was not restored, despite the Wizard's heart implant, because what he received was not the loving heart he had asked for (the Wizard was short on hearts just then), but rather, a

kind heart, which made his former ability to love impossible. When his desertion of her is pointed out to him as unkind, he decides to find Nimmie Amee and marry her, not for the sake of love but for the sake of kindness and to resolve his guilt for having abandoned her.

It is in this quest that he confronts his former head, in a macabre scene I have never forgotten from my childhood reading. When the Tin Woodman opens the cupboard and sees the vaguely familiar head perched on a shelf, he inquires its name:

"Haven't you a name?"

"Oh, yes," said the Head; "I used to be called Nick Chopper, when I was a woodman and cut down trees for a living."

"Good gracious!" cried the Tin Woodman in astonishment. "If you are Nick Chopper's Head, then you are Me--or I'm You--or--or--What relation are we, anyhow?"

"Don't ask me," replied the Head. "For my part, I'm not anxious to claim relationship with any common, manufactured article, like you. You may be all right in your class, but your class isn't my class. You're tin" (TW, 212).

The difficulties of identity don't end here, however. It seems that the tinsmith who outfitted the Tin Woodman and Capt. Fyter (who accompanies the Tin Woodman on his quest) used their spare parts to put together with magic

glue a man he named Chopfyt. The Tin Woodman's reaction is judgmental: "It seems to me that you did wrong in making a man out of our cast-off parts. It is evident that Chopfyt could, with justice, claim relationship with both of us" (TW, 227). In an ironic twist of fate, they eventually find Chopfyt, happily married to Nimmie Amee, who says she married him because of his resemblance to both her former sweethearts.

The Tin Woodman explains his birth, deconstruction, and reconstruction, quite matter-of-factly, and, like Hobbes, claims to be the same man he was before he ever picked up the enchanted axe: "In the Land of Oz, no one can ever be killed. A man with a wooden leg or a tin leg is still the same man; and, as I lost parts of my meat body by degrees, I always remained the same person as in the beginning, even though in the end I was all tin and no meat" (TW, 29-30). He is clearly not the same, however, since his ability to love is limited, a sort of litmus test for his humanity.

His casual tone and Baum's comic description--the Tin Woodman hopping around legless or headless, Nimmie Amee bundling up his body parts, Ku-Klip throwing cast-off body parts into a barrel like pickles in Baum's Bazaar--subvert the very complex question the Tin Woodman's presence raises. Bruno Bettelheim describes the case of Joey, an autistic child who thought he was a machine run by electrical energy, in The Empty Fortress. His article

supports Freud's definition of the uncanny but says more about how relevant this image of mechanical men or human machines is to the society we live in. He writes

What is entirely new in the machine age is that often neither savior nor destroyer is cast in man's image any more. The typical modern delusion is of being run by an influencing machine.

*machine taking the thoughts
3 Jan 91*

Just as the angels and saints of a deeply religious age help us to fathom what were man's greatest hopes at that time, and the devils what he trembled at most, so man's delusions in a machine world seem to be tokens of both our hopes and our fears of what machines may do for us, or to us. . . . A human body that operates like a machine, and a machine that performs human functions--each of these is uncanny (Bettelheim 1967, 234).

Uncanny, original, threatening, and yet, functioning as the embodiment of love, the Tin Woodman is the central cog in Baum's creation, a clanging symbol.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION: CLANGING SYMBOLS

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child"
(I Corinthians 13:11)

Baum's biographers record that this verse hung above his desk (Baum and MacFall 1961, 128), clearly a reminder that he was writing for children in case he was ever tempted to talk down to his readers or to overdo the description and forsake the adventure. He said himself, "It is folly to place before the little ones a class of literature they cannot comprehend and which is sure to bore them and to destroy their pleasure in reading. What they want is action--'something doing every minute'--exciting adventures, unexpected difficulties to be overcome, and marvelous escapes" (Baum 1909, 237). So, though Baum's Oz books present moral lessons, Baum had his audience firmly in mind when he imbedded his thematic messages in characters so interesting and comic that his readers might not notice the symbolism. The characters of the Scarecrow, the Tin Woodman, and the Cowardly Lion are his symbols, and are, oddly enough, desperate for symbols themselves.

As many writers have pointed out, each of Dorothy's three companions already possesses the quality he seeks--a

heart, a brain, courage--but each is looking for a tangible confirmation of his most prized quality from the Wizard. Gore Vidal notes: "Although a fraud, the Wizard is a good psychologist. He gives the Scarecrow bran for brains, the Tin Woodman a red velvet heart, the Cowardly Lion a special courage syrup. Each has now become what he wanted to be (and was all along)" (Vidal 1982, 68). The symbols themselves are empty, mechanical, and yet Baum seems to see the need for the distribution of them as an act of closure. Sheldon Kopp, a psychotherapist who sees the Wizard's insistence that Dorothy and her friends test their abilities before receiving his bestowal as a useful model for psychotherapy, describes the distribution of tangible panaceas as a demonstration of Baum's "sympathetic tolerance for human foibles" (Kopp 1970, 84).

Russel B. Nye explains: "Yet not until each possesses the symbol of what he wants is he confident and satisfied--something Dorothy wisely recognizes. You have within you, Baum seems to say, the things you seek; the symbol is of no value while the virtue is" (Gardner and Nye 1957, 5). The readers may know that, but the Oz characters don't. Throughout the Oz series, they hold firm to their belief in the power of the Wizard's gifts.

Henry M. Littlefield sees the truth in Baum's message more cynically. In his "Parable on Populism," he translates the desires of the three travelers into a political allegory of self-delusion: "Throughout the

story Baum poses a central thought; the American desire for symbols of fulfillment is illusory. Real needs lie elsewhere" (Littlefield 1964, 57).

If the moral of Baum's story is the importance of self-reliance and self-knowledge, and if the Tin Woodman actually had no need for the heart the Wizard gave him, then the love for Nimmie Amee he thought he had lost is an imaginary absence and the illusory replacement should satisfy the emptiness. Baum's disdain for love affairs as appropriate to children's fantasy was overtly stated in his warning to parents to screen the fairy tales they bought for their children: "Glance into the book yourself, and see that the story is not marred by murders or cruelties, by terrifying characters, or by mawkish sentimentality, love and marriage" (Baum 1909, 13). Perhaps Baum uses the technicality of having received a kind heart rather than a loving one as a strategy for distancing a father figure like the Tin Woodman, clearly an adult, originally a male, from the complications of full-blown, romantic love. The characters who function as the reliable adult companions for the innocent and trusting children in Oz, wielding magic bags like the Wizard or love magnets like the Shaggy Man or sharp axes like the Tin Woodman, must be trustworthy, kind, and well-intentioned.

Even though the Wizard is a humbug, he is not a bad man. When Dorothy upbraids him for misrepresenting

himself, he says, "On, no, my dear; I'm really a very good man; but I'm a very bad Wizard, I must admit" (Wizard, 180). And he tries to dissuade her three companions from seeking from him their desires. It is their lack of self-knowledge, their failure to see the Wizard as a humbug and his gifts as merely symbolic, that makes them ironically comic and elevates Dorothy as the heroine of the story. Their needs, physical and emotional, are much more simply met throughout the entire Oz series than are the needs of the children. Dorothy wants to go home and home can't be just anywhere one lands. Home for her is with her family, a need children readers can clearly identify with. There is comfort in home that no fairyland can replace, although Baum's description of Kansas and Aunt Em and Uncle Henry is so unremittingly bleak that one wonders if Dorothy is really giving Oz an honest chance.

Dorothy has no use for empty symbols, but her companions need them to satisfy their desires; their failure to grow and change from their experiences helps make them easy targets as symbols themselves in the allegories critics create for them. This is what makes them so accessible to the kind of reading Hearn gives the character of the Tin Woodman as Baum's symbol of humanized technology:

One of the tragedies of the Industrial Age of the nineteenth century was the rapid growth away

from basic human values. The close of the century encouraged many diverse hopes and prophecies of twentieth-century technological progress. A frequent prediction was the inevitable superiority of the machine; it would eventually perform all the labors of man. Baum realized that with this advancement man must not lose his humanity (Hearn 1973, 141).

Littlefield prefers a political interpretation--the enchantment of the Tin Woodman's axe is described as symbolic of the way "Eastern witchcraft dehumanized a simple laborer so that the faster and better he worked the more quickly he became a kind of machine. Here is a Populist view of evil Eastern influences on honest labor which could hardly be more pointed" (Littlefield 1964, 52). Eastern is ironically used to refer to both the Wicked Witch of the East whom Dorothy kills and to the industrialized East Coast of the United States.

This is the process of pigeonholing Baum's fiction and the interpreting of his characters as symbols that Ben Indick compares to the blind men touching parts of an elephant. Allegory is too narrow a classification for what Baum is writing. His major characters are too complex to be interchangeable cogs in anyone's critical invention. Baum's goal to modernize the fairy tale, a genre he not only wrote but also wrote about, meant a redefinition of the genre. Since the turn of the century,

the genres of fantasy and fairy tales have been discussed, defined, and debated, and scholars are still attempting to categorize Baum's Oz books satisfactorily. A setting that allows both magic and technology as equal forces invites contradictions. The reader is challenged to sort out and renegotiate the values and powers of each. Like Baum's The Master Key, the Oz books incorporate what are impossibilities in America as though they are everyday occurrences in Oz, stimulating a child's awareness of the magical potential in the world around him or her. "All the magic isn't in fairyland," the Shaggy Man tells Betsy Bobbin: "There's lots of magic in all Nature, and you may see it as well in the United States, where you and I once lived, as you can here." When she asks him why she never saw any, he answers, "Because you were so used to it all that you didn't realize it was magic. Is anything more wonderful than to see a flower grow and blossom, or to get light out of the electricity in the air? The cows that manufacture milk for us must have machinery fully as remarkable as that in Tik-Tok's copper body" (Tik-Tok, 161-62).

Magic becomes a metaphor for science, especially electricity and electrical devices. Ozma has a Magic Picture, "really a wonderful invention in magic" (Ozma, 252), which can show her any person or place in the world like an omniscient television set; Glinda has a magic "Record Book, on the pages of which are constantly printed

a record of every event that happens in any part of the world, at exactly the moment it happens" (Glinda, 16), a computer print-out of the most sophisticated kind. Harold E. Miner's "America in Oz" gives an excellent analysis of Baum's integration or anticipation of contemporary American life in his fiction. Miner notes, "The rise of the notion that anything is possible to technology (and the corresponding withering of the suspension of disbelief in fairyland) is a main element in the replacement of fairy stories by science stories, and is part of the legacy Baum left us" (Miner 1975, 3).

When the forces of technology and magic are combined in a fictional character, the dichotomy of vitalism versus mechanism is juxtaposed with the separation between imagined literary lives and human life. The introduction of characters like the Tin Woodman and Tik-Tok demands attention to the psychological and philosophical questions of identity and what makes us truly human. Baum uses the device E. M. Forster lists as a tool of the writer of fantasy: "the divings into and dividings of personality" (Forster 1949, 165). The result is the thematic development David L. Greene describes as "the acquisition of self-knowledge and the importance of reality in the face of deception and self-delusion" (Greene 1974, 173).

A discussion of deception seems ironically appropriate to this study since fantasy is, by definition, deception, a literary illusion. On the other hand, a

fantasy writer's greatest success comes from the invention of characters and otherworlds that seem real or believable. Baum's attitude, expressed through the young American children who visit Oz, especially Dorothy, seems to be to accept the marvelous as matter of fact. One feels that magic explained away as science, even if it science as yet undeciphered, is preferable to fairy magic. In The Land of Oz, the bad witch Mombi introduces several optical illusions as obstacles to block Tip and his companions from the Emerald City, "Yet not one of the obstacles really existed--all were cleverly contrived deceptions" (Land, 158). Even Glinda, who is the most powerful sorceress in the land, claims, "I never deal in transformations, for they are not honest, and no respectable sorceress likes to make things appear to be what they are not. Only unscrupulous witches use the art" (Land, 267). Because magic is so powerful, it is carefully controlled in Oz, limited by Ozma's law to be used by herself, Glinda, and the Wizard. The power to make things appear what they are not is a powerful one, as Ozma and every writer knows. The Shaggy Man makes explicit the connection between the deceptions in Oz and life. After leading his friends through an optical illusion of a gate, he explains, "It's the same with many other evils in life; they seem to exist, and yet it's all seeming and not true" (PW Girl, 162). What is true, Baum seems to say, is everything good one can see in Oz. The evil is only a

deception, and can be overcome by courage, self-reliance, honesty, and hard work.

Deception, a thing not being it appears, is part of the struggle visible in the character of the Tin Woodman. His appearance is metallic, machine-like; yet his thematic function is the embodiment of love. He is an ironically animated expression of another of Paul's concerns in his letter to the Corinthians: "If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal" (I Cor. 13: 1). The Tin Woodman, as a symbol, is not satisfactory in any of the various allegories in which he is set. His cyborg nature keeps us wavering between our consideration of him as a mechanical being or a meat person. He no longer needs to eat or sleep or love a woman but, with an insistency that begins to clang false, he clings to his human origin. When Dorothy sleeps at the Palace, he lies down, too, "from force of habit, for he remembered when he was made of flesh; but not being able to sleep he passed the night moving his joints up and down to make sure they kept in good working order" (Wizard, 118). The Dickensian personality traits that add to his charm also send conflicting messages: tears of compassion always carefully observed by someone holding an oil can lest he rust, his vanity and his frequent role as judge of others' individuality, his sharp axe that makes opponents doubt his compassion. The Tin Woodman is a character on

the limen, a lie-man, Lyman Frank Baum's enigma.

Baum's Oz books are full of enigmas, full of the challenges that E. M. Forster says are the extra price we pay as readers of fantasy, and through which Baum met his goals. He modernized the fairy tale, challenged the imaginations of his readers, pleased the children, and made a living at his craft as well.

Baum proved, without doubt, that an American writer could write fantasy from American materials, even if those materials were significantly unlike the well-developed tales and legends available to European collectors and storytellers. Other writers could build on his accomplishment, as he built on the efforts of those before him, could gradually bring into their American fairylands those questions he left out. Even with his weaknesses, he is our Grimm and our Andersen, the man who introduced Americans to their own dreams (Attebery 1980, 107-08).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, Paul M. and Stuart Kenter. "Tik-Tok and the Three Laws of Robotics." Science Fiction Studies 5 (1978): 67-80.
- Asimov, Isaac, Martin Harry Greenberg, and Charles Waugh, eds. Thinking Machines. Milwaukee: Raintree, 1981.
- Attebery, Brian. The Fantasy Tradition in American Literature: From Irving to LeGuin. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980.
- Bachelard, Gaston. The Poetics of Space. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston: Beacon, 1969.
- Baughman, Roland. "L. Frank Baum and the 'Oz Books'." Columbia Library Columns 4 (May 1955): 15-35.
- Baum, Frank Joslyn and Russell P. MacFall. To Please a Child: A Biography of L. Frank Baum, Royal Historian of Oz. Chicago: Reilly and Lee, 1961.
- Baum, L. Frank. "Our Landlady." Saturday Evening Pioneer [Aberdeen, SD] 4 Oct. 1890. 3 Jan. 1891. 10 Jan. 1891.
- . The Master Key. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill, 1901. Rpt. in A Treasury of Fantasy: Heroic Adventures in Imaginary Lands. Ed. Cary Wilkins. New York: Chatham River-Arlington, 1984. 345-434.
- . "Modern Fairy Tales." The Advance 19 Aug. 1909: 236-237.
- Baum, Maud. In Other Lands Than Ours. Chicago: privately

printed, 1907.

Bauska, Barry. "The Land of Oz and The American Dream."

The Markham Review 5 (Winter 1976): 21-24.

Beckwith, Osmond. "The Oddness of Oz." Kulchur Fall

1961: 19-30.

Bettelheim, Bruno. The Empty Fortress: Infantile Autism

and the Birth of the Self. New York: Free, 1967.

Bewley, Marius. "Oz Country." Rev. of The Machine in the

Garden: Technology and the Pastoral, by Leo Marx.

The New York Review of Books 3 Dec. 1964: 18-19. Rpt.

as "The Land of Oz: America's Great Good Place." In

Masks and Mirrors. New York: Atheneum, 1970. 255-

267.

Brotman, Jordan. "A Late Wanderer in Oz." Chicago

Review 18 (Dec. 1965): 63-73.

Cixous, Helene. "Fiction and Its Phantoms: A Reading of

Freud's Das Unheimliche (The 'uncanny')." New

Literary History 7.3 (Spring 1976): 525-548.

Coleman, Earle J. "Oz as Heaven and Other Philosophical

Questions." The Baum Bugle Fall 1980: 18-20.

"Cyborg." Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary.

1983 ed.

"Dear Sergeant Snow: Maud Baum's Correspondence with Jack

Snow." The Baum Bugle Winter 1982: 8-11.

Dryden, John. "Preface to Fables, Ancient and Modern."

In Criticism: The Major Texts. Ed. Walter Jackson

Bate. New York: Harcourt, 1970. 161-171.

- Erisman, Fred. "There Was a Child Went Forth: A Study of St. Nicholas Magazine and Selected Children's Authors, 1890-1915." Diss. U of M, 1966.
- Fisher, Irene. "The Art of John R. Neill." In The Best of The Baum Bugle, 1963-1964. Kinderhook, IL: Intl. Wizard of Oz Club, 1975. 68-71.
- Forster, E. M. Aspects of the Novel. New York: Harcourt, 1949.
- Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." In An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Trans. James Strachey with Anna Freud. 24 vols. London: Hogarth, 1977. 17: 219-256.
- Gage, Matilda J. "Dakota Days of L. Frank Baum." Unpublished essay, Alexander Mitchell Library, Aberdeen, SD. Feb. 1965.
- . Personal Interview. 2 March 1984.
- Gardner, Martin. "A Child's Garden of Bewilderment." Saturday Review July 17, 1965. Rpt. in Only Connect. Eds. Sheila Egoff, G. T. Stubbs, and L. F. Ashley. New York: Oxford UP, 1969. 150-155.
- and Russel B. Nye. The Wizard of Oz and Who He Was. East Lansing: Mich. State UP, 1957.
- Greene, David L. "The Concept of Oz." Vol. 3 of The Great Excluded: Critical Essays on Children's Literature. Eds. Francelia Butler and Bennett A. Brockman. 3 vols. to date. Storrs: U of Conn. P,

1974. 3: 173-175.
- and Dick Martin. The Oz Scrapbook. New York: Random, 1977.
- Hampsten, Elizabeth. Read This Only to Yourself: The Private Writings of Midwestern Women 1880-1910. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1982.
- Hearn, Michael P. The Annotated Wizard of Oz. New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1973.
- . "How Did the Woggle-Bug Do?" The Baum Bugle Autumn 1974: 16-23.
- . "L. Frank Baum and the 'modernized fairy tale.'" Children's Literature in Education 10.2 (Summer 1979): 57-67.
- . "L. Frank Baum." In Dictionary of Literary Biography: American Writers for Children, 1900-1960. 38 vols. to date. Ed. John Cech. Detroit: Bruccoli Clark, 1983. 22: 13-35.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. "The Sandman." In Tales of E. T. A. Hoffmann. Ed. and trans. Leonard J. Kent and Elizabeth C. Knight. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1972. 93-125.
- Indick, Ben. "Utopia, Allegory and Nightmare." The Baum Bugle Spring 1974: 14-19.
- "Invention." Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. 1983 ed.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Of Islands and Trenches: Naturalization and the Production of Utopian Discourse."

Diacritics June 1977: 2-21.

- Jensen, Richard J. The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict 1888-1896. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1971.
- Jones, W. T. "Thomas Hobbes." In A History of Western Philosophy. New York: Harcourt, 1952. 635-660.
- Joyce, James. Ulysses. 1934. New York: Modern Library-Random, 1961.
- Koelle, Barbara S. "The Tribulations of Trot." The Baum Bugle Winter 1977: 4-8.
- Kopp, Sheldon. "The Wizard of Oz Behind the Couch." Psychology Today March 1970: 71+.
- Lanes, Selma. Down the Rabbit Hole. New York: Atheneum, 1971.
- Lewisohn, Ludwig. "Helots." Rev. of R. U. R. The Nation 115 (1 Nov. 1922): 478.
- Littlefield, Henry M. "The Wizard of Oz: Parable on Populism." American Quarterly 16.1 (Spring 1964): 47-58.
- Luehrs, Robert B. "The Matriarchate, Witchcraft, and the Land of Oz." Unpublished paper from Popular Culture Asso. Convention. Wichita, KS. 1983.
- MacFall, Russell P. "L. Frank Baum--Shadow and Substance." The American Book Collector Dec. 1962: 9-11.
- Mannix, Daniel P. "The Father of the Wizard of Oz." American Heritage 16 (Dec. 1964): 36+.

- Martin, Dick. "The Wonderful World of Oz." Hobbies May 1959: 106-109.
- Miner, Harold E. "America In Oz." The Baum Bugle Winter 1975: 2-8.
- Molson, Francis J. "Children's Science Fiction." In Anatomy of Wonder: A Critical Guide to Science Fiction. Ed. Neil Barron. 2nd ed. New York: Bowker, 1981. 335-378.
- Moore, Raylyn. Wonderful Wizard, Marvelous Land. Bowling Green: Bowling Green U Popular P, 1974.
- Pearson, Carol and Katherine Pope. The Female Hero in American and British Literature. New York: Bowker, 1981.
- Propp, Vladimir. The Morphology of the Folktale. Trans. Laurence Scott. 2nd ed. Austin: U of Texas P, 1968.
- Reckford, Kenneth. "The Wizard's Magic." The Baum Bugle Autumn 1973: 22-24.
- Reichardt, Jasia. Robots: Fact, Fiction and Prediction. New York: Viking, 1978.
- Rivette, Barbara S. Matilda Joslyn Gage. n. p.: League of Women Voters of Fayetteville-Manlius, 1970.
- Sackett, S. J. "The Utopia of Oz." The Georgia Review 14 (Fall 1960): 275-291.
- St. John, Tom. "Lyman Frank Baum: Looking Back to the Promised Land." The Western Humanities Review 36.4 (Winter 1982): 349-360.

- Sale, Roger. "L. Frank Baum, and Oz." The Hudson Review 25 (Winter 1972-73): 571-592.
- Snow, Jack. Who's Who in Oz. Chicago: Reilly and Lee, 1954.
- Stevens, Wallace. "Sunday Morning." The Palm at the End of the Mind. Ed. Holly Stevens. New York: Vintage-Random, 1972.
- Thompson, Ruth P. "Concerning the Wonderful Wizard of Oz and Its Discoverer L. Frank Baum." The Baum Bugle Winter 1982: 2-4.
- Todorov, Tyvetan. The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre. Trans. Richard Howard. 2nd ed. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975.
- Travers, P.L. "My Childhood Bends Beside Me." The New Statesman and Nation 29 Nov. 1952: 639.
- Turkle, Sherry. The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit. New York: Simon, 1984.
- Vidal, Gore. "The Oz Books." In The Second American Revolution and Other Essays 1976-1982. New York: Random, 1982. 55-82.
- Vogel, Carl S. "The Amazonia of Oz." The Baum Bugle Autumn 1982: 4-8.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. Utopia Americana. Seattle: U of Washington Bookstore, 1929. Rpt. in The Wonderful Wizard of Oz, by L. Frank Baum, Critical Heritage Series. Ed. Michael Patrick Hearn. New York: Schocken, 1983. 142-157.

Will, George F. "It's Right to Worry About Use of Human Remains." Editorial. Grand Forks Herald 3 October 1985: 4.

Wilkins, Cary, ed. A Treasury of Fantasy: Heroic Adventures in Imaginary Lands. New York: Chatham River-Arlington, 1984.