

TRAUMA, CREATIVITY, AND UNCONSCIOUS CONFESSIONS: THE LOST CHILDHOOD HISTORY BEHIND L. FRANK BAUM'S *THE WONDERFUL WIZARD OF OZ*

REGINALD LEAMON ROBINSON*

I. INTRODUCTION

“[P]oisonous pedagogy” breeds overly well-adjusted individuals who can only trust the mask they have been forced to wear because as children they lived in constant fear of punishment.

– Alice Miller

*The Body Never Lies: The Lingering Effects of Hurtful Parenting*¹

Born in 1856 and raised by devout Methodists, Lyman Frank Baum was beaten, manipulated, and “murdered.” Perhaps not seen as a creative, imaginative child but as an idle and perhaps unmanly one, Frank’s parents, Benjamin Baum and Cynthia Baum, would have been determined to make him morally upright, socially productive, and not a slight, limp-wristed dandy. To garner this outcome, Benjamin may have had to be a stern, self-absorbed, and imposing figure,² especially given that his father, John, was a circuit riding Methodist minister, who likely preached about the dangers of the devil and lack of inner moral discipline.³ As such, John Baum would

* Copyright © 2010 by Reginald Leamon Robinson. Professor of Law, Howard University School of Law, Washington, D.C. B.A., (Phi Beta Kappa, Magna Cum Laude), Howard University (1981); M.A., Political Science, The University of Chicago (1983); Exchange Scholar, Political Science and Economic, Yale University (1984–1985); J.D., The University of Pennsylvania (1989). I would like to thank Dean Kurt Schmoke for his support and comments. I would also like to thank Professor Anthony Farley for organizing the “Taking Oz Seriously” symposium, which was hosted wonderfully by the Albany Law School. This essay depends on and pays homage to the critical, analytical brilliance and depth psychology of the late Dr. Alice Miller. In the area of child maltreatment, Dr. Miller is the most powerful voice I have ever encountered. Her works not only altered my personal life for the better, but they also shifted my ways of thinking, reading, seeing, and expressing my research and writing agenda. Last but not least, I would like to thank Susan Bitensky (MSU), Laurence Nolan (Howard), and Anne Turner, for reading and commenting on this piece. Of course, the politics and errata belong to me.

¹ ALICE MILLER, *THE BODY NEVER LIES: THE LINGERING EFFECTS OF HURTFUL PARENTING* 27 (Andrew Jenkins trans., W.W. Norton & Co. 2005).

² See generally ELEANOR D. PAYSON, *THE WIZARD OF OZ AND OTHER NARCISSISTS: COPING WITH THE ONE-WAY RELATIONSHIP IN WORK, LOVE, AND FAMILY* (2002).

³ See SUSAN FERRARA, *THE FAMILY OF THE WIZARD: THE BAUMS OF SYRACUSE* (1999) (“In 1843, according to Johnson, Cortland County [N.Y.] experienced yet another surge in revivalism and Reverend John Baum was there to help save souls. ‘In the early 1800’s,’ wrote Johnson, ‘Methodist circuit riders . . . ignored social questions and focused on personal salvation.’”). See also Kenneth A. Dodge, Vonnice C. McLoyd & Jennifer E. Lansford, *The Cultural Context of Physically Disciplining*

have strictly disciplined Benjamin, his eldest son, frowned on useless creativity, and compelled him to excel.⁴ While Cynthia would have played her surrogate mother role, Benjamin, like his father, at the very least, would have naturally relied on beatings, or physical pain, to rear and educate Frank and his siblings.⁵

In the context of proper childrearing, Benjamin's approach would not have fallen too far from John's tree. During his circuit ministry, John perhaps spent two-week stretches away from home, and during such absences, John's wife, Magdalena (or Lany), was expected not only to exhibit moral rectitude, but also to raise Benjamin within the strictest tradition of Methodist biblical teachings.⁶ One of these teachings was that children must obey their parents before they can be devoted to God, and a second teaching (though erroneously thought to come from the Bible) was spare the rod, spoil the child.⁷ Likewise, in Benjamin's sometime long absences, Cynthia would have provided day-to-day caretaking and perhaps enforced strict, moral discipline.⁸ To some degree, she may have been

Children, in AFRICAN AMERICAN FAMILY LIFE: ECOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY 245, 245–63 (Vonnie C. McLoyd, Nancy E. Hill & Kenneth A. Dodge eds., 2005) (explaining that children who suffer spanking and beating are apt to believe that spankings and beatings are necessary for properly raising children). See generally T. Walter Johnson, *Peter Akers: Methodist Circuit Rider and Educator (1790–1886)*, 32 J. ILL. STATE HIST. SOC'Y 417, 423–24 (1939) (“The pioneer Methodist preacher was a strong exponent of conversion, and he insisted on a change of heart, which meant right relationship with God and the proper kind of living. . . . In the face of such conditions [as drunkenness, vice, gambling, brutal fights, duels, and disregard of the Sabbath] the Methodist Church proclaimed an unbending morality. The circuit rider waged war on all vice, often calling out names in meetings and denouncing sinners to their faces.”).

⁴ Cf. ALICE MILLER, *THE UNTOUCHED KEY: TRACING CHILDHOOD TRAUMA IN CREATIVITY AND DESTRUCTIVENESS* 58 (Hildegard Hannum & Hunter Hannum trans., Doubleday 1990) (1988) (“It is difficult for parents who were wounded as children to resist the temptation to exercise their power. If they were not allowed to play freely as children, they will keep finding reasons to deprive their own children of this enjoyment, which is so crucial for development. Or they will pervert play by an overemphasis on achievement—in sports such as ice skating or in music lessons—and destroy the child's creativity by instilling a compulsion to excel.”).

⁵ See REBECCA LONCRINE, *THE REAL WIZARD OF OZ: THE LIFE AND TIMES OF L. FRANK BAUM* 12 (2009). Loncraine writes: “John Baum had buried two children. His fear for others led him to add, ‘I do hope that every member of our prosperity will in early life prepare for death.’” *Id.* She adds: “Children were not safe; their souls must be directed toward God in preparation for death in childhood.” *Id.* As a Methodist preacher, John would have been personally saving souls and wiping out sins. See *id.* Would John view any form of willfulness in Benjamin, his surviving child, as wicked and sinful? In 1834, as in 1856 when Frank was born, parents used beatings, severe ones if needed, to parent their children to recognize God and to cleanse them of sins, and given the foregoing, John and Lany would have not spared the rod to ensure that Benjamin's soul was prepared for that eventuality had he died in childhood. Given Miller's framework, Benjamin would have used violent childrearing practices to ensure that his children were properly educated in mind, body, and spirit. See generally ALICE MILLER, *FOR YOUR OWN GOOD: HIDDEN CRUELTY IN CHILD-REARING AND THE ROOTS OF VIOLENCE* (Hildegard Hannum & Hunter Hannum trans., The Noonday Press 4th ed. 2002) (1980).

⁶ See FERRARA, *supra* note 3. Cf. Johnson, *supra* note 3, at 423 (discussing a circuit rider's preaching).

⁷ See PHILIP GREVEN, *SPARE THE CHILD: THE RELIGIOUS ROOTS OF PUNISHMENT AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT OF PHYSICAL ABUSE* 21, 48 (1991) (Susanna Wesley, whose sons greatly influenced Methodism in America, believed in and inflicted painful punishment on her infant children, believing “that until a child will obey his parents, he can never be brought to obey God.”).

⁸ See LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 44 (“[Frank's] parents weren't strict disciplinarians, as long as he went to church on Sundays.”). Cf. GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 17. In describing the degree to which father's exercised authority even in their absence, especially those that professed not to rely on corporal punishment but on emotional manipulations and implied threats, Greven quotes:

To feel that by unwise, wrong behavior we had let down our parents who had trusted us to be wise and right was in itself so severe a punishment that other kinds were superfluous. I recall no corporal chastisement, although tradition has it that when I was a mere toddler my father spanked me for strewing a set of Shakespeare on the floor after he had told me not to; . . . Starting for school one

Frank's rescuer and disciplinarian⁹ because he became not dark and destructive, but perhaps repressed, suffering, and self-denying.¹⁰ Despite Cynthia's potential coddling and beatings, it was Benjamin, the patriarch, who may have been a strict disciplinarian and who wanted to see Frank become a good caretaker of the Baum name.¹¹ And so slowly, deliberately, and concertedly, even if they took slightly different approaches, they would have eventually tried to turn Frank away from his authentic feelings and creative imagination,¹² and strongly encouraged him to become a would-be entrepreneur and be a hard working, moneymaking, and child-producing man.¹³ At this point, if not before, Frank would have in all likelihood realized, even if unconsciously,¹⁴ that he would have had "no hope of being loved for what [he was]."¹⁵

In this way, to avoid punishment, humiliation, manipulation, and pain, Frank would have complied, thus beginning the "neurotic process."¹⁶ He would have internalized his father's disdain for his artistic penchant, which, I would argue, also would have undermined his self-esteem. For example, Frank would abandon a writing project if he could perhaps not turn it toward a commercially profitable end.¹⁷ Thus, by undermining him, Frank

morning my father turned to my mother, who was waving him good-by, and said: "Tell Harry he can cut the grass today, if he feels like it." Then after a few steps he turned back and added: "Tell Harry he had better feel like it!"

Id.

⁹ KATHARINE M. ROGERS, *L. FRANK BAUM: CREATOR OF OZ: A BIOGRAPHY* 6 (2002) (describing Cynthia). Here, Cynthia persuaded Benjamin to back Frank's interest to join a Shakespearean company on the promise that if he filled a list of needed costumes and wardrobes, he would get leading roles, even though he had no real experience in the theatre. *Id.* Benjamin correctly thought it was a rouse, and with Cynthia's intercession, he agreed. *Id.* Frank's costumes and wardrobes were permanently borrowed, and after a few walk-on appearances, he returned home crestfallen. *Id.*

¹⁰ *Cf.* MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 55–67 (discussing the different behavioral outcomes between Fyodor Dostoevsky and Paul Celan on the one hand and Stalin and Hitler on the other who were all beaten, except because Stalin and Hitler did not receive any love or protection or compassion, they hardened themselves, could not feel, hated others, and committed mass murders rather than remember what they suffered as children).

¹¹ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 6 ("Frank and his mother managed to persuade [Benjamin] to pay for the lot, on the condition that Frank use a pseudonym [George Brook], since the name *Baum* was respected in the community.").

¹² LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 44 ("At home, Baum was given space to explore his imagination, to daydream, to fully enter the stories he was so avidly reading.").

¹³ *See* ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 92. Frank valued the child's imagination, and thus he confessed that his imagination was key to his success, for with it the child can look beyond what might be painful or wrong or traumatic and see a world in which he is loved, appreciated, and happy. *Id.* ("He went on to explain that developing imagination, the capacity to envision what does not exist in the everyday world, was the essential function of fairy tales."). In addition, Frank wrote: "Stunt, dwarf, or destroy the imagination of a child and you have taken away its chances of success in life. Imagination transforms the commonplace into the great and creates the new out of the old. No man ever made a new invention or discovery without imagination, and invention and discovery have made human progress." *Id.* (quoting L. Frank Baum, Editorial, *BAUM BUGLE* Autumn, 1986, at 9).

¹⁴ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 14 ("I use the word 'unconscious' exclusively to refer to repressed, denied, or disassociated content (memories, emotions, needs).").

¹⁵ ARTHUR JANOV, *WHY YOU GET SICK AND HOW YOU GET WELL: THE HEALING POWER OF FEELINGS* 22 (1996).

¹⁶ JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 21 (arguing that if a child begins to suppress his first feelings, the neurotic process begins, and then by the by, the child develops dual selves: one real, the other unreal— "[t]he unreal self is the cover of those feelings and becomes the facade required by neurotic parents in order to fulfill needs of their own").

¹⁷ *See* ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 10. Rogers notes that after writing and performing *L. FRANK BAUM, THE MAID OF ARRAN* (1882), and after polishing and improving the play, the "play was never published, however." *Id.* It is possible that Frank was distracted by other matters leading up to 1883, especially courting, wedding, and starting a family with Maud. *Id.* at 11–13. Frank wrote after his 1882

would have learned to distrust not just his creative, imaginative insights, but also himself.¹⁸ Perhaps for his entire life, he may have been crippled with self-doubt, leading him to venture into artistic opportunities like Shakespearean acting,¹⁹ and, upon failing at it, causing him to return humiliated to work within the family enterprises.²⁰ Each time he failed, Frank personally laid bricks in the wall of self-doubt that Benjamin had erected within him. Because Cynthia probably spoiled Frank to some degree, because he spent time alone in imaginative play,²¹ and because he may have played with his siblings and cousins, Benjamin failed to quell Frank's artistic interests or his unconscious need to confess his possible childhood maltreatment.²² Nevertheless, what matters is that he would have doubted himself, which would have likely caused him to relive his childhood humiliation in his adult life. Regardless, Frank always ventured out, seeking creative, imaginative ways to express himself even while working at traditional jobs.²³

Yet, deep within himself, Frank was angry. At some level, he perhaps felt betrayed. Given the way in which he symbolically poked fun at wise old men, mocked the military, and refused to assault his children,²⁴ except the few times in which Maud insisted, he could not imagine openly faulting

marriage to Maud, L. FRANK BAUM, *KILMOURNE, OR O'CONNOR'S DREAM* (1883) (first performed April 4, 1883). *Id.* at 16. Yet, he never copyrighted or produced the play. *Id.* In 1885, Frank was fishing for ways to reach what he thought was a potential theater-going audience, and so he tried his hand at another Irish play. *Id.* In that year, he wrote L. FRANK BAUM, *THE QUEEN OF KILLARNEY* (1885), which he could not produce. *Id.* Perhaps Frank could not concentrate on just one venture for he was always seeking to mimic his father's success in business, and so he could have kept himself attuned to potential opportunities. They existed, and as Frank's theatrical career was waning, and as his "theatrical business was about to collapse altogether," Frank's brother, Benjamin William, hired Frank to superintendent his oil lubrication business, a prospect that was far more lucrative than the financially unsteady theatrical business. *Id.* at 16–17.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 6 (explaining that Frank not only moved around a great deal, but he was also quick to abandon a business enterprises if he faced external challenges like fierce competition or internal problems like his business partner and uncle who had a gambling problem).

¹⁹ *Id.* at 6–7.

²⁰ *Id.* at 6.

²¹ FRANK JOSLYN BAUM & RUSSELL P. MACFALL, *TO PLEASE A CHILD: A BIOGRAPHY OF L. FRANK BAUM ROYAL HISTORIAN OF OZ* 20 (1961) (explaining that although he played with his brothers and sisters, Frank spent much of his time "alone in some favored spot in the house or a corner of the yard, where he kept happy for hours with the fey playmates his imagination created"); LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 44 ("At home, Baum was given space to explore his imagination.").

²² Cf. MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 59–60 (discussing Paul Celan's life, she writes: "Particularly for people who at some point in their childhood experienced loving care, this truth won't allow itself to be silenced completely.").

²³ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 54 (explaining that while Frank sold china and waited for train connections at cheap hotels, he would write verses and stories like the poem—L. FRANK BAUM, *La Reine Est Morte—Vive La Reine*, in *BY THE CANDELABRA'S GLARE* (1895), which originally appeared in the *TIMES-HERALD* (Chi.)).

²⁴ Jeanne M. House, *The Wizard of Oz and the Path to Enlightenment*, REVERSE SPINS, <http://www.reversespins.com/wizardofoz.html> (last visited Nov. 12, 2010) ("Symbols are tools for our imagination, they act as doorways to our unconscious."). House also cites ROBERT A. JOHNSON, *INNER WORK* (1986), stating:

Inner work is the art of learning the symbolic language of the unconscious. The unconscious is a much larger realm than most of us realize. It is one that has a complete life of its own. It is an enormous 'field of energy,' and this constant stream of energy flows through our imaginations. So, our imagination is an organ of communication. It is an image-forming faculty. It does not make anything up. It converts the preexisting symbols into meaning.

Id.

or criticizing his parents.²⁵ And so, writing would become Frank's way of revealing, in fragments, what probably happened to him,²⁶ even though he would never intentionally disrespect his parents,²⁷ and even though he could not directly recall his probable childhood maltreatment. Given his wide interest, Frank wrote plays, editorials, trade promotions, and creative fiction, through which he constructed literary (surrogate or substitute) figures.²⁸ As such, Alice Miller would argue that these figures perform would be stand-ins for his parents,²⁹ who were perhaps the very sources of his life-long suffering against his inner disquiet.³⁰ In this way, Frank could vent his anger at his parents unconsciously, while not directly recalling his repressed childhood history.³¹

Unfortunately for Frank, he repressed himself thoroughly³² and identified very strongly with his father Benjamin.³³ He also needed

²⁵ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 66 (explaining that Frank gives his mother, with who he was not close, a signed copy of a book, L. FRANK BAUM, BY THE CANDELABRA'S GLARE (1895)). The book contained L. FRANK BAUM, *The Heretic*, in BY THE CANDELABRA'S GLARE (1895)—a story in which he criticized traditional religion through the Heretic's voice, illustrating that he was more loving and generous than the minister and explaining that he warned his mother that the Heretic's voice was not his but the character itself. ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 66. See also MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 30. Miller states that maltreated children who are creative enough to become writers kept their experiences repressed or at the most "split off from their own lives." *Id.* at 29. She also argues that such talented but maltreated adult children write about what happened to them "without leveling accusations at the parents. And that is something that is still prohibited in our society, in fact to an increasing degree." *Id.* at 30.

²⁶ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 14 ("For me, a person's unconscious is nothing other than his/her biography, a life story that, although stored in the body in its entirety, is accessible to our consciousness only in a highly fragmentary form.")

²⁷ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 66. Cynthia, a devout Methodist, honored the Sabbath. *Id.* On one visit, Frank had attended a Cubs baseball game while she remained at the house. *Id.* Inquiring disapprovingly about the boos, shouts, and noises from the stadium, his son "Robert blurted out, 'That's Daddy, yelling at the baseball game!' There was stunned silence. Maud was embarrassed. The elder Mrs. Baum was shocked. That evening she lectured her son . . . and after that he passed up Sunday baseball whenever she was a visitor." *Id.*

²⁸ See ARTHUR JANOV, *THE NEW PRIMAL SCREAM: PRIMAL THERAPY 20 YEARS ON* 131 (1991) ("My mother never loved me and never showed me any affection. I finally found a perfect substitute with whom I could struggle. I needed someone who didn't love me. Basically, my mother made me feel unlovable. To be with someone who loved me would be going against my type."). See also MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 21–22. Miller writes:

[T]he more implacably children have been deprived of love and negated or maltreated in the name of "upbringing," the more those children, on reaching adulthood, will look to their parents (or other people substituting for them) to supply all the things that those same parents failed to provide when they were needed most. . . . [The body] knows precisely what it needs, it cannot forget the deprivations. The deprivation or hole is there, waiting to be filled.

Id.

²⁹ See generally MILLER, *supra* note 5; MILLER, *supra* note 1.

³⁰ See ALICE MILLER, *THE DRAMA OF THE GIFTED CHILD: THE SEARCH FOR THE TRUE SELF* 1 (Ruth Ward trans., Basic Books 1997) (1979) ("[T]he truth often seems unbearable to us. And yet the truth is so essential that its loss exacts a heavy toll, in the form of grave illness. In order to become whole we must try, in the long process, to discover our own personal truth, a truth that may cause pain before giving us a new sphere of freedom.")

³¹ See GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 19 ("When painful blows are inflicted upon infants, not even memory suffices to tell the stories firsthand. . . . The body and the brain probably encode such pain, but none of us has any conscious recollection of blows experienced very early in life.")

³² See JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 75 (stating that dreams and nightmares are ways in which children's unconscious symbolically reveals what or who maltreated or traumatized them, and they stave off the plain truth of the real event and keep their authentic feelings buried).

³³ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 21. Even though Frank disliked the probable beatings he received from his father or disliked that his father permitted others to impose upon him, like the head teacher at the military academy, and even though Frank eventually refused to assault his own children, while permitting Maud to do so, he was determined to emulate Benjamin by becoming a successful businessman. See *id.*

Cynthia's love, and as Miller would argue, he symbolically expressed this hopefulness of getting a mother's real, unconditional love by marrying Maud Gage.³⁴ And like his father, Frank stayed away from home, perhaps forcing Maud to love him as Benjamin or Cynthia could never have, and clearly permitting her to assault their four boys in the very way that Cynthia (or Benjamin) may have done to Frank and his siblings.³⁵ Although he used his writings to mock, satirize, and criticize, Frank never really freed himself from his *internalized parents*.³⁶ Although he wrote, he never raged at his parents for "murdering" him and stunting his gifts.

Like his other writings,³⁷ Frank thus "unconsciously" had to write *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* so that he could both trust living as an artist and a writer and so heal and empower himself by possibly exposing Benjamin as the Wizard of Oz, the Great and Terrible, and thus as a false, external god. By unconscious, I mean "repressed, denied, or disassociated content (memories, emotions, needs). [A] person's unconscious is nothing other than his/her biography, a life story that, although stored in the body in its entirety, is accessible to our consciousness only in a highly fragmentary form."³⁸ Until this time, Frank's creative, imaginative personality, which may have died in childhood, may have remained entombed within his unconscious. Until this time, Frank kept a vigil at his symbolic grave, at which he would have cried and grieved for his true self. In this sense, through a series of experiences, especially meeting his mother-in-law and suffragette Matilda Gage, who encouraged him to publish,³⁹ and practicing Theosophy, I suspect that Frank eventually trusted his intuitive impulse to write *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.⁴⁰ Thus, I posit that Frank may have come quite close to rediscovering what he may have given over under the potential cruel lash, harsh words, and relentless criticism from his parents.

If all writing is an existential, unconscious confession of our being, I argue that Frank wrote *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* because he unconsciously wished to rediscover his lost childhood history, because he may have unconsciously needed to access his real self by recalling his actual trauma and thus needed to vent his impotent fury indirectly,⁴¹ and because he may have wished to empower his child readers, thus implicitly

³⁴ See BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 47. Throughout their marriage of thirty-seven years, it is more than clear that Frank needed Maud—who I argue is a proxy for Cynthia and in some ways for Benjamin also—to accept him completely as he was. He pursued commercial success because he felt he had to do so, and he wrote constantly because he desired an imaginative, creative outlet. Frank remained child-like and whimsical his entire adult life, thus requiring Maud to tolerate the needs of the child within Frank, which perhaps in his mind had been rejected by his mother and his father. Yet, in return, Frank brokered peace at home, which he could not do as a child or at least as a child whose views or insights were an anathema to adult affairs. Rather than shroud his financial dealings in secrecy, he literally turned the family's finances over to Maud. Thus, Frank was free to work and to follow his inner whimsy, knowing full well that Maud would care for him as she might care for their children. See *id.* ("Frank . . . allowed her to have her way with the household, the children, and the family purse.")

³⁵ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 26 (discussing the repetition of behavior patterns passed from parents).

³⁶ See ALICE MILLER, BANISHED KNOWLEDGE: FACING CHILDHOOD INJURIES 21–22 (Leila Vennewitz trans., Random House 1991) (1988).

³⁷ See, e.g., L. FRANK BAUM, MOTHER GOOSE IN PROSE (1897); L. FRANK BAUM, BY THE CANDELABRA'S GLARE (1898); L. FRANK BAUM, FATHER GOOSE: HIS BOOK (1899).

³⁸ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 14.

³⁹ LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 149.

⁴⁰ See generally L. FRANK BAUM, THE WIZARD OF OZ (Puffin Classics 2008) (1900).

⁴¹ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 38.

his own inner child, by perhaps encouraging them not to trust just their logical processes but to connect to their inner authentic feelings and intuitive knowing. Burdened even as an adult by the fears of a dependent child,⁴² I also argue that Frank unfortunately may have betrayed himself and the speculative reasons for writing *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* because he may have deeply feared reprisals from his parents if he had violated the social mores against parental disrespect by directly accusing his parents.⁴³ In the end, *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* compromised on actually empowering children, thus perhaps permitting a new generation of parents to rationalize violence against their children and perhaps requiring a new generation of children to believe that love, violence, and humiliation are eternally conjoined.⁴⁴

At the outset, I acknowledge in this preliminary treatment of Frank and *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* that I have trouble definitively proving the foregoing thesis. So much of what I would need as direct evidence does not exist in writing. Hence, much of what I would need remains buried in the Baum family's collective unconscious, or if remembered, has been kept out of books by family members who have a stake in protecting Frank's legacy and the Baum family's good will. Even modern-day biographers write about their subjects as if they were born but not raised by caregivers who embraced what Miller calls, "poisonous pedagogy."⁴⁵ Regardless, I rely on what limited direct and mostly circumstantial evidence I have to draw some deductive conclusions and many, ideally, strong inferences about what motivated Frank to write *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.

II. L. FRANK BAUM'S LOST CHILDHOOD

To please a child is a sweet and lovely thing that warms one's heart and brings its own reward.

– L. Frank Baum

*To Please a Child: A Biography of L. Frank Baum Royal Historian of Oz*⁴⁶

⁴² See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 29 (stating that maltreated children who are gifted enough to become writers do not direct their anger and indignation at others but at themselves, and hence they develop physical illnesses because they continue to conceal their truth by splitting off their childhood histories from their actual lives).

⁴³ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 78 (noting that if maltreated children only reveal their trauma by focusing on surrogate persons, they never really achieve true liberation).

⁴⁴ See MILLER, *supra* note 5, at 4 ("[Children] have no previous history standing in their way, and their tolerance for their parents knows no bounds. The love a child has for his or her parents ensures that their conscious or unconscious acts of mental cruelty will go undetected."). Miller goes on to write:

The conviction that parents are always right and that every act of cruelty, whether conscious or unconscious, is an expression of their love is so deeply rooted in human beings because it is based on the process of internalization that takes place during the first months of life—in other words, during the period preceding separation from the primary care giver.

Id. at 5.

⁴⁵ See generally *id.* at 3–91 (arguing that in order to cure a child of in-born impulses to be willful, definitive, lie, cry, rage, or other emotional outburst, so that the child can be properly educated and thus abide parents' absolute authority, order, law, rules, and morality, the parents must destroy at every chance the child's impulses through violence, humiliation, manipulated, misdirection, and symbols as early as possible after the child is born, starting at five or six months).

⁴⁶ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21 (quote appears on the title page).

Why did Frank plead for us to “please a child”? Principally, because after years of traumatic child rearing, he—a very emotionally sensitive child—still would have had an intuitive sense that his parents were not devoted to pleasing him when he was a child. As Arthur Janov writes: “Children are never fooled. From birth they are all feeling and sense every nuance of their parents.”⁴⁷ Although his suffering had been lost to him consciously, his body still remembered. Thus, his unconscious will still retain his childhood history, which out of biological and psychological would have compelled to tell him the truth.⁴⁸ After repressing this truth, or by engaging in self-deception, which invariably beckons emotional and physical ailments, Frank pled with us to please our children, even though many years later, Frank was still asking his parents to stop displeasing him, too.

This plea, this unconscious leaking⁴⁹ of what may have been Frank’s lost childhood, suggests to me that he was not living as his true self in at least two ways. First, he would have forgotten the divinity on which he had relied as an infant and toddler, which symbolically resurfaced in the character of young Dorothy in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.⁵⁰ Second, he would have pushed under, but did not completely suppress, what he had come to express—extraordinarily creative, emotional, and

insights through words.⁵¹ Although the writing of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* may have helped Frank access fragments of his childhood experiences,

⁴⁷ JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 19.

⁴⁸ See generally MILLER, *supra* note 5; MILLER *supra* note 1; JANOV, *supra* note 28; JANOV, *supra* note 15.

⁴⁹ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 97–143 (using the concept of “leaky gates.”). On this concept, Janov writes:

[G]ating, mediated by our internally produced opiates[e.g., dopamine], ordinarily stops you from sensing what’s going on inside your body so that you don’t suffer. Therefore, repression actually functions to protect the cortex from having access to primal pain. But for many, repression doesn’t work. They have what I call *leaky gates*, when repressive mechanisms can’t handle the pain inside of them. The result may be anxiety or hyperactivity, anorexia or bulimia, compulsions and obsessions, phobias, sleeping problems, nightmares, paranoia, psychosis, or even suicide. All of these are the mind’s way to “rationalize” the pain in the present and to keep the individual from being overwhelmed by his past. Leaky gates often require reinforcement in the form of drugs or alcohol.

Id. at 98.

⁵⁰ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 76 (describing Dorothy’s personality as “kind, responsible, self-reliant, brave, sensible, honest, self-confident, yet unpretentious—just what a child would like to be and what she ought to be”). See generally *id.* at 75–84, 91–94.

⁵¹ See generally DAN MILLMAN, *THE LIFE YOU WERE BORN TO LIVE* 202–08 (1993) (discussing “31/4s,” which was L. Frank Baum’s birth path/life path numbers, which he also shared with Sigmund Freud and noting that people like Frank who are born as 31/4s are generally “*here to work through issues of stability, creativity, and emotional expression, learning to channel their energy in constructive ways and to master a step-by-step process to their goals*”); JAMES HILLMAN, *THE SOUL’S CODE: IN SEARCH OF CHARACTER AND CALLING* (1996).

all of which he expressed symbolically,⁵² and although he left a huge tome of writing, Frank unfortunately never matured into a great literary artist.⁵³

Regardless, Frank appeared driven to reveal symbolically, thus indirectly, what he may have suffered as a child. Given his devout Methodist parents, Frank may not have been able to linger in a child-like state, frolicking and mindfully disinterested in maturing. Like the parents of Chaim Soutine,⁵⁴ Benjamin and Cynthia may have strongly disapproved of Frank's creative, imaginative mind and artistic leanings. Yet, such attributes were Frank, who was probably strong-willed. To ensure his proper education, they may have beaten and punished him regularly, which would have included manipulation, humiliation, and shaming. As devout Methodists, they would have wanted their children steeped in their faith's strictures. On this point, Miller writes: "Most parents see their own parents in their children. They are afraid of admitting an error because severe penalties were inflicted on them every time they made a mistake when they were children. They cling desperately to the mask of infallibility, and it is this that makes it so hard for them to respond."⁵⁵ Yet, despite their efforts to heel Frank, his parents may not have been purely motivated by higher principles, and that he may have assuredly repressed what he may have intuitively discovered so that he could possibly avoid further physical and emotional pain.⁵⁶ For example, in his later writings, Frank clearly revealed his disdain for his father, who had grown a white beard. In *Three Wise Men of Gotham*, Frank characteristically mocked "intellectual pretentiousness":

Two old men in a village found they could "earn money without working" by setting up as Wise Men. They were not actually wise, of course; but by displaying their pure white beards and piercing eyes, walking slowly and majestically, and saying as little as possible, they succeeded in impressing their neighbors. When a third pretender appeared, the first two, "knowing themselves to be arrant humbugs," realized they had to defend their position by engaging him in disputation. After the people gathered around "to hear the words of wisdom that dropped from their lips," one Wise Man put forth his reasons why the world must be flat, and the other

⁵² MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 14. Miller writes:

I use the word "unconscious" exclusively to refer to repressed, denied, or disassociated content (memories, emotions, needs). For me, a person's unconscious is nothing other than his/her biography, a life story that, although stored in the body in its entirety, is accessible to our consciousness only in a highly fragmentary form.

Id.

⁵³ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at xv ("Gillian Avery disparaged Baum partly for his unpolished style, but most for blandness and 'easy optimism.'"); *id.* at 110 (discussing Frank's dramatic writing as banal, unsophisticated, so that it could appeal to the standard of adult theater patrons).

⁵⁴ Cf. MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 47–68 (discussing the life and times of Chaim Soutine, and addressing why Soutine, unlike Hitler and Stalin, despite his severe beatings, turned to a life of art to express his repressed childhood trauma); *id.* at 48 (Soutine "was frequently beaten by his parents and brothers and could count on being punished regularly because he liked to draw so much, something that was forbidden by Orthodox Jews.").

⁵⁵ ALICE MILLER, *FREE FROM LIES: DISCOVERING YOUR TRUE NEEDS* 16 (Andrew Jenkins trans., 2009) (2007).

⁵⁶ JANOVA, *supra* note 15, at 4 ("What causes repression? Pain. When trauma or deprivation inflicted early in life is so great that it exceeds the organism's capacity to react to it, it becomes pain. This pain, in turn, stimulates the production of repressive agents—the endorphins and other natural painkillers.").

two demonstrated their superior wisdom with arguments for equally absurd conflicting theories. They agreed to settle the question by sailing to the outermost edge of the ocean and went out in a bowl because the boats were all out fishing. With Baum's help, a child can have the delight of seeing through adult pomposity.⁵⁷

Why would Frank need to expose adult hypocrisy? It appears to me that Frank may have possessed an early intuitive ability to see beyond his parents' façade. He also may have overheard private talks between his parents. Regardless, he knew that his parents may have been prone to manipulate him and his siblings so that they could engage in what Miller has called "poisonous pedagogy." This form of parenting, which was used by Susanna Wesley against her sons when they were infants, stunts the child's vitality when the child is an adult and can "substantially impair[], if not entirely kill[] off, the feeling for who we really are, what we feel, and what we need."⁵⁸ To be sure, this form of parenting requires constant vigils by parents, which I suspect Frank may have expressed symbolically in the Wicked Witch of the West, who had a telescopic and cyclopic eye.⁵⁹ This form of parenting may have entailed manipulations, which he expressed in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* when the Wizard—the Great and Terrible—gets Dorothy, the Lion, the Tin Woodman, and the Scarecrow to do his bidding if they kill the Wicked Witch of the West in order to have their desires granted, when the Wizard knew he was a "humbug"⁶⁰ and "bad wizard."⁶¹

Regardless, Frank, as a child, perhaps was unable to say anything, and in writing his fairy tales, including *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, he may have maintained a child-like mind, perhaps unconsciously aware that he had been reduced to an object⁶² on to which his parents foisted their Methodist beliefs and social mores. In his writings, Frank may have wished to alert other diminutive human beings to their parents' wiles and beguiling natures, especially those who may have feigned wisdom and superior experience to belittle, ignore, marginalize, and ridicule a child's authentic feelings, needs, and desires. To Frank, such parents would have differed little from the Wise Men who sought to impress their neighbors for their personal gain. And so, what Frank may have been unable to utter with impunity as a child, he could mock as an adult. For example, in *Dot and Tot*, Frank revealed that he could not individuate from his parents; he had to bend his will to their parental pedagogy.⁶³ Unfortunately, Frank indirectly attacked, judged, criticized, or raged against his parents. He relied thus on stories, verses, and fairy tales to hint at the emotional withering through

⁵⁷ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 62.

⁵⁸ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 26–27.

⁵⁹ BAUM, *supra* note 40.

⁶⁰ *Id.* at 133.

⁶¹ *Id.* at 139.

⁶² MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 46 ("A child is not really permitted to be a subject; he must remain the object of pedagogy.")

⁶³ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 104 ("Only when Marvel reunites the two half-personalities can the Hi Ki be restored to happiness and goodness. The double nature of the Twis also serves as a symbol for disturbing conformity. 'Two people would always look at two [identical] pictures at the same time and admire them in the same way with the same thoughts.' . . . 'There is no such word as 'one' in their language. In their view, *singular* can only mean deviant from normality.'")

which he perhaps suffered. By exposing his parents indirectly for their pedagogical absurdities, Frank unconsciously confessed that he was maltreated and manipulated.

Frank also hinted at how he may have been maltreated by his parents when he rewrote William Black's popular novel, *A Princess of Thule* (1874), in which an amateur painter, Frank Lavender meets, falls for, and brings back to civilized society Sheila, an unsophisticated daughter from an island.⁶⁴ Lavender's older friend Ingram admonished him that unsophisticated and high society will not mix well; Lavender rejects this warning. Sheila does not fit in, and Lavender grows dissatisfied. He belittles her and neglects her, forcing her to return to her island home. Shocked into repentance, Lavender renounces living off his aunt's wealth, retires to the remote island to which Sheila returned, and works seriously to live and thrive as an artist.⁶⁵

Frank rewrote Black's *A Princess of Thule* as a play, keeping the basic plot, placing Shiela (his spelling) in Ireland, and transforming Ingram into a "treacherous naval captain who foments discord between [Hugh (Frank's name for Lavender) and Shiela]."⁶⁶ Hugh drives Shiela away, and similar to Black's original plot, Hugh becomes "a common sailor on a warship in order to make a man of himself. Too late, he finds that Ingram, who betrayed him, is the captain of his ship."⁶⁷ Provoked, Hugh strikes the captain, who condemns him to hang.⁶⁸ Yet, Shiela saves him, and, after hard wandering for three years, Hugh returns home to live "a happy pastoral life with her."⁶⁹ As a rather dark drama with wafts of humor, Frank's playbill suggested his aim: "[T]o [e]nsnare all hearts and leave an impress of beauty and nobility within the sordid mind of man."⁷⁰

At a symbolic level, I suspect that Frank may have been unconsciously drawn to Black's novel.⁷¹ It may have resonated with his lost childhood history. Frank played Hugh in the staged production of the play because that character possibly appealed emotionally to him. I doubt that he could have played Ingram, who may have much more befitted Frank's unconscious experiences with his father Benjamin. In many ways, it seems to me that Shiela represented Cynthia, his mother. Generally, an infant or toddler loves his mother dearly, and because Benjamin was more than likely patriarchally dominant, I would opine that Frank's view may have been that Benjamin had interfered with the ways in which Cynthia potentially met Frank's needs. Perhaps Benjamin found her too coddling, too touchy feely, too emotionally sensitive to the infant's or toddler's physical and emotional needs, lest the child became spoiled⁷² or became

⁶⁴ See *id.* at 9–10.

⁶⁵ *Id.* at 9.

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.* at 9–10.

⁶⁸ *Id.* at 10.

⁶⁹ *Id.*

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ See generally ESTHER HICKS & JERRY HICKS, *THE LAW OF ATTRACTION: THE BASICS OF THE TEACHINGS OF ABRAHAM* (2006) (discussing such topics as how likes attract, opposites attract and negative past experiences that program children).

⁷² See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 47. Miller refutes the following statements, and given the late 1850s, in which Frank was an infant, I can imagine that a family like the Baums who embraced the Methodist

Edward Glover's egoistic child.⁷³ Frank would have internalized the way in which Cynthia may have been torn from him by a heavy-handed father.

Invariably, Frank's guilt may have caused him to wonder what he had done to cause his mother to perhaps keep an emotional distance from him. He may have faulted Benjamin, who, like Ingram, may have come between Frank and his mother's love for each other, not just because Benjamin may have wanted Cynthia romantically for himself, but also because Cynthia was perhaps making Frank less manly, less a Baum. Frank also may have faulted Cynthia; yet, she was home and perhaps she more or less met her children's needs. Frank thus may have needed to justify why Cynthia possibly refused to meet his needs perhaps as she had done or as he needed. Furthermore, Frank may have eventually seen Benjamin as a ruler who may have not only taken from others what perhaps they sorely needed, but also may have aimed at perhaps breaking those who were emotionally different. Moreover, it would appear that Frank may have thought Benjamin wanted him dead, or, at least at times Frank's possible pain, anguish, and humiliation may have been so deep that he may have thought he would have died if perhaps Cynthia or an aunt or an uncle or sibling, possibly at Cynthia's behest, had not come to his aid.

Like Miller, I reject Sigmund Freud's rationalizing and justifying drive theory,⁷⁴ and thus nothing I have said implicates Freudian or neo-Freudian

faith believed that they had to raise Frank and his sibling in a manner that forestalled the evils that followed inexorably from an undisciplined child. Paraphrasing what parents have said to her, Miller writes:

How can I discipline my child, how must I punish him so that he will grow up into a decent human being and not lie, not steal, not run away? . . . Children who are spoiled and given anything they ask for at home will steal if required to work; one must accustom them to the idea that they get nothing without working for it, one must accustom them at an early age to the fact that life is hard, one must not give them everything they want, even if one could, one must set them limits, one must, one must.

Id.

⁷³ See *id.* at 40. Building perhaps on Martin Luther's theory of in-born evil, and Melanie Klein's theory of the cruel infant, Edward Glover writes:

Expressing these technical discoveries in social terms we can say that the perfectly normal infant is almost completely ego-centric, greedy, dirty, violent in temper, destructive in habit, profoundly sexual in purpose, aggrandizing in attitude, devoid of all but the most primitive reality sense, without conscience or moral feeling, whose attitude to society (as represented by the family) is opportunist, inconsiderate, domineering and sadistic. And when we come to consider the criminal type labeled psychopathic it will be apparent that many of these characteristics can under certain circumstances persist into adult life. In fact, judged by adult social standards the normal baby is for all practical purposes a born criminal.

Id.

⁷⁴ See also MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 52–79 (setting forth and roundly rejecting Freud's drive theories as defensive mechanisms that permitted adults not only to sexually assault children with virtual impunity, but also to fault bad or sexually aroused children for instigating sexual contact with parents). On this point, Miller compellingly writes:

Sigmund Freud had to conceal his surprising discovery of adults' sexual abuse of their children, a discovery he was led to by the testimony of his patients. He disguised his insights with the aid of a theory that nullified this inadmissible knowledge. Children of his day were not allowed, under the severest of threats, to be aware of what adults were doing to them, and if Freud had persisted in his seduction theory, he not only would have had his introjected parents to fear but would no doubt have been discredited, and probably ostracized, by middle-class society. In order to protect himself, he had to devise a theory that would preserve

sexual desires for Cynthia by Frank. Notwithstanding his brilliant insights in *The Aetiology of Hysteria*,⁷⁵ Freud's drive theory was corrupted by his own childhood trauma, thus subjecting successive generation to a psychoanalytic model, which brackets parental abuse and trauma.⁷⁶ In truth, Freud's father molested him,⁷⁷ and it was Wilhelm Fleiss—a close confidant, a molester of his own son, Robert, and perhaps a guilt burdened person—who perhaps had convinced Freud to reject his patients' actual childhood histories of sexual abuse.⁷⁸ By privileging his drive theory over actual childhood histories, Freud could achieve at least four things. First, he could doubt if parental sexual abuse was pervasive; hence, he could say that what his patients told him was not untrue but fantasies in which they had great faith. Second, he could shield his clients' parents from villainy by declaring that his patients were not sexually abusing their child, but that their children projected their inner drives onto them. Third, he had a professionally plausible and psychologically defensible way to explain trauma or hysteria. Lastly, Freud aligned his drive theory with long-standing views that children were naturally wicked and bad, thus in need of pedagogical training "by adults to be good."⁷⁹ Hence, Frank's probable unexpressed hatred for his father may have turned not on displacing Benjamin as a sexual partner, but perhaps on getting his emotional needs

appearances by attributing all "evil," guilt, and wrongdoing to the child's fantasies, in which the parents served only as the objects of projection. We can understand why this theory omitted the fact that it is the parents who not only project their sexual and aggressive fantasies onto the child but also are able to act out these fantasies because they wield the power.

MILLER, *supra* note 5, at 60. See generally SIGMUND FREUD, *An Autobiographical Study*, in THE FREUD READER 1, 3–41 (Peter Gay ed., 1989).

⁷⁵ See generally SIGMUND FREUD, *The Aetiology of Hysteria*, in THE FREUD READER, *supra* note 74, at 96–111 (brilliantly linking hysteria or trauma with the power of parents to punish and to foist their sexual desires onto children, who were at the same time weak, dependent, and sexually aroused, all of which leading to repression, symptoms, symbolisms, and the idealization and life-long bonding of damaged children to exploiting and abusive parents); ALICE MILLER, *THOU SHALT NOT BE AWARE: SOCIETY'S BETRAYAL OF THE CHILD* (Hildegard Hannum & Hunter Hannum trans., Farrar, Straus & Giroux 1984) (1981).

⁷⁶ See generally MILLER, *supra* note 30; MILLER, *supra* note 75. See also MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 6 ("The discovery of my total helplessness at that time [when I was abused by my parents] also showed me not only the power of repression that all my life had kept me away from the truth but as well the impotence of psychoanalysis, whose misleading theories further reinforced this repression.").

⁷⁷ MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 53. In a letter to Wilhelm Fliess, Freud wrote: "Unfortunately, my own father was one of these perverts and is responsible for the hysteria of my brother (all of whose symptoms are identifications) and those of several younger sisters. The frequency of this circumstance often makes me wonder." *Id.* See also SIGMUND FREUD, *Letter to Fliess*, in THE FREUD READER, *supra* note 74, at 112 ("Then came surprise at the fact that in every case the father, not excluding my own, had to be blamed as a pervert—the realization of the unexpected frequency of hysteria, in which the same determinant is invariably established, though such a widespread extent of perversity toward children is, after all, not very probable.").

⁷⁸ MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 53–54. Miller writes:

Fliess's son, Robert Fliess, however, later became a psychiatrist and analyst and published three books containing some very revealing material on sexual abuse by parents of their own children. It took Robert Fliess many decades to find out that, at the age of two, he had been sexually abused by his father and that this incident coincided with Freud's renunciation of the truth. . . . [Robert] was convinced that his father had deterred Freud from further developing the trauma theory. That theory would have inevitably caused Wilhelm Fliess guilt feelings

Id.

⁷⁹ See *id.* at 55 ("For the Freudian dogmas corresponded to the widespread notion that the child is by nature wicked and bad and must be trained by adults to be good.").

met consistently. To end his early psychic disturbance, Frank may have unconsciously harbored a near-childlike solution: without Benjamin, Frank and his mother could live a peaceful, easy life, in which his immediate needs for love, acceptance, and recognition could be met.

Frank's lost childhood history may have had at least one source—his father. It would appear that Frank may have born a latent hatred for Benjamin, and, as discussed in the previous paragraph, he may have later symbolically argued that Benjamin's attitude, not just Cynthia's own childhood upbringing, explained why Cynthia potentially lashed out at him. Frank wrote:

In nine cases out of ten, a happy home depends on the temperament of the "man of the house." A woman is usually so occupied with her household duties and the care of her children that she naturally becomes more or less nervous and irritable, and looks forward to the home coming of her mate as the one excitement that shall relieve the monotony of her daily routine. If he appears sullen, morose and bearish her overwrought nerves give way, and quarrels and bickerings naturally ensue. If he enters the house with a cheerful face, a smile and kiss of welcome and a cheery word her troubles are all forgotten; the latent sweetness in the disposition of the most unsociable woman is involuntarily drawn out, and a pleasant and genial chat restores to her the even poise of her nervous organization.⁸⁰

As Miller would argue, Frank's language would have symbolized childhood experiences that he perhaps could not recall directly, or that due to maltreatment, he simply may have learned to repress his genuine feelings so that he may have been able to exist within the Baum household,⁸¹ even though such self-deception often leads to physical illness.⁸² Frank faulted fathers, the patriarchic rulers of the house, in which, from his perhaps naïve view, mothers may have simply existed to care for children. Note that Frank did not assign complex emotional needs or mental faculties to mothers. They responded rather cybernetically to stimuli: if perhaps Benjamin came home in a foul mood, then it is possible that Cynthia's latent sweetness may have been uncontrollably disturbed, which may have caused her to become irritable, quarrelsome, and prickly; if perhaps Benjamin came home, kissed her, greeted her cheerfully, then her troubled day perhaps filled with drudgery, monotony, and meeting the needs of others may have evaporated, which may have left her in an

⁸⁰ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 30. LONCRAINE, *supra* note 5, at 109–10 ("Baum theorized from his own experience, writing that men were responsible for the atmosphere at home, women being ground down by child care and domestic chores.")

⁸¹ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 14–15 ("[I]ndividuals abused in childhood can attempt to obey the Fourth Commandment [i.e., 'Honor thy father and thy mother'] only by recourse to a massive repression and detachment of their true emotions. They cannot love and honor their parents because unconsciously they still fear them. However much they may want to, they cannot build up a relaxed and trusting relationship.")

⁸² *Id.* at 19 ("It is my firm and considered opinion that one specific and extremely well-established behavior norm—the Fourth Commandment—frequently prevents us from admitting to our true feelings, and that we pay for this compromise with various forms of physical illness."). See generally JANOV, *supra* note 15 (arguing that repression and its neurotic process are the source of nearly all illness that human beings suffer).

otherwise natural state of pleasantness and geniality. Mothers thus were proverbial switches, permitting fathers, with a flick of the finger, to determine their mood. Perhaps having received proper, misleading training, Frank gave Cynthia a pass. He may not have asked her to account for her parenting choices. He may have provided a scapegoat to explain why Cynthia, who possibly strictly abided the moral precepts of Methodism, may have become irritable, quarrelsome, and prickly.⁸³

Who would have suffered when she suffered? I believe that Frank may have. Benjamin's arrival at home, especially if he had wanted Frank reared in a manner that rationalized how he was parented by his own father John, may have perhaps been like a psychic disturbance to Frank, even if Cynthia may have found a gentler, less dominating way to engage in the poisonous pedagogy of her day. If Frank were the sensitive child that I suspect he was, then he may have suffered an inner discord perhaps directly related to the potential change in the emotional temperament of the home.

This question further suggests that Frank may have viewed Benjamin's impact on Cynthia from his own emotional needs, which may have been put aside if Cynthia were angry, distracted, and reactive. By effectively giving Cynthia a pass when she was abrupt, curt, or dismissive of his needs, and thus perhaps retaining his "emotional blindness,"⁸⁴ which also may suggest that he hoped to be loved by her, Frank may have engaged in a kind of "self-deception," which may have permitted him to brush off what Cynthia may have done.⁸⁵ Self-deception suggests repression, which would have required Frank to split off, that is, dissociate his potentially emotional pain from the kind and degree of maltreatment he may have experienced.⁸⁶ Self-deception also implies that he may have suffered physical ailments.⁸⁷ In fact, he did suffer physical ailments: a weak heart,⁸⁸ Bell's palsy,⁸⁹ and operable mouth cancer.⁹⁰

⁸³ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 4-5 ("[Many people] describe their [abusive choices] as proper and necessary. Others are of the opinion that such behavior, although not quite proper, is unavoidable since children are sometimes difficult and their parents overtaxed: They 'can't help themselves' and lash out. To my mind, both views are mistaken, inhumane, and dangerous.").

⁸⁴ *Id.* at 35 (Emotional blindness "is the consequence of a repression of feelings and memories that renders a person unable to see certain sets of circumstances.").

⁸⁵ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 38. On this point, Miller writes:

Yet they will continue to strive in this direction [of seeking genuine, unconditional love] because even as adults they still believe that they need their parents and because, despite all the disappointments they have experienced, they still hope for some token of genuine affection from those parents.

Such futile striving can have fateful effects on adult children if they are unable to free themselves of this urge. All it results in is delusion, compulsion, pretense, and self-deception.

Id. See also MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 2-3 ("[Children] will not remember the torment to which they were once exposed, because those torments, together with the needs related to them, have all been repressed: that is, completely banished from consciousness.").

⁸⁶ See JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 29.

⁸⁷ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 9 ("When the brain is occupied with this continual repression, all that energy and activation has to find its way into some kind of disease. . . . Neurosis is everywhere and nowhere, invisible at first glance yet very visible in its psychophysiological effect, in how we behave and in our state of health. . . . Most doctors may find it difficult to accept the notion that a heart attack or stroke is the result of something that occurred sixty or sixty-five years earlier.").

⁸⁸ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 3 ("[Frank] had a defective heart, either congenital or the result of rheumatic fever."); LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 46 ("Baum was punished for not concentrating in class and he collapsed. This was one of many episodes of dizziness and chest pains that Baum would

Despite the rather naïve view of family, personalities, and conflicts, Frank's words perhaps symbolically confessed in fragmented ways what he could not have dared to recall directly. Was Benjamin domineering? Did he bring his warts and worries of commerce home, and if so, when his businesses were suffering ups and downs, did he cause turmoil and tumult at home?⁹¹ Or perhaps did John, the itinerant Methodist minister grandfather, abuse Benjamin, and then deny him the right to cry, to get angry, or to get a satisfactory answer for his beatings or the rules of the house, and later, having idealized his father and having rationalized his maltreatment, did Benjamin blindly and dutifully abuse Frank without a sense of guilt?⁹² By focusing on what may have been Benjamin's abuse, Frank may have explained why his mother, Cynthia, beat him. He may have justified why she may have ignored him. He may have explained why she may have done Benjamin's bidding to perhaps make Frank a proper man. He may have understood her curtness, rudeness, and sarcasm. As such, Frank probably mollified himself with the belief that he must not get angry with his mother. Possibly a fount of latent sweetness, the cause of Cynthia's potential emotional shortcomings and physical assaults may have lain elsewhere. Indirectly, I suspect that Frank may have faulted Benjamin. Once Benjamin's sullenness entered the home, Frank may have feared and may have needed Cynthia, for he may not have received any attention. Yet, given that abused children still love their parents, Frank may have accepted even harsh attention.

As a result of his childhood maltreatment, Frank may have been incapable of directly confronting either Benjamin or Cynthia.⁹³ It is unclear how Benjamin related to Frank. Did Benjamin perhaps speak to Frank openly and honestly? In my opinion, probably not. Did Benjamin perhaps raise him with pedagogic parenting, such that Benjamin may have had a preconceived idea of right and wrong, and even if Frank's behavior or

periodically suffer throughout his life in times of stress. It might have been that he had a weak heart, possibly as a result of contracting rheumatic fever as a young child.”).

⁸⁹ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 116. See also NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKES, *Bell's Palsy Fact Sheet*, NIH, http://www.ninds.nih.gov/disorders/bells/detail_bells.htm (last visited Nov. 10, 2010) (“Bell's palsy is a form of temporary facial paralysis resulting from damage or trauma to the facial nerves. The facial nerve—also called the 7th cranial nerve—travels through a narrow, bony canal (called the Fallopian canal) in the skull, beneath the ear, to the muscles on each side of the face. For most of its journey, the nerve is encased in this bony shell.”).

⁹⁰ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 29 (“In contrast to those power-crazed individuals, they did not direct the suppressed feelings of anger and indignation against others, but against themselves. They fell ill and developed a variety of symptoms, and many of them died at an early age.”). For example, Freud—who was molested, kept his father's secret, and unconsciously propped up his father by betraying thousands of sexually abused children with the advent of drive theory—died of mouth cancer. Peter Gay, *Introduction to THE FREUD READER*, *supra* note 74, at xiii–xxx.

⁹¹ See LONCRAINE, *supra* note 5, at 20 (“In June, the bank foreclosed on Benjamin's loan; the barrel business was in deep crisis. Anxieties about money and about how they would cope must have seeped into the atmosphere at the Baum home.”); *id.* (“[In 1860,] [f]our-year-old] Frankie wouldn't have been directly concerned with these [financial] problems, even though his family's money worries must have intruded into his little world.”).

⁹² See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 8 (“Because [my parents]—like the analysts in my training—were not allowed to feel and thus understand what had happened to them in the past, they were unable to recognize the abuse and passed it on to me without a trace of guilty feelings.”).

⁹³ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 78 (“[T]he therapist knows that the patient can accuse only the parent in whom he still had a modicum of confidence and not the parent in whose presence he had been paralyzed with fear.”).

words were not immoral or wrong, they may have nevertheless had to conform to his father's ideas? In my opinion, probably yes. For example, if Frank had had an overly close, emotional relationship to Cynthia, was perhaps a little weaker than his siblings, was perhaps clinging to and trailing behind her, Benjamin may have viewed such behavior as unbecoming of a boy who would have had to enter a man's world having properly understood his gendered role and what others might expect. If so, and the foregoing paragraphs suggest that Benjamin may have taken this position, then Benjamin's arrival home, especially if he had been sullen, a threatening, psychic disturbance, may have caused Frank angst. And if Benjamin had assaulted Frank, then he may have not only hated but also feared his father. Frank thus may not have directly accused his father or mother, not just because social mores forbade such charges by children, but also because, even as an adult, he would have felt that his parents would punish him for charges of maltreatment.⁹⁴

According to Miller, Frank would have spoken abstractly or symbolically, relying perhaps entirely on his unconscious—the keeper of his lost childhood history. Generally, a maltreated child cannot imagine confronting or accusing the father when the father was the child's chief tormentor. The child might confront her mother if she had not been as brutal.⁹⁵ Of course, a mother could be a primary abuser.⁹⁶ In Frank's case, he may have needed to protect himself, perhaps even when he became an adult. As a helpless, defenseless, and dependent child, Frank may have relied on self-protection. He would have abided by the honor-thy-parents tenet, Christianity's heart and soul, which forces children to suppress their true feelings in favor of mental concepts like moral discipline.⁹⁷ Still believing that he would be punished, Frank, even as an adult, would have relied on "surrogate persons,"⁹⁸ essentially so that he would have been able "see" and keep "hidden" the truth of his childhood history.⁹⁹

By repressing his childhood history, and by focusing on surrogate persons, Frank could never have properly faulted his true tormentors, without which he would not have escaped his suffering and struggles.¹⁰⁰ By focusing on surrogates, it is clear that he wanted to know the truth so that he could free himself. Unfortunately, by faulting the Wicked Witches of the East and West (that is, Cynthia) and ambivalently blaming the Wizard of Oz (that is, Benjamin), Frank would have obscured what happened to him behind literary turns and twists, but he would have found no truth.¹⁰¹ And so, he perhaps could not have achieved "freedom by blaming people who in

⁹⁴ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 66. Frank willingly obeyed his mother's demand that he respect the Sabbath even though he was an adult. *Id.*

⁹⁵ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 78.

⁹⁶ *Id.*

⁹⁷ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 19.

⁹⁸ *Id.*

⁹⁹ Cf. MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 24 ("I believe that every murder committed not directly in self-defense but on innocent surrogate objects is the expression of an inner compulsion, a compulsion to avenge the gross abuse, neglect, and confusion suffered during childhood and to leave the accompanying feelings in a state of repression.").

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *id.* at 20 ("For a long time this taboo against condemning parents for their actions toward their children prevented me from clearly seeing and formulating the parents' guilt.").

¹⁰¹ See *id.*

reality never harmed him. By directing diffuse[d], nonspecific, and unsubstantiated accusations at surrogate persons,” Frank would have remained disastrously confused.¹⁰² Hence, Frank constructed a character with a long, white beard (his father had sported such a long, white beard), and then he mocked the character for his false wisdom.¹⁰³ I would suspect that while writing *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Frank would have unconsciously needed to remind himself that he had perhaps discovered that Benjamin, a common man, had lied, manipulated, and exploited others, especially children and so, he constructed the Wizard of Oz, the Great and Terrible, whom Toto, the embodiment of Dorothy’s natural instincts, exposes as a “humbug.”¹⁰⁴ In this way, Frank’s unconscious would have attempted to place before him that on which perhaps his conscious mind depended and perhaps that on which his unconscious suffering turned.

Unfortunately, by speaking so abstractly and symbolically, Frank might never have realized that he was struggling to please his parents.¹⁰⁵ Accordingly, Frank’s inevitable struggle would have staved off the suffering hopelessness¹⁰⁶ because Frank would have had something for which he could work.¹⁰⁷ At some point, it would have become clear to Frank that not his real but his conceptual needs would be met—that is, his parents were rejecting his authentic self, and in so realizing, he would have unconsciously identified with and harbored anger toward his father. In addition to wanting to be successful at business enterprises, Frank would have acted like him by sending his children to military schools even though, with Benjamin’s complicity, he suffered emotional, psychological, and physical trauma.¹⁰⁸ He would have arguably talked like him. All the

¹⁰² *Id.* at 78.

¹⁰³ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 62 (discussing “Wise Men” with pure white beards).

¹⁰⁴ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 132–33.

¹⁰⁵ JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 24 (“I call the attempt of the child to please his parent the struggle. The struggle begins with parents, then spreads beyond the family as the person carries his deprived needs with him wherever he goes, and those needs must be acted out.”).

¹⁰⁶ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 15 (“[P]eople abused in childhood frequently hope all their lives that someday they will experience the love they have been denied. These expectations reinforce their attachment to their parents, an attachment that religious creeds refer to as love and praise as a virtue.”).

¹⁰⁷ *Cf.* JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 137. Janov writes:

Even behavior that seems quite normal can be deceptive. The person acting young and seeming to be in full vigor, as was the case in one patient, was acting out a refusal to “act his age.” He had to stay young because to act his age meant to give up hope for the love he had not received as a young child. “I won’t grow up until you love me, Momma,” seemed to be what he was unconsciously saying.

Id.

¹⁰⁸ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 58 (“When Frank Junior finished grammar school, his parents sent him to the Michigan Military Academy. It seems a strange choice, considering his father’s misery at military school and the satire on warlike ambition throughout his books.”). In near homage to Freud, Rogers projects such a choice onto Frank Junior, without understanding the potential for distorted idealization by the son of his father. She writes: “Perhaps the younger Frank insisted on going.” *Id.* More than likely, Frank was unconsciously destroying in his children what Benjamin and Cynthia had conspired to destroy in him—free thinking and authentic feelings. See *id.* at 115 (“Maud and Frank moved Rob from public school to a private school, Lewis Institute, and then away to the Michigan Military Academy in 1903, because it enforced stricter discipline, he suspected.”). *Cf.* MEG BLACKBURN LOSEY, *THE SECRET HISTORY OF CONSCIOUSNESS: ANCIENT KEYS TO OUR FUTURE SURVIVAL 4* (2010). Although she failed to please her father, and although she engaged self-denial, which led to emotional paralysis, Losey writes:

For a couple of decades, I lived a cardboard life. I lived and loved from the perspective of those around me—my friends, my family, everyone. For example, when I asked my dad what it would take for him to be proud of me, for me to be

while, Frank would have actually and unconsciously hated his father because “[s]truggle is the neurotic’s hope of being loved.”¹⁰⁹ By banishing his authentic but unaccepted feelings, Frank would have thus “become another version of himself.”¹¹⁰ In short, he would have become the unreal self, an adaptive personality, which he thought his parents might love. Regardless, he was still not living as his true self because, by the time Frank wrote *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, which relied on symbols, metaphors, and the quest motif, he would not have been expressing his once repressed and denied feelings.

Although Frank would have harbored deep anger toward Benjamin, and although he would have been attempting to reclaim his true self, Frank would have perhaps still harbored anger toward his mother, Cynthia. It appears that Cynthia truly loved Frank; when Benjamin was not home, she doted on him whenever she could. I also believe that Cynthia would have distanced herself from Frank, especially when his father was home, if Benjamin had been taking Frank under his tutelage to ensure that Frank was reared properly. I also speculate, however, that whenever Cynthia did perhaps keep her distance, Frank would have suffered. Frank perhaps felt that his mother did not care enough to resist his father’s probable insistence that Frank be raised differently.¹¹¹ In what is clearly a symbolic description of Cynthia’s self-centeredness, Frank wrote:

For the first week, perhaps, nearly every old hen is faithful to her little brood, and guards them with that maternal tenderness for which she has been made the symbol of motherly love. But this care soon wearies her, and in a few days she begins to neglect them, marching around in the chill and drenching rain of spring, and dragging her little brood after her through the damp grass, entirely oblivious of their sufferings; and one by one they drop off.¹¹²

Again, symbolically and unconsciously, Frank may have confessed his anger, maybe even rage, about the way in which Cynthia had probably

a success, he said, “Do well in business.” So I set out to prove to dad that I was made of that stuff, that I had the grit and determination of a successful business person.

Id.

¹⁰⁹ JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 25. See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 21 (“Despite his record of disappointments, Baum was still determined to pursue success as a businessman, as his father had”).

¹¹⁰ JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 25 (“Instead of being himself, he struggles to become another version of himself. Sooner or later, the child comes to believe that this version is the real him. The ‘act’ is no longer voluntary and conscious; it is automatic and unconscious. It is neurotic.”).

¹¹¹ See *infra* text accompanying note 210. In evaluating Frank’s rather brutal experience at Peekskill Military Academy, I draw the inference that Frank probably concluded that Cynthia was self-absorbed with her own sufferings or parenting demands, given that he felt that she probably did not stand between Benjamin and him, especially when it was probably Benjamin’s decision to send Frank to military school. It was more than likely that Benjamin wanted to ensure among other things that during his own absences from the home, Frank would receive the same degree of consistent training and discipline, which perhaps Cynthia refused to or could not, impose upon him. Recall that despite Frank’s direct appeals to his father, Benjamin only removed his son after two years of harsh treatment and only after he suffered a heart attack following a severe beating. BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 23–24.

¹¹² ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 8 (quoting L. FRANK BAUM, *THE BOOK OF THE HAMBURGS, A BRIEF TREATISE UPON THE MATING, REARING AND MANAGEMENT OF THE DIFFERENT VARIETIES OF HAMBURGS* 58-59 (H. H. Stoddard 1886)).

failed to meet his emotional needs. Ostensibly, Frank wrote about “nearly every old hen.”¹¹³ Although Frank’s father Benjamin was more than likely patriarchal, Cynthia in his absences may have exercised her particular sphere of influence over her children.¹¹⁴ Yet, he was not familiar with behavioral characteristics of all old hens. Moreover, Frank ascribed personalities to such hens in a near-Chaucerian style.¹¹⁵ It is not that he was not truly devoted to breeding, studying, and writing about poultry; he was.¹¹⁶ Perhaps, then, he was telling us that he felt unloved by his mother. Given that Frank would have repressed his childhood history and given that his emotions and experiences would have been keepsakes of his unconscious, Frank was perhaps attempting to cope with abandonment and either an infant’s or toddler’s sense that Cynthia’s apparent indifference to his needs and suffering was tantamount to existential death. Unfortunately, if Cynthia had been distracted when Frank was an infant or a very young toddler, and if her absence had caused him severe, intolerable pain, then Frank would have repressed the experience because its acuteness may have threatened his biological existence.¹¹⁷ Without direct recall, Frank may have just sensed unconsciously and expressed symbolically the anger he may have felt in his infant or toddler mind when she grew weary of tending to his needs. And it is clear from the above-quoted passage about hens that Frank would have needed what all infants and toddlers need: his parent’s fidelity, protection, and tenderness.¹¹⁸ It is not clear if Benjamin forced Cynthia to ignore her son’s needs, or if Cynthia’s self-centeredness drove her to maltreat Frank, to expose him to dangers and then to ignore him as if he had suffered and died.

¹¹³ *Id.*

¹¹⁴ *Cf.* MILLER, *supra* note 5, at 146. I am not arguing that Benjamin bore any existential resemblance to Alois Hitler, Adolf’s brutal father. *Id.* at 147–97. However, I am arguing that Benjamin was clearly the patriarch. He earned the money. He had the professional work and business relationships outside of the home. He was often gone for stretches of time on business matters. Given the times, Cynthia would have accepted her subservient role to her husband, and her role as manager, if you will, of the marital home. In his absence, Cynthia would have ruled in her husband’s name by invoking Benjamin’s name as the authority behind her words, or if she and Benjamin, who were both Methodists, were in accordance on childrearing norms, she would have exercised her authority over the children, no doubt in keeping with her own personality and sensibilities, because she knew that Benjamin would support her. If Benjamin were required to remind her of her subservience, she would suffer some degree of shame, if not, humiliation. On this point, Miller writes:

The family structure could well be characterized as the prototype of a totalitarian regime. Its sole, undisputed, often brutal ruler is the father. The wife and children are totally subservient to his will, his moods, and his whims; they must accept humiliation and injustice unquestionably and gratefully. Obedience is their primary rule of conduct. The mother, to be sure, has her own sphere of authority in the household, where she rules over the children when the father is not at home; this means that she can to some extent take out on those weaker than herself the humiliation she has suffered.

Id. at 146.

¹¹⁵ *See* ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 8.

¹¹⁶ *Id.* at 7–8.

¹¹⁷ *See* JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 4 (“Repression limits our ability to react to events and inhibits the expression of feelings. It is the foundation of many diseases, emotional and physical, and it often literally kills. . . . What causes repression? Pain. When trauma or deprivation inflicted early in life is so great that it exceeds the organism’s capacity to react to it, it becomes pain. This pain, in turn, stimulates the production of repressive agents.”).

¹¹⁸ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 21 (“When children are born, what they need most from their parents is love, by which I mean affection, attention, care, protection, kindness, and the willingness to communicate.”).

While Frank may have suffered from “emotional blindness,”¹¹⁹ which would have caused him to repress his childhood history, Frank also may have harbored deep anger for his parents’ unwillingness to accept him, acknowledge him, and meet his emotional needs. His parents forcing him to stay at Peekskill Military Academy is just one powerful example.¹²⁰ Yet, given that I have not read the volume of Frank’s personal letters, I can only guess that at the military academy, Frank would have been required to repress his authentic feelings and to perhaps make them secondary to his parents’ pedagogical parenting. To get what Benjamin and Cynthia may have offered consistently—especially love, affection, and attention—he would have unconsciously and gradually adapted, lest he possibly suffer life-threatening emotional harm.¹²¹ On this point, Miller proffers a compelling story that arguably applies to Frank.¹²² Discussing the life of Käthe Kollwitz, Miller writes that Kollwitz, who grew up a “high-spirited child” in a religious sect and had been “raised to follow rules and orders to the letter and to suppress her feelings in the service of religious values, self-control chief among them,” suffered severe punishments.¹²³ For example, if Kollwitz screamed, her parents, who never spanked her, would lock her “up by herself for a long time as punishment.”¹²⁴ Eventually, Kollwitz repressed her natural spiritedness, which turned to rage and caused physical symptoms.¹²⁵ When Kollwitz suffered physical symptoms, her “mother knew that [Kollwitz’s] stomach aches concealed small sorrows, and at such times she would let [Kollwitz] snuggle close to her.”¹²⁶ Yet, Kollwitz’s mother would only comfort Kollwitz if she “was quiet and behaved herself and above all don’t say anything about what was troubling her.”¹²⁷ As a young child, Kollwitz thus was lonely, self-accusing, and depressed.¹²⁸ In addition to physical symptoms, which resulted in her desperately holding back her true feelings, Kollwitz suffered psychic ailments.¹²⁹ On this point, Miller writes: “if a child is forbidden to express her true feelings, observations, and thoughts because only good, kind thoughts that are pleasing to God are permitted, then everything that has no place in this ‘good’ world is relegated to the realm of death.”¹³⁰

Unlike Kollwitz, Frank’s writing does not reveal an obsession with death. I speculate, however, that he may have suffered from angst and depression for a good deal of this life, and, rather than banishing his creative, imaginative nature to Miller’s “realm of death,” Frank expressed his distorted, authentic feelings through the realm of fantasy. With his

¹¹⁹ MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 35 (Emotional blindness “is the consequence of a repression of feelings and memories that renders a person unable to see certain sets of circumstances.”).

¹²⁰ ROGERS *supra* note 9, at 3–4.

¹²¹ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 4 (“Repression limits our ability to react to events and inhibits the expression of feelings.”).

¹²² See generally MILLER, *supra* note 4 (relating childhood events to a person’s creative work).

¹²³ *Id.* at 22.

¹²⁴ *Id.* at 23.

¹²⁵ *Id.*

¹²⁶ *Id.* at 25.

¹²⁷ *Id.*

¹²⁸ *Id.*

¹²⁹ *Id.* at 26.

¹³⁰ *Id.* at 27.

powerful ability to daydream, it is possible that Frank may have given proper vent to his repressed, creative, and natural divinity.¹³¹ Perhaps what sat atop Frank's divinity were Frank's probable maltreatments. To get to his divinity, Frank may have had to wade through the darker side of his unconscious, where he possibly had stored through perhaps repression all of the ways his parents may have taught him to ignore his authentic feelings.¹³²

Frank may have suffered for engaging in potential self-deception. According to Miller and Arthur Janov, repression, and the lie that we are still expressing authentically, causes us to suffer.¹³³ Repression, coupled with self-deception, not only keeps us from knowing ourselves, expressing our feelings, or enjoying our lives, but also makes us ill.¹³⁴ "In early manhood, heart attacks several times caused [Frank] to fall unconscious. Later, in life he would walk the floor in agony, tears streaming from his eyes as he fought the pangs of angina pectoris."¹³⁵ And if artists like Kollwitz, Soutine, and Pablo Picasso ultimately placed their emotionally traumatic experiences on paper and canvas, could Frank have done the same if he had similar emotionally traumatic experiences? Of course he could have. Except by the time he was writing, perhaps struggling to reclaim consciously what his body remembered all too well, Frank could not have recalled how his parents may have displeased him.¹³⁶

In the end, Frank may have just known intuitively that they had.¹³⁷

III. FRANK'S TRAUMATIC SUFFERING

In addition to having to conform and to realizing that his parents were not going to accept him,¹³⁸ Frank would have experienced traumatic, physical suffering. Two probable results may have followed from such physical punishments. First, Frank may have numbed himself to such violence, thus perhaps attempting to rob his parents of any degree of

¹³¹ See R.M. Ziegler, *Biography: L. Frank Baum*, HELIUM, <http://www.helium.com/items/1003399-biography-l-frank-baum> (last visited Sept. 2, 2010). In the introduction to the *THE LOST PRINCESS OF OZ*, Frank wrote, "Imagination has given us the steam engine, the telephone, the talking-machine and the automobile, for these things had to be dreamed of before they became realities. So I believe that dreams—day dream, you know, with your eyes wide open and your brain-machinery whizzing—are likely to lead to the betterment of the world. The imaginative child will become the imaginative man or woman most apt to create, to invent, and therefore to foster civilization. A prominent educator tells me that fairy tales are of untold value in developing imagination in the young. I believe it." L. FRANK BAUM, *THE LOST PRINCESS OF OZ* 13 (1999) (1917).

¹³² JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 8 ("[W]hat you don't know *can* hurt you, because *the repressed memory of trauma is traumatic*. Neurosis preserves childhood in pristine form, and it is the *memory* of the deprived childhood that keeps on hurting us.").

¹³³ See generally MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 19–39; JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 7–18.

¹³⁴ JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 4, 52.

¹³⁵ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 20.

¹³⁶ See JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 19–20 ("When needs are not fulfilled the child suffers, not, unfortunately, for just the moment, but for the rest of his life. . . . And nothing the child or adult does later can undo that deprivation.").

¹³⁷ See *id.* at 19 ("Children are never fooled. From birth they are all feeling and sense every nuance of their parents.").

¹³⁸ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 8–9 (discussing how the slightest, consistent rejection of a child will push the child into the neurotic process, in which he or she will not only repress who she is, but also require her to be whatever is required of her to get love).

personal power they gained in his mind by causing him further suffering.¹³⁹ Second, if Frank had attributed such physical violence to his existential identity as a creative, imaginative artist, then he may have relegated any internal awareness and personal power he perhaps gained from such artistry to the realm of make-believe or to a fantasy world. At this point, he could have unconsciously accessed such awareness and power when he was publishing a newspaper, studying chickens, acting, writing dramatic plays, or telling his siblings or children stories like *Adventures in Phunniland*, a forerunner to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.¹⁴⁰

Third, when Frank was seven, his youngest brother died.¹⁴¹ The Baum family had experienced the loss of infants and toddlers.¹⁴² Cynthia and Benjamin so cherished their young dead that the dead children were like shadow children, always about but never physically present.¹⁴³ Miller hypothesizes that when parents lose a child to death, the parents may become increasingly harsher on the surviving children who could never measure up to the idealized departed child.¹⁴⁴ This hypothesis may map directly onto Frank's family, and it may, in part, explain the degree to which Benjamin and Cynthia—although Cynthia may have been conflicted and may have played the “helping witness”¹⁴⁵ either after Benjamin beat Frank or while Benjamin was away from home—may have perhaps pressed Frank to mature and to become a proper, productive man.

Hence, in this section, I will deal more directly with the assaults that Frank may have received, even though I must interpolate, depend on conceptual arguments, and draw strong inferences from the ways in which Frank interacted with his wife Maud and his children to find the support for this claim. Along the way, I will further argue that Frank closely identified

¹³⁹ Cf. MILLER, *supra* note 5, at 156 (discussing how Alois, Adolf's father, once beat him thirty-two times, and young Hitler, the eventual leader of the mass murdering Third Reich, who had heroically repressed his feelings, did not cry, and later proudly told his mother, who thought he had gone crazy, not about his pain but about the number of times he had been hit).

¹⁴⁰ See LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 150.

¹⁴¹ *Id.* at 31.

¹⁴² *Id.* at 7–17, 31.

¹⁴³ *Id.* at 8. In the near ghost-like presence of dead siblings, Loncraine writes:

These two dead children [Cynthia-Jane and Oliver] remained very important in the Baum family. Many years later, in 1877, Benjamin Baum bought a family plot in the grand Oakwood Cemetery on a hill overlooking Syracuse. Heavy stone blocks with the children's names chiseled in bold lettering were placed on the plot as memory markers if the small bodies weren't disinterred and reburied beneath them. These stone markers were the same size as those of other Baums who lived on into adulthood, whose bodies would eventually be placed beside them. There were plenty of other infant graves amid the clover and moss in the plots of Oakwood Cemetery, but they were rarely given equal status with those of other family members who lived on into old age. Cynthia-Jane and Oliver may have died in 1848, but they clearly lived on in the collective memory of the Baum family, continuing a kind of shadow life alongside their living siblings.

Id.

¹⁴⁴ See MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 26–31.

¹⁴⁵ See ALICE MILLER, *THE TRUTH WILL SET YOU FREE: OVERCOMING EMOTIONAL BLINDNESS AND FINDING YOUR TRUE ADULT SELF*, at x (Andrew Jenkins trans., 2001) (“A *helping witness* is a person who stands by an abused child (consistently or occasionally), offering support and acting as a balance against the cruelty otherwise dominant in the child's everyday life. This can be anyone from the child's immediate world: a teacher, a neighbor, a caregiver, a grandmother, often a sibling.”). See also MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 7 (“By ‘potential helpers’ I mean all those who do not shrink from unequivocally taking the side of the child and protecting him from power abuse on the part of adults.”).

with his principal tormentor, his father Benjamin, who was symbolically represented by the Wizard of Oz, the Great and Terrible. At an unconscious level, Frank arguably used *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* to access at a far greater level his lost childhood history, a history in which he may have known intuitively that Benjamin had exploited, humiliated, manipulated, and beguiled people, principally his diminutive children. Perhaps Frank felt compelled to drink the Kool-Aid, which may have symbolically killed his soul and his intrinsically creative, imaginative personality. Perhaps in order to co-exist properly in the Baum household, Frank had to wear rose-colored glasses like the emerald goggles in Oz, which distort the mindsets of the little people of the Emerald City so that they see what the Wizard of Oz wants them to see and which construct the reality in which the Wizard of Oz wanted them to believe.¹⁴⁶ In conclusion, I will argue that Frank may have actually hated his father, and he may have wished to dethrone him perhaps ostensibly from his conscious mind but perhaps in reality from his powerful unconscious. To do so, Frank may have had to expose his father as a “common man,” a “bad wizard,” and a “humbug”—a fraud.

A. BENJAMIN’S DESPOTISM: NARCISSISM AND SELF-DEFEAT

In the Baum family, I suspect that Benjamin’s voice, values, and rules held sway. Benjamin perhaps was the despotic patriarch, and he managed his home, loved his wife, and reared his children more or less as John and Lany, his father and mother, had modeled for him. Benjamin revered his father.¹⁴⁷ After John and Lany lost their fifteen-year-old and after John’s business was seized by creditors, John became a circuit-riding Methodist minister.¹⁴⁸ Although he was untrained, he had found his calling, and even though he and Lany had children, and he had few circuit duties so that he could have spent time with his family; John, however, had two purposes: promoting religion and converting sinners.¹⁴⁹ I speculate that John and Lany, an itinerant lay minister and a devout Methodist, drilled moral values into their children, all of them rigidly reinforced by corporal punishment.

While John ministered to rural communities and ferreted out the devil’s work in small and large ways, Lany may have suffered under the difficult times, including having very little help raising the children.¹⁵⁰ Those sufferings would have been amplified by the daily pressures and moral expectations foisted on the wives of itinerant ministers. Indeed, Reverend H. M. Eaton wrote ninety-six pages about the trials, duties, and sufferings

¹⁴⁶ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 80. *See also id.* at 137 (The Wizard of Oz says “I would call it the Emerald City; and to make the name fit better I put green spectacles on all the people, so that everything they saw was green.”); *id.* at 138 (describing how in response to Dorothy’s question about whether Emerald City is really green, the Wizard of Oz says: “No more than in any other city, . . . but when you wear green spectacles, why of course everything you see looks green to you”).

¹⁴⁷ *See* LONCRAINE, *supra* note 5, at 13. Benjamin’s reverence and devotion to his father’s memory were also evidenced by how he paid homage to him. “When, a decade after the reverend’s death, Benjamin bought the family plot in Oakwood Cemetery, he not only remembered his dead children, he put up a tall stone monument at the center of the site on which he had chiseled in bold deep cuts the name of his father, REVEREND JOHN BAUM. The impressive stone monument reached up toward the oak trees that surrounded and overshadowed it.” *Id.*

¹⁴⁸ FERRARA, *supra* note 3. *See generally* Johnson, *supra* note 3.

¹⁴⁹ *Id.*

¹⁵⁰ FERRARA, *supra* note 3.

of the itinerant's wife.¹⁵¹ Susan Ferrara writes, however, that "he could have saved [ninety-five] pages and written one sentence: She had to be a saint."¹⁵²

Lany probably translated "saintliness" practically. Lany raised seven children and helped her newly-married son and daughter-in-law who lived with them; she had sound judgment.¹⁵³ It is possible that everyone watched her. Being beyond moral reproach, she probably would have been given less charity if her words and actions failed to conform to the Methodist strictures. Without regard to whether she had sufficient leisure, Lany probably would have been expected to have "sufficient literary culture" befitting of her proper place in society.¹⁵⁴ Above all, even if the standard for literary culture was ill-defined, Lany had to be pious.¹⁵⁵

Piety and duty were practically synonymous. Lany probably had to joyously follow her husband,¹⁵⁶ and they likely moved constantly.¹⁵⁷ She would have had to selflessly support her husband's success by praying for him and by encouraging him with "pious counsel."¹⁵⁸ She had to attend church on time.¹⁵⁹ She had to fulfill her church duties.¹⁶⁰ And, even if time did not permit, Lany had to raise John's children.¹⁶¹

In John's absence, how would Lany have raised their seven children well? I have no evidence that Lany used corporal punishment and moral discipline. However in keeping with her Methodist faith, it seems likely.¹⁶² Thus later, Benjamin and Cynthia may have also later relied on corporal punishment and moral discipline, doing to their children what had likely been done to them.¹⁶³ In order to rear that many children, and to meet all of the duties imposed on her, it seems probable to me that Lany would have assaulted her children in their infancy before their brains formed memories.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, as a pious Methodist, Lany may have been expected to use physical violence for her children's proper corrective education and moral discipline. This early use of physical violence was exemplified by Susanna Wesley, the mother of John and Charles Wesley

¹⁵¹ *Id.*

¹⁵² *Id.*

¹⁵³ *Id.*

¹⁵⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵⁵ *Id.*

¹⁵⁶ *Id.*

¹⁵⁷ *Id.*

¹⁵⁸ *Id.*

¹⁵⁹ *Id.*

¹⁶⁰ *Id.*

¹⁶¹ *Id.*

¹⁶² *Id.*

¹⁶³ See MILLER, *supra* note 55, at 10–11. On this point, Miller argues:

Though the pain inflicted may not be severe (at least we assume this to be the case), children will surely register the fact that they have been attacked by the very person they instinctively expect to protect them from attacks by others. This is bound to cause ineradicable confusion in the infant brain, which at this stage is not fully formed. Such children will inevitably wonder whether their mother is there to protect them from danger or is in fact a source of danger herself. Accordingly, they will adjust to the situation by registering violence as something normal and integrating it as such into their learning processes.

Id.

¹⁶⁴ See GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 18–22 (discussing the effects on infants of being beaten).

who founded Methodism, who wrote and explained how she disciplined her sons:

When turned a year old (and some before) they were taught to fear the rod and to cry softly, by which means they escaped abundance of correction which they might otherwise have had: and that most odious noise of the crying of children was rarely heard in the house, but the family usually lived in as much quietness as if there had not been a child among them.¹⁶⁵

Was the heart attack psychogenic as Rogers suggests?¹⁶⁶ Why did Benjamin withdraw Frank only after the heart attack? Does the heart attack reveal that Frank had learned to dissociate his feelings from his experiences, thus permitting him to repress or forget what he had suffered as an infant or toddler? Regardless, Frank was emotionally overwrought and physically overwhelmed by the teacher's brutal attack, and having repressed his natural, normal feelings, including crying, Frank's heart, the center of his emotions, just could not accept the stress. In this way, Frank's body—this time his heart, later Bell's palsy, still later, mouth cancer—may have revealed that Frank was not listening to his body. And while traditional religions like Methodism required him to accept beatings as a form of love, Frank's body only knew what he had experienced and not what he was required to believe. Hence, Frank's heart attack was likely a sign that he mentally ignored what his body had never forgotten—childhood maltreatment.

Despite his emotional blindness, Frank's body could not be fooled. "Our bodies know exactly what we need, what we have been denied, what disagrees with" it, and that to which it is allergic.¹⁶⁷ And when we ignore what our intelligent biology knows, we become physically, mentally, or emotionally ill. Then and today, we prefer to medicate our symptoms so that we do not or cannot feel. In Frank's day, two forms of medicine were religious devotion and moral discipline, which encouraged repression, rejected authentic feelings, and contributed to psychosomatic illnesses.¹⁶⁸ Fortunately, I speculate that Frank's mind believed what he had internalized; however, his body could not accept morality. According to Miller, our bodies cannot "truck with the Fourth Commandment,"¹⁶⁹ which requires us to emotionally purchase a biblical insurance that "tells us to honor our parents, 'that thy days may be long upon the land the Lord thy God giveth thee.'"¹⁷⁰ Miller further argues:

¹⁶⁵ *Id.* at 19–20.

¹⁶⁶ See Rogers, *supra* note 9, at 4.

¹⁶⁷ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 23.

¹⁶⁸ See JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 240–75. See also *id.* at 267 (discussing repression as a fatal disease, and stating the real reasons a woman died of cancer were: "a lack of love, a terrible isolation, years of depression, loneliness, and solitude. As long as she was simply *in agony*, she was mentally ill; but when the agony was chemically repressed, she died of that repression in the form of cancer."); *id.* at 271 ("Why do we get sick? Because we are already sick and don't know it. Neurosis is the key illness of our day. . . . Once the neurosis sets in, however, it is only a matter of time until symptoms appears, either physical or mental.")

¹⁶⁹ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 31.

¹⁷⁰ *Id.* at 24.

[Our bodies] cannot be fooled by words in the way the mind can. The body is the guardian of the truth, our truth, because it carries the experience of a lifetime and ensures that we can live with the truth of our organism. With the aid of physical symptoms it forces us to engage cognitively with this truth so that we can communicate harmoniously with the child within, the child who lives on inside us, the child who was once spurned, abused, and humiliated.¹⁷¹

What then did Frank's body wish him to recall? At the very least, Frank's body was telling him that he did not trust those on whom he had depended for love. According to Anodea Judith, the heart reflects how the child has internalized the parent-child relationship: "It is not only the messages Dad continually gives us about being noisy in the house, but also the context of Dad's relationship with us that becomes important."¹⁷² As part of the developmental process, the heart copes with "identification," which means: "the child adopts the beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors of others, and then carries these attitudes into his relationships."¹⁷³ To survive, Frank became Benjamin, turning even creative, imaginative ventures into enterprising opportunities.¹⁷⁴ Yet, Frank's heart was probably never into money, the green, the emerald of a jaded life, which may have preoccupied Benjamin more than love did. To live, Frank needed to repress why he had to be less than authentic.

Did Frank realize that he had not been accepted for who he was, and that he would have to fight to be himself? And if so, at what age? Did he give up his authentic feelings and self, so that he could avoid maltreatment such as assaults and rejection? Did he finally appreciate that his parents were warm and loving on "some days and cruelly abusive on others"?¹⁷⁵ If so, Frank created a false self, and über congenial, compliant self, because his need "for love usually dominate[d] [his] need for autonomy."¹⁷⁶ Undoubtedly, Frank repressed his broken heart. At some intuitive level, he perhaps knew Benjamin and Cynthia loved him conditionally; this knowing may have devastated him. Such corrupted love would have distorted his primary relationship not with his siblings but with his parents. Once devastated, although compliant and obedient, Frank would never have been close to his parents.

Having this awareness may have caused Frank angst. He preferred not having this insight, whether it was intuitive, emotional, or mental. And having been manipulated by Benjamin and Cynthia's pedagogical parenting, Frank did not want them to see into him and to use that seeing against him. In Frank's work *The Master Key*,¹⁷⁷ the central character, Rob,

¹⁷¹ *Id.* at 31 (emphasis omitted).

¹⁷² ANODEA JUDITH, *EASTERN BODY, WESTERN MIND: PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHAKRA SYSTEM AS A PATH TO THE SELF* 255 (1996).

¹⁷³ *Id.* at 256.

¹⁷⁴ See generally BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 1–16.

¹⁷⁵ JUDITH, *supra* note 172, at 258.

¹⁷⁶ *Id.* at 259.

¹⁷⁷ L. FRANK BAUM, *THE MASTER KEY: AN ELECTRICAL FAIRY TALE FOUNDED UPON THE MYSTERIES OF ELECTRICITY AND THE OPTIMISM OF ITS DEVOTEES. IT WAS WRITTEN FOR BOYS, BUT OTHERS MAY READ IT* (1901).

is “determined to light up a toy palace with electric lights.”¹⁷⁸ He does; he produces a blinding light and evokes “a curious Being.”¹⁷⁹ Because Rob has touched the Master Key of Electricity, and because he had the wisdom and bravery to touch the key, the Demon of Electricity is forced to obey Rob’s commands.¹⁸⁰ As part of the deal, Rob may demand “three electrically powered gifts per week for three weeks.”¹⁸¹ The second set of gifts symbolically confessed Frank’s angst about special, intuitive insights. One of the third sets of gifts is a “Character Marker, a pair of spectacles that will reveal people’s real nature despite appearances—good or evil, wise or foolish, kind or cruel.”¹⁸² Rob, who was eager to impress the world, perhaps as Frank might have been unconsciously or intuitively even as a toddler or later when he grew and sought love from others,¹⁸³ considers the consequences of using the Character Marker on this family.¹⁸⁴ Speaking for Rob, Frank, full of angst, wrote:

They were his nearest and dearest friends on earth, and in his boyish heart he loved them all and believed in their goodness and sincerity. The possibility of finding a bad character mark on any of their familiar faces made him shudder, and he determined then and there never to use the spectacles to view the face of a friend or relative.¹⁸⁵

Yet, in *The Master Key*, Frank created a logical tension. Rob, now armed with these powerful electrical gifts—or new technology—refuses to see the truth about his family and friends, preferring instead to wear not the Character Markers but the kind of emerald goggles that the Wizard of Oz required all citizens of and visitors to the Emerald City to wear.¹⁸⁶ Unfortunately, several tensions disrupt Rob’s noble claim. First, why would Rob fear the truth of his family and friends if he truly had been reared in love, acceptance, and authenticity? Heading home from the French Republic, where he used the Character Marker to save his life after a French scientist plotted to kill him and take his gifts, Rob feels “homesick and depressed.”¹⁸⁷ Second, having refused to challenge his parents’ internalized pedagogy, Rob, or Frank, unconsciously preferred not the autonomy he had rent asunder, but the distorted, conditional love that his parents’ could have only offered to him if they were hell-bent on rearing

¹⁷⁸ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 99.

¹⁷⁹ *Id.*

¹⁸⁰ *Id.*

¹⁸¹ *Id.*

¹⁸² *Id.*

¹⁸³ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 22–25. In the latter instance, Frank would have become what Janov terms a “neurotic.” *Id.* at 19. Assuming that Benjamin and Cynthia consistently chipped away at Frank, so that he would comply with their concept of the good child, then he would comply, thus beginning “to speak and move in prescribed ways.” *Id.* at 22. As in the case of every human being, neurosis thus “is the organism’s defense against catastrophic reality in order to protect its own development and psychophysical integrity.” *Id.* Along the way, perhaps so imperceptibly that it goes largely unnoticed, Frank, if he felt a deep unloved from his parents, would need to get that “love” from proxies like having his name in lights or hearing the audience’s applause. Thus pleasing a child or “an audience then becomes the struggle.” *Id.* at 24.

¹⁸⁴ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 99.

¹⁸⁵ *Id.*

¹⁸⁶ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 138.

¹⁸⁷ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 99.

him within the Methodist, moralistic tradition. Third, Rob, and thus Frank, is described as having been “born and reared a hearty, healthy American boy, with a disposition to battle openly with the world and take his chances equally with his fellows, rather than be placed in such an exclusive position that no one could hope successfully to oppose him.”¹⁸⁸ Is Rob, thus Frank, abdicating an authentic self, thus indirectly rationalizing the violent methods on which his parents relied to “rear a hearty, healthy American boy,” who would actually pass up the chance to do battle with his familiars and friends if, by using the Character Markers, he learns that they had abused, rejected, humiliated, and manipulated him? In truth, I believe that Rob and Frank, feared the “new” technology of intuitively seeing the world through a grounded, balanced, and discerning sixth chakra,¹⁸⁹ which, in the hands of a maltreated child (the wrong person) would be dangerous to familiars and friends. In the end, Rob and thus Frank, declares: “Humanity is not yet ready to use unlimited power properly”;¹⁹⁰ the Character Marker, for example, would kill false heroes (that is, Frank) and dethrone abusive gods (that is, his parents).¹⁹¹

Although I have no direct evidence that Lany relied on the rod, which was encouraged by Methodism, I suspect that she probably would have done so for practical reasons, especially if she was the devout wife of an itinerant minister. As a minister’s wife, Lany would have not wished to embarrass her husband’s ministry by having wayward, ill-kept, and unruly children. The children likely had to respect the Sabbath—the Lord’s day—which would have required Lany to instill such reverence within them. Cynthia, like Lany, also taught her children to respect the Sabbath.¹⁹² By using the rod, the Methodists at that time would have destroyed their children’s resistance, required them perhaps to repress their natural, normal vitality, promoted emotional dishonesty, and probably forced them to submit unswervingly to their parents’ will.¹⁹³ Perhaps not particularly concerned that they were requiring their children to engage in self-deception, which would not only have suppressed them as children but would also have disfigured them as adults, Methodist parents at that time may have rationalized such assaults and violence as teaching obedience to

¹⁸⁸ *Id.* at 100.

¹⁸⁹ See JUDITH, *supra* note 172, at 385–87 (discussing the impact of having excessive energy in the sixth chakra, which prevents grounding, and weakens the ability not to judge but to discern).

¹⁹⁰ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 100.

¹⁹¹ *See id.*

¹⁹² *See id.* at 66.

¹⁹³ See GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 18–22. Cf. JANOV, *supra* note 15 at 22–23. Janov writes: Neurosis involves being what one is not in order to get what doesn’t exist. If love existed, the child would be what he is, for that is love—letting someone be what he or she is. Thus, nothing wildly traumatic need happen in order to produce neurosis. It can stem from forcing a child to punctuate every sentence with “please” and “thank you” to prove how refined the parents are. It can also come from not allowing the child to complain or cry when he is unhappy. Parents may rush in to quell sobs because of their own anxiety. They may not permit anger—“good girls don’t throw tantrums; nice boys don’t talk back”—to prove how respected the parents are. The child gets the idea of what is required of him quite soon. Perform, or else. It is the hopelessness of never being loved that causes the split. The child must deny the realization that his own needs will never be filled no matter what he does. He then develops substitute needs, which are neurotic.

Id.

God. Indeed, Sereno Dwight wrote about his grandmother's, Sarah Edwards, child-rearing methods:

Her system of discipline, was *begun at a very early age*, and it was her rule, to *resist the first*, as well as every subsequent exhibition of temper or disobedience in the child, *however young*, until its will was brought into submission to the will of its parents: wisely reflecting, that until a child will obey his parents, he can never be brought to obey God.¹⁹⁴

Given that John was an itinerant minister, it is possible that neither he nor Lany spared the rod, and they would have passed this child-rearing method onto their children, including Benjamin. It does follow that he and Cynthia may have actually relied on corporal punishment. I wrote to Baum biographer Katharine Rogers, in which I advanced the thesis of this Article. Rogers disagreed with my thesis, however, and responded: "I think the love and value for children evident in his books reflected his own basically happy childhood."¹⁹⁵ Additionally, Rogers argued:

There is no warrant for assuming that he was abused as a child or that his spirit was broken. I too wonder why his parents sent him to military school, but you can't build too much on that; after all, his father took him out before very long. Neither I nor anyone else can "explore" Frank's childhood and disciplining, since there is no evidence (apart from the military school).¹⁹⁶

Without direct evidence, which Rogers noted does not exist, can I effectively argue that Benjamin and Cynthia relied on physical assaults and emotional violence to raise their children? I posit that strong circumstantial evidence exists that Frank may have been a maltreated child. First, I believe that Frank's father Benjamin may have been as self-absorbed in

¹⁹⁴ GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 21.

¹⁹⁵ E-mail from Katharine Rogers to author (Nov. 12, 2009, 21:30) (on file with author). I wrote back to Rogers, hoping that she would reveal why she felt so certain that Frank was not abused. E-mail from author to Katherine Rogers (Nov. 12, 2009, 23:29) (on file with author). With respect to Maud's violence against her four children, Rogers had written: Maud "was firm but remotely an abusive mother—spanking is not beating." *Id.* See E-mail from author to Katharine Rogers (Nov. 12, 2009, 23:31) (on file with author). Given Rogers's distinction between spanking and beating, did she think that if Frank were disciplined with mild, physical violence, then he had not suffered abuse? The modern literature on child maltreatment makes no real distinction ultimately between the effects of a spanking and a beating. See generally MICHAEL J. MARSHALL, WHY SPANKING DOESN'T WORK: STOPPING THIS BAD HABIT AND GETTING THE UPPER HAND ON EFFECTIVE DISCIPLINE 2 (2002) ("I use the term *spanking* in the general sense to represent all forms of using corporal punishment on children. This includes: slapping, shoving, shaking, pulling hair, pinching, twisting arms, etc. because essentially they are the same thing to children—getting their bodies hurt with physical punishment—and they will ultimately result in the same harmful physical and psychological effects."). From the child's point of view, spanking is a beating because they suffer physically, emotionally, and psychologically. See generally RICHARD J. GELLES, INTIMATE VIOLENCE IN FAMILIES 13–14 (3d ed. 1997) ("Who decides which acts of violence are legitimate and illegitimate? Also, is 'force' hitting a child without physical evidence of an injury, whereas 'violence' is hitting a child and causing a black-and-blue mark? Should the decision be left to the person who is being hit, to the person doing the hitting, to agents of social control such as police, social workers, or judges?"). Rogers did not respond to my second e-mail on Nov. 12, 2009. Nevertheless, on June 7, 2010, I wrote Rogers, asking her if she would consider reading this manuscript while it was still in its rough stage. Again, Rogers did not respond. See E-mail from author to Katherine Rogers (June 7, 2010, 02:12) (on file with author).

¹⁹⁶ E-mail from Katharine Rogers to author (Nov. 12, 2009, 21:30) (on file with author). See GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 4 ("[P]hysical punishment of children appears to be one of the subjects in America that [is] still profoundly disturbing, because [it is] too deeply rooted in our individual and collective psyches to be confronted directly.").

dominating his household as Benjamin's father, John, was in saving souls and uprooting his family perhaps without serious regard to Lany and their children's needs. Second, Miller argues that when parents inflict violence on their children without regard for their feelings, pain, and rights, these maltreated children have no regard for their own children's feelings, pain, and rights.¹⁹⁷ Assuming that Lany had suffocated Benjamin's naturalness with rigid, authoritarian parenting, which may have relied on physical pain and which may have begun in his infancy and continued until he perfectly submitted himself to his parents' will; that Lany and John perhaps never took Benjamin's feelings, pain, and rights into account; and that Benjamin may have validated his parents' assaultive and violent child-rearing practices by perhaps applying them to his own children, it is, highly probable that Benjamin sent Frank to Peekskill Military Academy as part of an overall plan to ensure that Frank grew into a proper man.¹⁹⁸

Let us now consider directly Frank's military school experience. Since his infancy, Frank had been a "shy and sedentary child,"¹⁹⁹ who mostly played with his siblings and his imaginary friends.²⁰⁰ Due to his heart condition, Benjamin and Cynthia required him to be less physically active.²⁰¹ By twelve, after an examination by doctors, Frank was deemed strong enough to attend school.²⁰² Frank was first schooled at his house; military school was not the next, logical place to educate Frank.²⁰³ Why military school? Rogers speculates that Benjamin did not think Frank was "manly" enough.²⁰⁴ It would also appear that perhaps due to direct comments, knowing looks from Benjamin, or peer pressure from his siblings or cousins, Frank convinced his mother to stop calling him Frankie because "it was 'sissy.'"²⁰⁵

Once at the Academy, Frank suffered maltreatment.²⁰⁶ It was not, as stated by biographers Frank Joslyn Baum and Russell MacFall, that he enjoyed vastly more freedoms and liberties at his home, Rose Lawn.²⁰⁷ His parents properly disciplined him there. It was rather that he was left-handed, and, as a result, he probably faced unusually venal attention from his peers.²⁰⁸ In addition, Frank's teachers were at liberty, undoubtedly with Benjamin's formal permission or accepting knowledge, to use corporal punishment on Frank whenever they thought it proper and fitting.²⁰⁹ Many years later, Frank recalled his cruel and oppressive Academy experiences:

¹⁹⁷ See MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 41 ("Cheated of their feelings, they begin to steal, to destroy property, and to ignore the feelings and rights of others.").

¹⁹⁸ See MILLER, *supra* note 5, at 97 (finding that adults have an "unconscious need to pass on to others the humiliation one has undergone oneself").

¹⁹⁹ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 20.

²⁰⁰ *Id.*

²⁰¹ *Id.*

²⁰² *Id.* at 23.

²⁰³ *Id.*

²⁰⁴ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 3–4.

²⁰⁵ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 20.

²⁰⁶ *Id.* at 23–24.

²⁰⁷ *Id.* at 23; ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 3.

²⁰⁸ See LONCRAINE, *supra* note 5, at 43.

²⁰⁹ See BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 23–24.

“I complained to my father about the brutal treatment I felt I was receiving at the school.” [I] told [my] father that “the teachers were heartless, callous and continually indulging in petty nagging.” [I] complained that the masters were “quick to slap a boy in the face, or forcibly use a cane or ruler to punish any student who violated in the slightest way any of the strict and often unreasonable rules.” The masters of Peekskill were . . . “about as human as a school of fish.”²¹⁰

Whenever Benjamin visited Frank, he told his father about his maltreatment. I can imagine that Benjamin perhaps visited the Academy not just to see his son but also to hear directly from the Academy’s head teacher how Frank was responding to rigid rules and entrenched hierarchies. After all, the Academy’s brochure announced an inflexible commitment to moral discipline: “No act of immorality or special impropriety will be suffered to pass unnoticed.”²¹¹ Stated differently, cadets who breached moral decorum were flogged.²¹² Equally important, the Academy’s mission may have affirmed Benjamin’s rearing with the Methodist faith because it instilled in cadets a “sense of religious and moral obligation,” which reinforced teaching them “physical and moral manhood.”²¹³ I can imagine that the head teacher perhaps assured Benjamin that Frank would adjust and adapt if his father did not heed his wails and woes. Such possible reassurances from the head teacher only could have comforted Benjamin if Benjamin believed that he had become an educated, moral, and disciplined person precisely because John and Lany Baum had imposed sufficiently thorough physical violence on him so as to overcome his willfulness. Rather than consider Frank’s feelings, pain, and rights, Benjamin probably favored rigidity, authority, and discipline. In this way, Benjamin’s probable deference to, or active collaboration with, the head teacher revealed that Benjamin may have thought that his and Cynthia’s corrective violence against Frank’s body was ineffective, especially if they could not agree and did not consistently physically chastise Frank, and thus Benjamin needed to subject Frank to the maltreatment of another authority figure.

Assuming that Benjamin and Cynthia assaulted Frank in infancy, then Frank may not have been able to express his feelings during his infancy, except to cry. And if Benjamin and Cynthia followed the Methodist approach faithfully, they would have continued to impose pain on Frank’s body until he understood that he was not to express any emotion, including crying. I speculate that such maltreatment broke Frank’s heart, a problem that surfaced while Frank was at the Academy. His teacher “severely disciplined [him] for looking out of the window at the birds while he should have been preparing his lesson. His resentment of the penalty brought on a heart attack—the first in several years—and he fainted in the classroom.”²¹⁴ Unfortunately, the teacher, an authority figure, had license to slap, beat, and humiliate cadets. Frank probably never saw the teacher as a

²¹⁰ *Id.*; LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 46.

²¹¹ LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 42.

²¹² *Id.*; BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 23–24.

²¹³ LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 42.

²¹⁴ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 24.

parent, and so what he might have accepted from his parents, he simply could not have internalized at the Academy. Yet, in the face of authority, Frank perhaps still had not learned to express his genuine feelings, and so his conscious mind and body warred, the result of which was a heart attack.

In *The Master Key*, Frank showed that humans have difficulty handling enormous power, having the ability to use it for good or evil.²¹⁵ Where did Frank first encounter good and bad use of power? Perhaps in the family—the primary locus in which we learn about the world and in which parents wield enormous power, especially from the point of view of their needy, helpless, and dependent infants and toddler. And if Frank had elected his parents' love, however distorted or corrupted, over his authentic feelings and self, his Faustian deal would have required him to forever rationalize his decision. Thus, Frank could not have spoken of this thing. He repressed his authentic feelings and self, and he would have had to convince himself that he had to trust his familiars and friends, for his parents had only done what they thought was best for him. Unfortunately, Frank was engaged in self-deception. His mind bought into the justification; his body simply recorded what it experienced. What then was Frank's Bell's palsy telling him? Likewise, why did Frank's body need oral cancer?

Since he repressed his authentic feelings and self so that Benjamin and Cynthia would love him, I speculate that Frank could have expressed himself with words or used his body, but his faith in his familiars and friends would have demanded that he not judge, criticize, or accuse his parents. And Frank did not. Although he did not speak inappropriately about his parents, he did, from an early age, reveal his maltreatment with his body. For example, Frank loved to daydream, which, as discussed above, led to his teacher beating him severely at the Academy and caused his heart attack and subsequent withdrawal from the school after two years of excruciatingly rigid authoritarianism. Daydreaming, a way of using our minds and bodies, suggests repression. Indeed, according to Janov, repression's diffused energy can be found in daydreaming.²¹⁶ Frank could have used daydreaming to access his authentic feelings and self, which he may have been banished to the realm of fantasy because he faced abuse, cruelty, rejection, humiliation, and manipulation by familiars. Frank's daydreaming may also have confessed a lie. With his mind and body, Frank lied to himself.²¹⁷

To protect that lie, Frank tensed his facial muscles. No truth, however small, escaped his lips, unless the truth were so disguised as symbols or so watered down by the fairytale genre that Frank could not have recognized it. Unconsciously, to ensure that he would not whisper a single truth, Frank pressed down on the seventh cranial nerve, causing paralysis on one side of his face. By refusing to speak his authentic feelings and self into the world, Frank unconsciously lied, preferring instead to push a distorted version of himself into the world through fairy tales. To use the mouth, the voice, and vocal vibrations to literally co-create his personal experiences and social

²¹⁵ *Id.*

²¹⁶ JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 68, 71.

²¹⁷ See JUDITH, *supra* note 172, at 312.

realities, I speculate that Frank had to have openly embraced his individuated self. According to Judith, the voice's creativity "allows the self to give back to the world an assimilated form of what it has taken in."²¹⁸ What had Frank taken in? How assimilated was it? I have already argued that Frank took in a deformed, corrupted form of parental love, and if so, he assimilated lies and self-deception. As such, once Frank too repressed his authentic feelings and self by assimilating the lie that moral discipline was a proxy for love, Frank lived a lie, and so he constantly had to lie to himself and to others. Hence, in Frank's work, *Dot and Tot*, Frank must have still privileged naked conformity over authentic, autonomous views.²¹⁹ By repressing his traumatic suffering, especially to quell his inner psychic disturbance, Frank had been "living a lie [and] [l]ies form the demon of the fifth chakra."²²⁰ For Frank, one such demon was operable, mouth cancer.

B. FRANK'S MALTREATMENT: SCARECROW AND OBEDIENCE

Two additional examples suggest that Frank traumatically suffered as a child. The first are Frank's nightmares, which biographers Frank Joslyn Baum, Russell MacFall, Rebecca Loncraine, and Katharine Rogers discuss but offer literally no explanation.²²¹ The second is Frank's reaction after Maud ordered him to beat one of their children. In the light of what I have already discussed, these additional examples reveal that Benjamin and Cynthia maltreated Frank and so effectively morally justified their emotional and physical violence and so thoroughly convinced Frank that disobedience would provoke violence that even as an adult he could not resist. By internalizing those justifications and fear, Frank began to dream his parents' parasitic ideas,²²² and despite his suppressed childhood history, the gateway into his real biography was his scarecrow nightmares.²²³

When Frank returned home from the Academy, it is likely he saw scarecrows around the family estate at Rose Lawn.²²⁴ Having just moved with his family from Syracuse to Rose Lawn, he probably had not become attuned to the humanoid figure hanging on a stick, its sole purpose to frighten crows. Shortly thereafter, Frank began having nightmares, and the biographers attributed these sleep terrors to his vivid imagination.²²⁵ Specifically, Frank's nightmares were recurring and unfolded this way. Loncraine writes:

A wild scarecrow chased him through the darker regions of his mind in recurring nightmares. A misshapen, awkward straw man,

²¹⁸ *Id.* at 313.

²¹⁹ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 95–96, 104.

²²⁰ JUDITH, *supra* note 172, at 312.

²²¹ See BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 46, at 22; LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 47; ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 3.

²²² In the film *INCEPTION*, protagonist Cobb asks Saito "What is the most resilient parasite?" CHRISTOPHER NOLAN & JONAH NOLAN, *INCEPTION: THE SHOOTING SCRIPT* (2010). "... An idea. Resilient, highly contagious. Once an idea's taken hold in the brain it's almost impossible to eradicate. A person can cover it up, ignore it—but it stays there." *Id.*

²²³ See JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 75 (showing nightmares to be way of reliving birth or early life trauma).

²²⁴ LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 47.

²²⁵ See, e.g., *id.* at 47 ("[Baum's] vivid imagination found things to fear there.").

so familiar in the fields around Rose Lawn, would climb down from its pole and run after him through the fields, with its arms flailing about. At the last moment, just before it caught up with him, the scarecrow would collapse into a harmless inanimate heap of yellow straw and old clothes.²²⁶

None of Frank's biographers takes seriously the idea that Frank's imagination had nothing to do with his nightmare. It seems likely that Frank had suffered deep, painful trauma in his early infancy, so Frank's imagination was perhaps just one adaptive effect of violent parenting. Nevertheless, Loncraine, whose biography of Frank reads more like a neo-rationalist and a neo-Freudian search for real, objective, and external objects or experiences to explain why Frank wrote *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, argues that his fertile imagination encompassed everything, including fear. She links his fear-based explanation with Frank's dislike of "witches and goblins" and "little dwarves in the woods bobbing up with their horrors."²²⁷ Put bluntly, Loncraine proffers specious reasoning and, in my judgment, completely misreads Frank's nightmares, for even self-consciously unimaginative people can have nightmares.²²⁸

What then explains Frank's nightmares? Are they linked to his traumatic suffering as a child? I have argued that Benjamin's demands for manliness, moral discipline, and an entrepreneurial outlook caused Frank traumatic suffering. Likewise, Cynthia's demands required the same of Frank, although she was perhaps much more nurturing than Benjamin, the self-absorbed businessman, and, even though the Baums employed two live-in servants,²²⁹ Cynthia still had her domestic and caretaking hands full with managing the house and raising children. And I speculate that Cynthia weaned Frank off breastfeeding well before his needs were met, and if his demands made her weary, she either told him to mature into a proper man or intimated that he ought to be like his brothers. In the late 1850s and early 1860s, Benjamin would have expected Frank to become a miniature adult with a short period of emotional, physical, and psychological dependency.²³⁰ Perhaps Frank needed to prolong his attachment to his mother, and this need caused tension between Benjamin and Cynthia when Benjamin came home. By possibly relying on a traditional Methodist approach to parenting, which perforce relied on corporal punishment, emotional humiliation, and psychological manipulation, I argue that Benjamin and Cynthia effectively broke Frank's spirit and his heart. To survive biologically and to be loved, however corrupted it might have been, Frank repressed his authentic feelings and self.

²²⁶ *Id.*

²²⁷ *Id.*

²²⁸ See JUDITH, *supra* note 172, at 387 (stating that "[r]ecurrent nightmares can result from either excess or deficiency" in the sixth chakra, thus leaving the excess (that is, highly intuitive, visual, or imaginative) person overly stimulated by psychic input, and leaving the deficient (that is, having rigid boundaries to prevent seeing into the world, limited imagination, narrow mind and egotistic) person self-motivated to serve her material, personal needs).

²²⁹ LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 19.

²³⁰ See *id.* at 49 ("[Prior to 1874], children had been considered small adults who, after brief years of dependency, were to enter employment and take up adult roles as soon as possible.").

At a very young age, Frank's repression would have haunted him. Keep in mind that Benjamin favored military training, which undergirded his view that Frank was not a proper man but could become one. In addition to the Academy's moral discipline and physical and moral man training, Benjamin had also favored the Academy because Frank would have learned practical, professional skills such as bookkeeping, commercial correspondence, law, and economics.²³¹ In effect, Benjamin likely pressured Frank to be just like him; John likely did the same to Benjamin.²³² In *For Your Own Good*, Miller illustrated how Adolf Hitler's father, Alois, pressured him to become a bureaucrat, which he resisted. Among other reasons, Hitler's willfulness gave Alois just cause to beat and humiliate him daily, which had holocaustic effects on Jews and the world.²³³ My comparison is somewhat ineffectual because unlike Hitler who had no helping witness, not even in his mother, Klara, to whom he could turn,²³⁴ Frank not only would have had Cynthia's distorted love, but also would have had his siblings, especially his sister, Harriet, who initially encouraged him to write.²³⁵ Moreover, Loncraine argues that the Baums "weren't strict disciplinarians, as long as [Frank] went to church on Sundays."²³⁶ If, however, Alois were a strict, dark disciplinarian, would Benjamin and Cynthia's violent Methodist parenting be considered for the times effective, moral child-rearing? Based on the biographies, Frank, whose wild imagination conjured up the flailing, chasing scarecrow, lived a happy, charmed, and supportive life in a loving family.²³⁷

Janov would disagree. He argues that we, especially children, suffer from nightmares unless we have suffered an actual traumatic injury, either psychically, physically, emotionally, or psychologically.²³⁸ In an effort to cope, to live, we dissociate the pain from the experience, and then if our tormentor is an adult authority figure, we also project. We become like our tormentor, and later we inflict the same horrible injury on others. Before we become arguably self-reliant adults, we have to co-exist with our tormentor, and by splitting and projecting, we inflict a severe wound to our authentic self. As a child, I argue that Frank would have suffered a deep psychic disturbance for having helped his parents kill his true self. Somewhat taken aback upon first seeing the scarecrow, Frank symbolically had a way of

²³¹ *Id.* at 42.

²³² See MILLER, *supra* note 55, at 158 ("[E]very perpetrator was once a victim. . . . Only those who deny their childhood sufferings and play them down or sneer at them are in danger of becoming perpetrators. . . . But since most of the torments suffered in childhood are unknown because they have been denied, and since childhood is often idealized, . . . [they] can [not] protect [themselves] from the blind repetition of [their] own unconscious sufferings.").

²³³ See MILLER, *supra* note 5, at 142–80; *id.* at 159 ("[Alois] established a nice little dictatorship at home. His wife looked up to him, and he treated the children with a hard hand. Hitler in particular he had no understanding for. He tyrannized him.").

²³⁴ See *id.* at 180–83.

²³⁵ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 25 (Frank wrote: "It was you, I remember, who first encouraged me to write. Years ago you read to father an incomplete 'novel' which I, in my youth and innocence, had scribbled, and you declared it was good."). See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 63 (showing that Frank also thought Mary-Louise appreciated him and his work, saying: "I know you will not despise these simple tales, but will understand me and accord me your full sympathy").

²³⁶ LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 44.

²³⁷ See *id.* at 153 (writing to Harry about their times together, Frank said: "the old life, so sweet to remember, is now left far behind"; his memories of childhood had "become a dream of the past").

²³⁸ JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 72–79.

forcing himself to confront what he had done, all in the name of seeking conditionally love.

Hence, I posit that Frank's recurring nightmare symbolically represented two aspects of his life-long existential suffering. First, Frank became Benjamin. He probably admired and idealized him as Benjamin's graveyard headstone confessed Benjamin had done with his father, John, the itinerant Methodist minister. As John drove Benjamin to manhood and moral discipline, Benjamin too would have ignored Frank's pleas to remove him from the Academy because John had rejected his push-back and willfulness. Second, Frank never raged against his actual abusers. Given the amount of time that Frank spent with his mother, I would argue that she must have shaped how, when, and where he could authentically feel and be. If Benjamin beat and scolded him, Cynthia was just as effective by combining violence and emotional manipulation.²³⁹ For all of the pain that Frank suffered, I argue that he, like Anton Chekhov, "never trespass[ed] the Fourth Commandment."²⁴⁰ At the very least, Frank may have felt impliedly threatened, and so he may have been prepared to honor his parents even if they did not deserve it.²⁴¹ What, then, did Frank do with his authentic feelings and self? If he could not speak against his parents, except through fairy-tale symbolisms that would not weaken his self-deception or cause a psychic collapse, where would his anger, rage, and humiliation exist? I believe they became part of his unconscious.

And once there, I argue that Frank's repressed, but powerful, authentic feelings and self would have become dark and fearful. Guilt-laden and shameful, these feelings may have become dark because they may not have been immediately aired and thus, released. At an early age, Frank may have learned to separate what he immediately felt from what was happening to him. He may have stopped feeling anything. In this way, he would have been "gating," a mechanism which "ordinarily stops you from sensing what's going on inside your body so that you don't suffer."²⁴²

Why then did gating not work for Frank? In Frank's case, repression did not completely work perhaps because he was quite determined to act, to write, to express, or to emote, or because he had helping witnesses in the form of his brothers, sisters, and cousins, or both. If his siblings had been helping witnesses when either parent caused him suffering, I speculate that his siblings would have comforted him, showing him that suffering was not

²³⁹ Cf. GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 21. Writing in 1754, Esther Burr (wife of Reverend Aaron Burr—president of Princeton) stated:

[Sally, her first born] has been Whip'd once on *Old Adams* account, and she knows the differance between a smile and a frown as well as I do. When she has done any thing that she Surspects is wrong, will look with concern to see what Mama says, and if I only knit my brow she will cry till I smile, and altho She is not quite Ten months old, yet when she knows so much, I think tis time she should be taught.

Id. (original spellings retained) (quoting *The Journal of Esther Burr 1754–1757* 95 (Carol F. Karlsen & Laurie Crumpacker eds., Yale Univ. Press 1984)).

²⁴⁰ MILLER, *supra* note 55, at 25. For a full analysis of Anton Chekhov's emotionally disfiguring maltreatment and his deep devotion to his parents, see *id.* at 23–24 ("Chekhov's father was hot-tempered and uncouth, and he treated the members of his family with extreme severity. The children were beaten almost every day."); MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 43–45.

²⁴¹ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 26.

²⁴² JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 98.

the entirety of the world. It is also possible that Cynthia wished her children to enjoy great happiness, especially after suffering the loss of four, even if they were acting or writing and especially if they were good, morally disciplined children. Later, it was Cynthia who helped to persuade Benjamin to spend thousands of dollars so that Frank could join a Shakespearean theater, even though Benjamin was fairly sure that it was wasted money backing a poor risk.²⁴³ He was right.²⁴⁴ In any event, Frank's gate leaked because his "repressive mechanisms" could not "handle the pain inside of them."²⁴⁵ One result of such leaks is nightmares because nightmares are "the mind's way to 'rationalize' the pain in the present and to keep the individual from being overwhelmed by his past."²⁴⁶

What did Frank wish to repress about his past? Why did the scarecrow chase him? Everything that I have read thus far, especially because I am relying on hermeneutics and exegesis of texts, suggests that Frank's traumatic suffering was likely caused by his parents' pedagogical parenting, which required early weaning, manhood training, moral discipline, and a practical mind for commercial enterprises. Violent, humiliating, and manipulative maltreatment were Benjamin's and Cynthia's primary and secondary tools. And so Frank wanted to repress his rage and anger because those on whom he depended for love would not let him be. And if he condemned his authentic feelings and self to his unconscious and his expressive needs to the realm of imaginative fantasy, they would have become dark too because Frank's new ways of expressing himself would have been shrouded proxies for now shadowy feelings. Hence, I speculate that Frank could only speak symbolically about what he buried. Fortunately, Frank must have needed to express himself.

With this strong, powerful need, nightmares followed. Hence, having been actually frightened by the scarecrow, Frank unconsciously had a symbol by which to understand what had happened to his authenticity. Through repression, Frank's authenticity was distorted, twisted, or disfigured by his parents' conditional love. Such love may have caused him the deepest pain. On nightmares, Janov writes:

Nightmares occur when we are ending deep sleep with its deep repression. [If the primal] pain is enormous and gating cannot do its job, there is a sudden breakthrough of the imprint with all of its sensations The result is that the deepest lying pain shoot to the surface abruptly, an end-around the [emotional defenses].²⁴⁷

And so Frank had nightmares of a flailing scarecrow that chased him because at some level, he was defending himself against any awareness that would have permitted him to see his parents' physical and emotional cruelty. Frank would not have been aware that he was self-deceiving, which would have required him to ask why and to follow the emotional breadcrumbs, as in the Grimms Brothers' *Hansel and Gretel*. By refusing

²⁴³ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 6.

²⁴⁴ *See id.*

²⁴⁵ JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 98.

²⁴⁶ *Id.*

²⁴⁷ JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 74.

awareness and by rejecting seeing, Frank may not have had to relive an early life trauma. As such, the scarecrow symbolically represented an existentially lethal experience, and his unconscious wanted him to know that it had kept this part of his early life alive because it needed healing. If healing were impossible, however, then Frank's unconscious may have simply relied on an imago of Frank's parents so that he could have continued to exist among them.²⁴⁸ Hence, Frank's natural defense mechanism would never have permitted the scarecrow to catch him, thus causing the scarecrow to crash to the ground in a heap of yellow straw. If the scarecrow had actually caught him, perhaps Frank would have died.²⁴⁹ His heart, weakened, as I argued above, by acute parental betrayal, may not have taken the stress or accepted the truth.²⁵⁰ To this degree, the scarecrow was also Frank, or at least the false self that he had become in order to garner even conditional love from his parents. And so Frank awoke screaming, and, by so doing, he wanted to be awake, aware, and conscious, so long as he remained unconscious of truth of his dark, repressed secrets.²⁵¹

As a result of his early trauma, and after years of struggling against a self-absorbed father, who may have been so determined to perfect his son's manhood and moral discipline that he perhaps basically conspired with the Academy to physically and emotionally maltreat his son, Frank suffered from very low self-esteem. His mother had perhaps a more prominent hand in undermining Frank's sense of self. As devout Methodists, Benjamin and Cynthia would have either followed a prescribed script for properly instilling moral discipline within their children, or, having been reared by parents like John, they would have just unconsciously repeated the self-annihilating pedagogical parenting, which teaches children to become

²⁴⁸ See JUDITH, *supra* note 172, at 265. Relying on HARVILLE HENDRIX, GETTING THE LOVE YOU WANT (1988), and writing about the internalized imago we have of our parents, Judith writes:

The imago is a "composite picture of the people who have influenced you most strongly at an early age." This image is not formed in the conscious mind but is like a template etched into the nervous system over years of constant interaction with our family. It programs our reactions, defenses, behaviors, and interpretations of events. It becomes part of our character armor, part of our personality.

Id.

²⁴⁹ Cf. JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 75 ("It is crucial to understand that nightmares are forms of defense. Against what? DEATH. Quite literally. For the person in a nightmare is the same as the person on the verge of reliving his birth or other early life and death trauma; his vital signs are lethal in an attempt at fleeing and repressing the pain. . . . Therefore, dreams are defenses against nightmares, and nightmares are defenses against death.").

²⁵⁰ See *id.* According to Janov:

For the person in a nightmare is the same as the person on the verge of reliving his birth or other early life and death trauma; his vital signs are lethal in an attempt at fleeing and repressing the pain. His heart-beat and blood pressure are inordinately high. If allowed to continue for an extended period of time, the body is at great risk. So the person wakes up to calm down and slow down those functions that could kill him.

Id.

²⁵¹ See *id.* On this point, Janov aptly writes:

We become awake and "aware" (of our current surroundings) in order to remain unconscious (of ourselves). Being awake and seeing the "reality" of the room, the lights reassure us, so we do not have to face our pain directly. . . . The system does whatever it must, awake or sleep, to ensure that we remain neurotic and unconscious (of our imprints).

Id.

good, God-fearing Methodists. Regardless, I would argue that they were self-absorbed, demanding, unimaginative, and determined to shape their children for their own good. In Frank's case, he may have learned to distrust his abilities, thus possibly leaving such matters to others like Maud who proved more than able to manage the house, discipline the finances, and rear the children.

In this way, Maud was Cynthia by proxy. It is possible that that Frank's first, enduring love was his mother, and even if she would assault his body and manipulate him emotionally, he perhaps loved her anyway. I would argue that all abused children love their parents. Between Benjamin and Cynthia's child-rearing practices, Frank may have been left physically disempowered except in his imaginative world, in which he may have been powerful and creatively able to resolve the nastiness of human affairs. Accordingly, if Frank did desire to live mostly in his head, Maud would have been perfect: strong, less demonstrative, unimaginative, and practical.²⁵² On the other hand, Frank possibly yielded, which suggests to me that he feared confronting Maud as if she were his mother. For example, on one occasion, he bought jelly doughnuts, Bismarks, without first consulting Maud, who found fault with his unilateral decision and further weakened his confidence by forcing him to eat the doughnuts for several consecutive days.²⁵³ After a few days of eating them, Frank complained that they were getting stale, suggesting that Maud should cease serving them to him.²⁵⁴ Maud responded *ex cathedra*, saying: "Let's stop this nonsense. . . . You bought them without consulting me, so you will have to eat them. I am not going to have food wasted. But I'll let you off this time if you will promise never again to buy any food unless I ask you to get it."²⁵⁵ Maud's retort set the tone for their domestic arrangement, and it perhaps shifted Frank back to a time when he was a child living under the near-cyclopean eyes of Cynthia, or *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz's* Wicked Witch of the West.²⁵⁶

One response to Maud's Bismarkian imposition was that Frank, properly home trained, may have known how to keep domestic peace. Yet, if it is true that Benjamin and Cynthia had broken Frank, chipping away at him like the Tin Woodman had been chipped away at, causing him to lose his human parts bit by bit,²⁵⁷ and requiring him to repress his authentic feelings, I can only imagine that Frank should have been quite angry. Unfortunately, Frank never learned how to express his genuine feelings and that he emotionally wished to avoid emotional pain and physical punishment just as he did when living under his parents' roof. Without self-confidence, which he may have never had except in his imaginative world, Frank would have never learned how to fight back. I posit that he resisted quietly, perhaps relying on passive-aggressive tactics, so that he would have not had to confront Maud or Cynthia directly. Perhaps at some quiet

²⁵² ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 14.

²⁵³ *Id.*

²⁵⁴ *Id.*

²⁵⁵ *Id.*

²⁵⁶ See BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 98–100.

²⁵⁷ See *id.* at 39–41.

moment, Frank realized that he had married his mother. In the end, Maud, like Cynthia before her, taught him that: “around the house she was the boss.”²⁵⁸

In the real world of adults and children, Frank’s congenial nature, about which everyone knew, in my mind signals strongly that he had developed a practiced habit, mostly unconscious, of repressing his authentic feelings. At his children’s birth, he devoted himself to them, playing with them, singing to them, and telling them stories.²⁵⁹ Moreover, he was viewed as an “exceptionally sweet-natured, easy-going man, whose positive attitude caused others to see the best in themselves and their circumstances.”²⁶⁰ Maud described him as “a very kindly man—never angry—pleasant to everyone.”²⁶¹ Unfortunately, despite his whimsical humor, his spontaneous puns, and his gentleness, Frank may have harbored anger and rage, causing psychogenic heart issues, Bell’s palsy, and mouth cancer. His physical ailments were perhaps directly related to either his inability to authentically express himself except through the genre of fairy tales, or his learning in early childhood to numb himself to painful, judgmental, and aggressive nature of adults. For example, in *Emerald City of Oz*, his character, and thus Frank, knew that self-absorbed rulers (or parents) are “cruel or fault-finding overseers.”²⁶² Later, even as an adult, Frank’s inner child never overcame the deep pain he may have suffered in his early childhood. In this way, I argue that Frank unconsciously feared adults. They were proxies for his morally disciplining parents, and he may have been child-like his entire adult life.

Unfortunately, Frank was a maltreater by proxy. After living in a home where he was possibly physically and emotionally abused, he may have promised himself that he would never do to his children what his parents had done to him. He left such disciplinarian tools to Maud, who thought “little about taking a hairbrush” and beating her children.²⁶³ When Maud sent young Frank to bed without dinner for twice falling into a large pan of paste, Frank, over her protest, “took a plate of supper to the child’s bedroom, told him a story, and watched by him until he fell asleep.”²⁶⁴ Moreover, abused children treat living animals harshly. When Robert, their second child, “was very small, he threw the family cat out of the second-

²⁵⁸ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 14 (quoting BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 51). *See id.* at 88–89 (discussing how Maud needed money for the coming Christmas holiday of 1900, and Maud asked Frank to ask his publisher for an advance on his royalties). Although asserting that it was unprofessional, Frank demurred, returning with a check for \$3,432.64. *Id.* at 88. Harry in describing his parents’ relationship recognized that “after further discussion, Father, as usual, did what Mother asked.” *Id.* at 89.

²⁵⁹ *Id.* at 14.

²⁶⁰ *Id.* at 15.

²⁶¹ *Id.*

²⁶² *See id.* at 169–70.

²⁶³ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 49–50. Having already beat Frank Jr. for falling into a white paste for hanging wallpaper, and ruining his clean, white suit, he did so again, now wearing his last clean white suit, after his father asked him to show him how he had fallen in the first time. *Id.* “This was too much for Maud. She rushed the child to her room, scrubbed and spanked him again—this time with the back of a hairbrush until his little bare bottom was fiery red—and put him to bed without supper.” *Id.*

²⁶⁴ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 14–15.

story window.”²⁶⁵ To teach him reciprocity, Maud held Robert out the window by the ankles, and he screamed so loud he drew the neighbors to the house.²⁶⁶ Of course, no one did anything to help him, for parents enjoyed the legal privilege to assault their children if they were correctively punishing them.²⁶⁷

After returning from a long business trip, Frank hated to discipline his children.²⁶⁸ He preferred to give them jawbreakers and tell stories.²⁶⁹ Perhaps that role evoked deep emotions about what Cynthia had required of Benjamin after his long business trips. Years later after the cat tossing, Maud promised Kenneth, the youngest child, that Frank would beat him.²⁷⁰ Upon coming home, Maud insisted that he carry out her threat.²⁷¹ To support her authority, he reluctantly beat Kenneth.²⁷² By beating Kenneth, however, Frank had unconsciously reawakened deeply repressed feelings or unearthed entombed memories of his parents assaulting him. If that had happened, Frank’s defense mechanisms, his lie of a pristine childhood, would have been unraveled. Benjamin and Cynthia then would not have been loving, devoted, accepting, and supportive parents.²⁷³ After the beating, he sent Kenneth, who was howling, to bed without dinner.²⁷⁴ Frank was so upset and sickened to his stomach, he could not eat dinner.²⁷⁵ He was sick to his stomach precisely because he was experiencing dark, unfamiliar, and painful feelings. To relieve his angst, and to restore his parents’ false but mythic standing, Frank took dinner to Kenneth, who was still crying.²⁷⁶ Frank “sincerely apologized to his son and swore he would never hit any of the boys ever again.”²⁷⁷

That promise was kept, and by keeping that promise Frank could have unconsciously vented his repressed fury and discharged his anger over his parents maltreating him when he could not fend them off.²⁷⁸ That promise, however, could never have included Maud. I speculate that Frank unconsciously wished to protect his memory of a pristine childhood and that he wanted his children to think of him that way, too. In effect, he could beat them by proxy because Maud had a penchant for beating her children. For example, Robert had fallen in a pan of white paste after Maud had

²⁶⁵ *Id.* at 15.

²⁶⁶ *Id.*

²⁶⁷ See *Johnson v. State*, 21 Tenn. 283, 283 (1840) (“The right of parents to chastise their refractory and disobedient children is so necessary to the government of families, to the good order of society, that no moralist or law-giver has ever thought of interfering with its existence or of calling upon them to account for the manner of its exercise, upon light or frivolous pretences.”). But see *Hornbeck v. State*, 45 N.E. 620, 620 (Ind. Ct. App. 1896) (“[The parent] has no right to administer unreasonable or cruel and inhuman punishment. . . . [I]t is unlawful.”).

²⁶⁸ LONCRAINE, *supra* note 5, at 148–49.

²⁶⁹ *Id.* at 148.

²⁷⁰ *Id.* at 149.

²⁷¹ *Id.*

²⁷² *Id.*

²⁷³ Cf. MILLMAN, *supra* note 51, at 203 (stating that 31/4s “can also learn many lessons from their own children or other children.”).

²⁷⁴ LONCRAINE, *supra* note 5, at 149.

²⁷⁵ *Id.*

²⁷⁶ *Id.*

²⁷⁷ *Id.*

²⁷⁸ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 38.

cleaned him and readied him in “his last white suit.”²⁷⁹ Shortly thereafter, Frank arrived at home, and Robert showed him how the accident had happened, which resulted in him falling into the paste again and getting dirty.²⁸⁰ “This was too much for Maud. She rushed the child from the room, scrubbed and [beat] him again—this time with the back of a hairbrush until his little bare bottom was fiery red—and put him to bed without his supper.”²⁸¹ Given Maud’s proclivity for violence against her children, Frank could have been passive-aggressive. If his children caused him upset, I speculate that he would be numb or refuse to acknowledge his feelings; however, he perhaps knew that Maud would beat them, thus possibly indirectly getting revenge or restoring the privileged role of the parent. After Frank beat Kenneth that day, “Maud had to inflict any punishment herself.”²⁸² In this way, Frank was more than passive-aggressive. Through Maud’s violence, he could have placed his children in an impotent position, one that may not have been too different from his own possibly repressed memories of childhood violence. By permitting Maud to beat their children and by refusing to rescue them, I argue that Frank vicariously released some of his repressed feelings. According to Miller:

[R]epression is a perfidious fairy who will supply help at the moment but will eventually exact a price for this help. The impotent fury comes to life again when [Frank’s] own child is born, and at last [through Maud] the anger can be discharged—once again at the expense of a defenseless creature.²⁸³

Yet, Frank’s defensive mechanisms were strong and he found a creative way to meet his need to release repressed feelings. At a conscious level, he was not Benjamin or Cynthia. At an unconscious level, I speculate that he was just as violent and manipulative as his parents. Parenthetically, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, it seems that Frank again vented his impotent fury when he permitted the Wizard of Oz, thus him, to exploit Dorothy and her companions. In short, although he kept his promise to Kenneth and his siblings, Frank was still, by proxy, a parent who maltreated his children.

C. CYNTHIA-JANE’S AND OLIVER’S DEATHS: MORAL DISCIPLINE SERVED CYNTHIA’S IDEALIZED CHILDREN

In 1863, George McClellan, Frank’s youngest sibling, died.²⁸⁴ Before George McClellan died, Benjamin and Cynthia’s first- and second-born children, Cynthia-Jane who was four or five and Oliver Stanton who was three or four, had also died.²⁸⁵ In addition to George McClellan affecting Frank, Frank’s parents had to bury yet another infant and toddler child. While Cynthia-Jane was dying, Oliver developed her diphtheritic

²⁷⁹ BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 49.

²⁸⁰ *Id.*

²⁸¹ *Id.*

²⁸² ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 15.

²⁸³ MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 38.

²⁸⁴ LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 31.

²⁸⁵ *Id.* at 7–8.

symptoms.²⁸⁶ Thirteen days after Cynthia-Jane died, Benjamin and Cynthia were grief stricken as they buried Oliver.²⁸⁷ Benjamin and Cynthia buried both children in a small, local cemetery.²⁸⁸ In 1877, Benjamin bought a family plot in the hills overlooking Syracuse.²⁸⁹ He had Cynthia-Jane's and Oliver's names chiseled into heavy headstones, ones equal to the size of other Baum relatives who had lived to adulthood.²⁹⁰ At this cemetery, other children's graves were present; however, none of them was given the same status as adults as Cynthia-Jane and Oliver had been given.²⁹¹ Although Cynthia-Jane and Oliver died in 1848, "they clearly lived on in the collective memory of the Baum family, continuing a kind of shadow life alongside their living siblings."²⁹² When George McClellan died in 1863, he too cast a shadow over the living Baums.

How did Cynthia-Jane's and Oliver's death influence how Benjamin and Cynthia would raise their surviving and after-born children? After all, when Benjamin was thirteen, his sister Catherine died from tuberculosis and his father, John, had permitted her death to cast a shadow over those who had survived her, too.²⁹³ Moreover, Benjamin and Cynthia were devout Methodists, and even though medical advances weakened the hardened belief that God determined which children lived and which were taken,²⁹⁴ Frank's parents, especially Cynthia, who "committ[ed] herself to a God who might bear some responsibility for the deaths of her children, or at least forgive her for failing to save them,"²⁹⁵ likely clung to their faith. If Cynthia punished herself for not having done everything to save Cynthia-Jane, especially while still nursing baby Mary-Louise,²⁹⁶ she carried an emotional burden and shame that may have affected how she reared her other children.

In *The Untouched Key*, Miller argues that "the death of a child, especially the firstborn, plays a very important role in a mother's life."²⁹⁷ She also argues that parents place great hopes in their children, especially the first born, and regardless, every child awakens within their parents the desires that originated in the parents' own childhood. They may look to the child to do for them what their bad parents did not do. In their thinking, the parents may say that "this child will honor me, take note of my feelings, and treat me with respect." Second, the parents now may have a chance to

²⁸⁶ *Id.*

²⁸⁷ *Id.* at 8.

²⁸⁸ *Id.*

²⁸⁹ *Id.*

²⁹⁰ *Id.*

²⁹¹ *Id.*

²⁹² *Id.*

²⁹³ *See id.* at 11–12 (explaining that after burying Catherine, John "wrote that he wanted [a] record to be kept 'in memory of our well-beloved daughter Catherine whose virtues demand our highest respect of commemoration, and who is no more to be seen as she was yesterday interred in the burying ground . . . by the side of her dear brother Orlando who died about two and a half years ago—aged thirteen months and twenty six days.'").

²⁹⁴ *Id.* at 8–9.

²⁹⁵ *Id.* at 9.

²⁹⁶ *Id.* at 7.

²⁹⁷ MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 27.

give to that child “all that my parents had to deny me.”²⁹⁸ I know people who have burdened their children accordingly.

Yet, a child has her own will and need for autonomy. If that child dies before the parents’ high expectations have been disappointed by the child’s own autonomy, the “mother may idealize her lost child and thereby preserve its central importance for the rest of her life.”²⁹⁹ If the mourning never runs its course, the mother, having unfilled hopes from her own childhood, may associate her expectations with the dead child. The parents may visit the grave and tend to it for decades. In the case of Benjamin and Cynthia, they never exhausted their grief or mourning.³⁰⁰ Nearly forty years after Cynthia-Jane and Oliver died, they were still mourning their lost children.³⁰¹

Unfortunately, the mother of a dead child often assigns near divine, superhuman, or inordinate abilities to the dead child, which may make existence difficult for the surviving or after-born children outside of their entombed sibling’s shadow.³⁰² Miller writes: “They must be dutifully cared for and raised in a way to rid them of their bad behavior and make them acceptable in the future. To be too affectionate would be dangerous, for too much love could ruin them.”³⁰³ As for the dead child, the mother cannot spoil the child, and if the mother visits the grave of the child, she may be able to pour her heart out and fully express her “genuine inner freedom in her grief.”³⁰⁴ And so the mother may be able to train the living children well and may suppress their true feelings. By so doing, unlike the dead child who can demand nothing from the mother and who can never awaken feelings of inferiority or hatred in the mother, the mother may be able to prevent her living children from making her suffer. Unlike the dead child, the living children have vitality. I see the living children making demands of her; they wish to claim her. Yet, if she is deeply in love with her dead child, who never exhausted her, she may “feel distinctly insecure.”³⁰⁵

As if he were sassing her, Frank would toy with Cynthia, perhaps unconsciously fighting back and perhaps chipping away at her confidence.³⁰⁶ And as Frank was wont to do, Cynthia felt “helplessness and despair” if her children questioned her pedagogical principles.³⁰⁷

²⁹⁸ *Id.*

²⁹⁹ *Id.* at 28.

³⁰⁰ See LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 8.

³⁰¹ *See id.*

³⁰² *See, e.g., id.* at 17 (“[Frank’s] parents and aunts and uncles must have lived with an aching part of their hearts turned toward those children who were no longer with them. Baum grew up amongst shadow siblings and shadow cousins, and this would have a founding influence on the development of his imagination.”).

³⁰³ MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 28.

³⁰⁴ *Id.*

³⁰⁵ *Id.* at 29.

³⁰⁶ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 66. In referring to the ways in which Frank sassed his mother and questioned her biblical pedagogy, Rogers writes:

Baum’s mother was pained by her son’s disregard for conventional religion, for she was a devout Methodist who had reared her children with strict observance of the Sabbath. He liked to tease her with fictitious biblical citations. Once when she accused him of telling her an untrue story, “he replied at once, with a straight face, ‘Well, Mother, as you know, Saint Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians said, ‘All men are liars.’” She thought gravely a moment and then told him he must be wrong, for she did not recall that quotation. Nevertheless, despite having

IV. FRANK'S UNCONSCIOUS CONFESSIONS: SAYING AND CONCEALING, AND HEALING AND AUTHENTICATING IN *THE WONDERFUL WIZARD OF OZ*

Speak [t]ruth to [p]ower.

– Bayard Rustin, an African-American Quaker

It is easier to build strong children than to repair broken men.

– Frederick Douglass

If he had been a maltreated child, Frank would have suffered from emotional blindness. His amnesia more than suggests that he identified very strongly with his parents, especially if one or both were tormentors. And if he identified with either or both parents and if he were socially and morally prohibited from directly accusing his parents, then he would have found other ways to express his self-deception. He may have either punished others or turned against himself. In Frank's case, he may have turned against himself. Because it was his *raison d'être* to express himself creatively, however, Frank perforce would have written, and in so doing, would have unconsciously and symbolically confessed his childhood history of trauma.

An unconscious confession would have allowed Frank to say and conceal, so that few scholars or readers would find direct evidence of his lost childhood history of trauma. For example, Rogers and Loncraine miss this history entirely. Yet, they are not alone. Many biographers not only refuse to include narratives on their subject's childhood history with their parents, but also proffer plausible explanations of such trauma by faulting the child.³⁰⁸ They usually say that the parent was required to take a heavy hand to the child to correct his or her incorrigible ways.³⁰⁹ In *L. Frank Baum: Creator of Oz*, Rogers ignores or cannot fathom the symbolism of the Land of Oz.³¹⁰ In comparing the Land of Oz with idealized America, she focuses on the tension between uncivilized and civilized, the latter of which depends on "social conventions that limit imaginative possibilities by defining what is real, prescribing roles, and controlling nature."³¹¹ Oz embraces what civilized society has extinguished, and so in the untamed, uncivilized world of Oz, "witches [conjure], animals talk, and scarecrows [live],"³¹² which means that Nature, with its hybrid beasts, can create and

"been fooled many times before," she could not resist getting out her Bible and looking up the imaginary verse.

Id.

³⁰⁷ MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 29.

³⁰⁸ See MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 43–47 (describing how the pedagogical parenting and its tragic effects were revealed unconsciously in the creativity and philosophical writings of Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Kafka, and Nietzsche).

³⁰⁹ See MILLER, *supra* note 5, at 153 (referencing FRANZ JETZINGER, *HITLER'S JUGEND* (1956), which discusses Hitler's youth and defends Alois, Hitler's father, against allegations that he had beaten Hitler badly, arguing that "[i]t may well be that the willful and recalcitrant boy was given an occasional thrashing—he richly deserved it—but he certainly could not be called a 'battered child'; his father was a man of thoroughly progressive convictions").

³¹⁰ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 77–82.

³¹¹ *Id.* at 77.

³¹² *Id.*

take life.³¹³ Likewise, in *The Real Wizard of Oz*, Loncraine examines *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* against the traditional archetypes of folktales from which Frank drew his material³¹⁴ and against America in the 1900s.³¹⁵ Furthermore, she understands the Tin Woodman's prosthetics against the historical backdrop of the Civil War and amputees.³¹⁶ Even though Loncraine discusses archetypes, realism, Theosophy's teachings, and symbols,³¹⁷ she does not make presumptions about what Frank was actually saying and concealing, which is Frank's unconscious confession of his lost childhood history.

Yet, if Frank lost his childhood history, especially if his unconscious needed him to remember so that he could end his self-deception, then that loss may have required him to say, conceal, and confess, however symbolically, what he perhaps could recall about his maltreatment at the hands of his parents. As such, the Land of Oz would have symbolized the tension between Frank's authentic feelings, his penchant for daydreaming, his vivid imagination, and his parents' demand for him to mature, to focus on the material world, and to garner professional skills and moral discipline. As a child, I believe that Frank would not have been able to prevail intact if Benjamin and Cynthia were determined to break him. As I have already argued in the previous Sections, Benjamin and Cynthia would have used violence, humiliation, and manipulation to force Frank to banish imaginative possibilities to the realm of fantasy. Moreover, in this vein, I believe that the Tin Woodman was Frank. "‘Baum’ means ‘wood’ in German,"³¹⁸ so Frank may have been unconsciously confessing that the Wicked Witch of the East, or traditional family values, moral discipline, and civilizing proscriptions, kills the heart and love. Indeed, I have already argued that Frank, at a very early age, may have suffered from a broken heart after he realized that his parents could not accept him as he had entered this world.

It is thus also symbolic that the house in Kansas—or Frank's or Dorothy's bodies or consciousnesses—killed the Wicked Witch of the East before Dorothy ever formally steps foot into Oz. Given that Frank's siblings may have been his helping witnesses, especially Harriet who encouraged him to write, and that his parents may have forced him to harden his skin, to act without feelings, to suffer without tears, and to exist in a foreign body of his parents' making, Frank would never have completely abandoned who he was. He would have simply repressed his authenticity. Hence, in this regard, I believe that Loncraine correctly argues: "He remains himself even though his entire body has been removed and replaced."³¹⁹ If so, then I posit that Rogers's and Loncraine's readings of the Land of Oz, and perhaps *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, miss their existential and psychological mark because they too unconsciously wanted

³¹³ *Id.*

³¹⁴ See LONCRAINE, *supra* note 5, at 174.

³¹⁵ *Id.* at 175.

³¹⁶ *Id.* at 176.

³¹⁷ *Id.* at 176–77.

³¹⁸ *Id.* at 19.

³¹⁹ *Id.* at 176.

Frank's unconscious confessions to remain somewhat said but symbolically concealed.³²⁰

A. SAYING SYMBOLICALLY AND CONCEALING UNCONSCIOUSLY

Although Frank, with William Wallace Denslow, had written the popular *Father Goose: His Book and Adventures in Phunniland*, his children's story,³²¹ I believe that he still needed unconsciously to confess how his parents had maltreated him. Yet, his confessions may have concealed his lost childhood history in symbolism because, just as dreams and nightmares protect us from our deepest truths,³²² it is possible that he relied on self-deception so that he could prevent the imago of his parents from withering away. By unconsciously confessing, which means saying and concealing, I speculate that Frank literally lived as if he were in a dream,³²³ perhaps protecting his parents from powerful accusations and ensuring his realm of fantasy played its proper role—an existential pressure valve.

Because Frank did not directly accuse his parents but instead indirectly opened the pressure valve in his unconscious due to the gate failing to keep repressed information away from his conscious mind, Frank may have remained hopeful, giving him a chance to see the purest motives in his parents' child-rearing practices.³²⁴ Equally important, if Frank were hopeful, then Frank would have needed to engage his critical faculties. And so in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Dorothy, and thus Frank, expresses this hopefulness by her strong desire to return home, noting that her Uncle Henry and Aunt Em would worry about her.³²⁵ By so worrying, Dorothy implies that her worries about her Uncle's and Aunt's feelings mean that her Uncle and Aunt cared deeply for her and her feelings, too. Unfortunately, what Dorothy knows belies her worries.

What did Dorothy already know? Her Aunt and Uncle never smile or laugh.³²⁶ Perhaps like Frank, who was deeply driven by his nightmare about a scarecrow, Dorothy's uncle is sternly and solemnly focused on material gain. Dorothy's Uncle rarely expresses himself.³²⁷ Dorothy's aunt

³²⁰ See, e.g., E-mail from Katharine Rogers to author (Nov. 12, 2009, at 21:30) (on file with author).

³²¹ See LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 169–71.

³²² See JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 73 (“Dreams, by and large, deal with buried needs and feelings. . . . The trick is how to have access and still not feel the direct impact of early traumas so we may sleep and get our needed rest. Enter the dream. The dream is designed to wrap a symbol, image, and story around a feeling so as to make the feeling unrecognizable for what it is; otherwise, the pain would shoot up unmasked and we would be awake and confronted with our internal reality.”).

³²³ See *id.* 73–74 (“The dream is responsible for diluting the energy of the feeling in the story and its images. It is a form of camouflage. . . . [T]he dream is an attempt to make rational and coherent the feelings we necessarily have access to when we descend the level of consciousness during sleep. . . . This gating keeps us from knowing the feeling and its context, allowing us to form symbols around it. The symbols rush in before we have to recognize the feeling.”).

³²⁴ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 125 (“Children who have been badly treated and have thus never been able to grow up will try all their lives to do justice to the ‘good sides’ of their tormentors and will pin all hopes and expectations to that attempt.”).

³²⁵ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 13 (“I am anxious to get back to my aunt and uncle, for I am sure they will worry about me.”).

³²⁶ *Id.* at 2.

³²⁷ *Id.* (“Uncle Henry never laughed. He worked hard from morning till night and did not know what joy was. He was grey also, from his long beard to his rough boots, and he looked stern and solemn, and rarely spoke.”).

is little different from her husband; Dorothy's joy startles her.³²⁸ Based on the traditional role of the wife during Frank's time, Dorothy's Aunt shields her own heart from Dorothy's merry voice.³²⁹ Moreover, when the cyclone—an external crisis—approaches, Dorothy's Aunt screams at Dorothy, the only words she speaks to her in the book: “Quick, Dorothy! . . . Run for the cellar!”³³⁰ Dorothy's Aunt, however, does not take Dorothy's hand and lead her to the small, dark hole, thus ensuring her well-being.³³¹ Rather, perhaps relying on a moral discipline in which children obey parents as if their words were issued *ex cathedra* from God, Dorothy's Aunt, now badly frightened, throws open the cellar and climbs “down the ladder into the small, dark hole.”³³² In this way, Frank may have symbolically told his readers that the Aunt—a rather self-absorbed personality (as perhaps Cynthia was) who is no less grey and washed out than the Kansas landscape—survives by existing in a small, dark hole, which is borne of, at the very least, having no imagination, heart, or joy.³³³

If so, then why does Dorothy wish to return home? Despite what she must know, her professed reason for wishing to return home is to prevent her Uncle and Aunt from suffering emotionally: “I am anxious to get back to my aunt and uncle, for I am sure they will worry about me.”³³⁴ Yet, we know what Dorothy knows because Frank's authorial pen has revealed it to us. Why then does Dorothy believe that her Aunt and Uncle will worry about her? Perhaps Dorothy, and thus Frank, is still gripped by the moral precept, which requires children not only to reject what they authentically feel but also to believe that their parents' actions, however traumatic, serve their best interest. Such a precept would overwrite an actual account of Frank's childhood history. Moreover, Dorothy, and thus Frank, emotionally needs to believe that her guardians, who may be literary proxies for Benjamin and Cynthia, would actually worry about her, principally because Dorothy needs to rationalize the way in which they had treated her. In this sense, she would view, and relate to her guardian, through an *imago*, and to protect false image and to give her some inner sense of stability, she would simply choose to ignore or to repress her own factual childhood history. In this way, perhaps like Frank, Dorothy lives more in her imagination than in her actual history. As may have been Frank's case, Dorothy preferred her imaginary world, in which she, through Frank, constructed the Land of Oz, and because she had not confronted the Wizard yet, Dorothy still had not found her voice. Once she did, she spoke truth to power, thus potentially giving herself a chance to reject the *imago* of her guardian and embrace her (and thus his) childhood truth. Until then, Dorothy, possibly like Frank, lives in the past, but does so while she is constantly rewriting or re-imagining the truth so that she may feel loved, protected, and accepted.

³²⁸ *Id.* (“Aunt Em had been so startled by the child's laughter that she would scream and press her hand upon her heart whenever Dorothy's merry voice reached her ears; . . .”).

³²⁹ *Id.*

³³⁰ *Id.* at 3.

³³¹ *Id.* at 3 (“Aunt Em, badly frightened, threw open the trap door in the floor and climbed down the ladder into the small, dark hole.”).

³³² *Id.*

³³³ *Id.* at 2.

³³⁴ *Id.* at 13.

Hence, Dorothy wishes to return home, or, more specifically, to keep her imago intact, so that, perhaps like Frank, she can stave off her own existential crisis, one which would have been inexorably brought on by the truth of her (and his) maltreatment.

Other examples exist in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* of Frank's rejection of the truth in favor of concealment, the most powerful of which deals with his parents. First, I will discuss the death of the Wicked Witch of the East. Second, I will analyze the dethroning of the Wizard Oz. Third, I will discuss the death of the Wicked Witch of the West.

First, Frank used Dorothy's purported innocence as a literary device so that he could avoid accusing his parents and thus potentially relieve himself of any righteous indignation that may have motivated him to kill his parents. In this sense, then, Frank may have simply needed to purge the imago (the lie) of his parents from his unconscious, so that he could have seen them as perhaps his childhood tormentors. Upon entering the Land of Oz, Dorothy kills the Wicked Witch of the East.³³⁵ "Dorothy was an innocent, harmless little girl, who had been carried by a cyclone many miles from home; and she had never killed anything in all her life."³³⁶ She had not killed anything in her life, for she had not realized her literal or figurative power to kill lies, to destroy an imago, or to reject living in her imaginary world. Unfortunately, although she is not cruel, Dorothy is not innocent. A dependent, infant child is innocent because the child cannot do anything to hurt or destroy human lives.³³⁷ Through Frank's literary devices, Dorothy, however, can hurt others, but she fears doing so while worrying about her guardians' feelings more than they care about hers. But Dorothy lives in denial: "I have not killed anything."³³⁸ Note that when Dorothy rejects her roles, however implicit in the death of another being, the Munchkins have already identified the Wicked Witch of the East, a person, as the dead body, to wit, "two feet were sticking out, shod in silver shoes with pointed toes."³³⁹ Yet, Dorothy cannot acknowledge that she killed a person, saying instead "anything."³⁴⁰ Fortunately, not everyone is as deluded as Dorothy; a little old woman says: "Your house did, anyway, and that is the same thing. See!"³⁴¹ It is at this point that Frank may have unconsciously confessed the purpose behind *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. In order for Dorothy, and perhaps Frank, to feel innocent and non-accusatory of his parents—for, after all, bad things must happen to bad people—the cyclone that causes the house to kill the Wicked Witch of the East, is beyond Dorothy's direction or intent.³⁴² By projecting his cruel

³³⁵ *Id.* at 9.

³³⁶ *Id.*

³³⁷ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 42 ("A small child cannot be cruel for the simple reason that he is defenseless and unable as yet to take revenge on others for the torments he has suffered—except perhaps on small animals. The child has not yet the power to destroy human lives, even though, of course, he can—and must—harbor murderous thoughts and vengeful desires in his imagination.").

³³⁸ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 9.

³³⁹ *Id.*

³⁴⁰ *Id.* (emphasis added).

³⁴¹ *Id.*

³⁴² *Id.* ("Your house did, anyway," replied the little old woman, with a laugh, 'and that is the same thing.' . . . Dorothy looked, and gave a little cry of fright. There, indeed, just under the corner of the great beam the house rested on, two feet were sticking out, shod in silver shoes with pointed toes.").

imagination onto his literary characters, Frank implicated the reader in Dorothy's actions by telling us that the Wicked Witch of the East oppressed little people (that is, children) and that her death freed them.³⁴³ Accordingly, Dorothy says: "The house must have fallen on her. Whatever shall *we* do?"³⁴⁴ By asking this question, Dorothy seeks clean hands, or at least absolution from the little old woman. Yet, this little old woman acknowledged Dorothy's power by bowing and referring to her as a "most noble Sorceress."³⁴⁵ Symbolically, the house stands for her old consciousness, which may have been bound by precepts like moral discipline and which must undergo a change. Dorothy remains unaware of her true power, thus she remains innocent in this narrow sense. One of the necessary but unintended consequences of Dorothy entering into Frank's imaginary world may be to ferret out lies, to expose the lies, and perhaps even to recall Frank's childhood history, and to do so, Dorothy, thus Frank, first had to kill old world, European values like Methodism (à la Anglicanism) because they would have been unconsciously binding or enslaving Frank's mind to his mythic past.

Second, Frank was symbolically saying and unconsciously concealing when Dorothy, through Toto, her natural instincts, discovers that the Wizard of Oz was a humbug, a fraud.³⁴⁶ The saying and concealing happens at two levels. First, Dorothy dethrones a powerful male figure, the Wizard of Oz (or perhaps Benjamin).³⁴⁷ Second, Frank unconsciously identifies with and is symbolically the Wizard of Oz, who can order the death of the Wicked Witch of the West (or perhaps Cynthia) without directly accusing Cynthia of maltreatment because Dorothy and the readers (who are sympathetic to Dorothy, or perhaps Frank) know that the Wicked Witch of the West is wicked.

Dorothy, aided and supplemented by Toto, exposes the Wizard of Oz as a fraud, but Frank does not punish the Wizard of Oz for not acknowledging Dorothy's authenticity. Long before the infant Frank learned that his father was "just a common man,"³⁴⁸ Frank and his siblings must have held Benjamin in a near-god status, just as the Wizard of Oz is held in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.³⁴⁹ Having perhaps identified with his tormentor, Benjamin, who in one instance may have colluded with the head teacher at the Academy, Frank may have become in part like his father. And so Frank too was a common man, especially given the jobs Frank had worked to feed his family.³⁵⁰ Writing from his unconscious, Frank viewed the Wizard

³⁴³ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 9 ("We are so grateful to you for having killed the Wicked Witch of the East, and for setting our people free from bondage.").

³⁴⁴ *Id.* (emphasis added).

³⁴⁵ *Id.*

³⁴⁶ *Id.* at 132–33, 135 ("Doesn't anyone else know you're a humbug?" asked Dorothy.).

³⁴⁷ *Id.* at 132–33.

³⁴⁸ *Id.* at 133.

³⁴⁹ *See, e.g., id.* at 131 ("I am Oz, the Great and Terrible. . . . I am everywhere, . . . but to the eyes of common mortals I am invisible.").

³⁵⁰ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 17 (noting that when Frank's theatrical career waned, he worked in his family's Castorine oil business, which required Frank to travel away from Maud and his children); *id.* at 19 (stating that after the Castorine's clerk killed himself after gambling away the firm's capital, Frank had to find another way to support his family, and he thought about opportunities out West where he unsuccessfully ran a store, wrote for a local newspaper, and took pictures); *id.* at 21 ("Despite his record

of Oz as a bad man, and, in dealing with others, the Wizard of Oz fits the bill. As Benjamin must have done in Frank's eyes, the Wizard of Oz lies, manipulates, and beguiles Dorothy and her companions, exploiting their deepest desires to remain trapped in their self-denial and self-deception, and ultimately convincing them that he will fulfill their desires if they would just kill the Wicked Witch of the West.³⁵¹ Dorothy and her companions are arguably self-denying because they desire qualities which they already had, for example, the Tin Woodman wants a heart, which he already has.³⁵² Likewise, they were self-deceiving. For example, Dorothy, and thus Frank, wants to protect the lie that her guardians care enough for her to worry about her. Perhaps having been unable to express his impotent fury when his desires to write or to act were frustrated by his father, Frank, through Oz's actions, like lying, may have punished Dorothy and her companions (or possibly children like them) for having desires, because lying and manipulating delayed or prevented Dorothy, at the very least, from fulfilling those desires. Dorothy and her companions kill the Wicked Witch of the West, and, upon returning, they learn that the Wizard of Oz cannot honor his promise.³⁵³ Yet, the Wizard justifies his exploits; to craft this part of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Frank may have repressed his latent hatred for his father and the probable causes of his latent anger.³⁵⁴ As Miler has argued, Frank would have lived in mortal fear of women who were connected to the "divine feminine," and who commanded "magical powers."³⁵⁵ In his defense, the Wizard of Oz says to Dorothy and her companions: "No; you are wrong. I have been making believe."³⁵⁶ Later, Dorothy finally, but tepidly, expresses herself: "I think you are a very bad man."³⁵⁷ Although he defrauds them, the Wizard of Oz ultimately shapes his own character when he says condescendingly: "Oh, no, my dear; I'm really a very good man, but I'm a very bad Wizard, I must admit."³⁵⁸

Why did Frank not hoist the Wizard of Oz, the most powerful male character, on his own petard? This question is vital assuming that Frank permitted the Wizard of Oz to symbolically say and unconsciously conceal whether the Wizard of Oz represents Benjamin. Along with her traveling companions, the Wizard exploits Dorothy, a child, who needs to get home. If her companions have consciousness and if the Wizard treats them as sentient beings, he manipulates what could be seen as their innocence. In a sense, by beguiling them, he did not act in their best interest, especially

of disappointments, Baum was still determined to pursue success as a businessman, as his father had, and was still confident of finding lucrative opportunities.").

³⁵¹ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 86–96.

³⁵² *Id.* at 100 (describing how the Tin Woodman fought off the forty wolves, showing heart and bravery, even though he said that the hexed axe had cleaved his body and killed his heart. Nevertheless, he cared enough about his traveling companions to risk himself to save them from the marauding wolves.).

³⁵³ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 135 ("'But this is terrible,' said the Tin Woodman. 'How shall I ever get my heart?' . . . 'Or I my courage?' asked the Lion. 'Or I my brains?' wailed the Scarecrow, wiping the tears from his eyes with his coat sleeve.").

³⁵⁴ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 37–39.

³⁵⁵ MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 24 ("In every adult who has suffered abuse as a child lies dormant that small child's fear of punishment at the hands of the parents if he or she should dare to rebel against their behavior.").

³⁵⁶ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 133.

³⁵⁷ *Id.* at 139.

³⁵⁸ *Id.*

given his rather paternal role in Emerald City. The Wizard says: “I was willing to promise anything if you would only do away with the other Witch.”³⁵⁹ Despite the Wizard of Oz’s obvious faults, to which he admits when the Scarecrow calls him a humbug,³⁶⁰ Oz’s justifications are neither challenged nor refuted. Like perhaps some maltreated children, Frank perhaps could not hoist Oz, or perhaps Benjamin, thusly. And so Dorothy, and perhaps Frank, needed to stay within her dream or imagination.

Along the way, Frank used *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* to say and to conceal his childhood history, to perhaps love and to condemn his devoted parents. And if Dorothy were to symbolize Frank, she would never find her voice or would rebuke Oz strongly following his defrocking. The Scarecrow, in a grieved tone, vents anger and indignation: “you’re a humbug.”³⁶¹ As such, Frank was like Fyodor Dostoevsky, who, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, wrote about a merciless father but never penned the cruelties of his actual father.³⁶² In this way, the Wizard of Oz, or Benjamin, was just “make believing” or pretending, and after all, Frank spent countless hours pretending when he was a child, perhaps creating imaginary worlds in which he was the most powerful male figure.

So, like Dorothy, who factually ignores the way her guardians had treated and reacted to her, Frank gave the Wizard of Oz—an old man—a pass, even though the Wizard of Oz placed Dorothy and her companions in harm’s way. Far from hoisting the Wizard on his shield, Frank required Dorothy, her companions, and the reader to enable Oz by keeping his secret. In so doing, Frank unconsciously got us to empathize not just with Dorothy but with the Wizard of Oz, and at much more insidious level, Frank may have unconsciously used *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* to encourage us to say symbolically and to conceal unconsciously the ways in which our parents or paternal figures have maltreated us. At this critical juncture, Frank avoided confronting Oz, who must amount to a literary surrogate person, or Benjamin indirectly, because Benjamin would have been the parent who perhaps most paralyzed Frank with fear.³⁶³

Unlike Benjamin, Frank did not have the same fear of Cynthia, and so Frank may have been able use the Wizard to kill symbolically his mother, who was perhaps represented by the Wicked Witch of the West. Hence, Frank could “accuse only the parent in whom he still had a modicum of confidence.”³⁶⁴ The biographies do not reveal any emotional, intimate ways in which Frank and Benjamin related. Frank’s father would have been old school, clearly sitting at the pinnacle of public authority in the family, and given that he left childrearing to Cynthia while he was developing his businesses, he may not have forged a very close, emotional relationship with Frank.

³⁵⁹ *Id.* at 138.

³⁶⁰ *Id.* at 133.

³⁶¹ *Id.*

³⁶² MILLER, *supra* note 1, at 44 (“I read [Dostoevsky’s letters] but found not one single instance of a letter to his father. The one and only mention of him was obviously designed to testify to the son’s consummate respect and unconditional love for him.”).

³⁶³ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 78–79.

³⁶⁴ *Id.* at 78.

On at least three instances, Frank sassed his mother, which suggests that he may not have had a very close relationship with her and that he could have had a latent hatred for her. First, he sassed and undermined her views by citing non-existent quotes or passages from the Bible.³⁶⁵ Second, he wrote *The Heretic*, in which he mocked a minister and suggested that a heretic, though a non-believer, lived more aligned with higher, spiritual principles than did the minister.³⁶⁶ In the copy he gave to Cynthia, Frank included a handwritten explanation of the sonnet, saying that not he, but the Heretic, mocked religious values.³⁶⁷ Frank himself meant Cynthia no direct disrespect.³⁶⁸ In so doing, it seems that he also presumed that Cynthia was witless and that this indirect affront would have gone undetected. Lastly, Frank attended a baseball game on the Sabbath while Cynthia visited his family, knowing she had reared them to abide this Biblical holy day.³⁶⁹

In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Frank did not have to sass or mock Cynthia indirectly. In the west, in America, in the home, she was possibly the most powerful sorcerer he had known, one who had great powers of sight or insight. Even from afar, Cynthia could see what he was or had been doing, or she could divine motives for his actions, or she could ignore his feelings having already reached her own conclusions. From Frank's view, this power enabled her to chip away at his authenticity. Although Dorothy had professed her innocence in killing the Wicked Witch of the East, she knowingly pursues the Wicked Witch of the West, having formed a pact with Oz. Yet, Frank punted, permitting Dorothy to kill the Wicked Witch of the West with water (that is, spiritual innocence). By so doing, Dorothy, and perhaps Frank, remained existentially intact because if she were to kill the Wicked Witch of the West deliberately and with malice aforethought, she would have had a motive, the locus of which would have been in the years preceding her arrival in the Land of Oz—her childhood. Apart from her pact with the Wizard, Dorothy unconsciously needed to kill her guardians because they indirectly urged her against her naturalness, just as Cynthia would have done to Frank.

In this section, the fairy-tale genre possibly permitted Frank's unconscious to suggest that his parents used their power to perhaps disempower him by rejecting his authentic feelings. Unfortunately, this genre may also have permitted Frank to possibly submerge fragments of his actual childhood history beneath the traditional motifs, structures, and conceits of fairy tales. So, on the one hand, by possibly killing or purging his parents' power from his unconscious, Frank's Dorothy grew, too. In Rogers's words, Dorothy can be "kind, responsible, self-reliant, brave,

³⁶⁵ *Id.* at 66; *supra* quotation accompanying note 306.

³⁶⁶ *Id.* at 65 ("In 'The Heretic,' an attack on conventional Christianity, the heretical speaker shows himself better than the pious deacon who tells him he will go to hell. While the heretic always tries 'To help my feller man,' the deacon drove a starving father from his door, prompting the heretic to declare, 'This selfish Christianity/Ain't good enough fer me!'"").

³⁶⁷ *Id.*

³⁶⁸ *Id.* at 66 ("The inscription on copy three, to 'My darling Mother,' shows affection but some distance between them: 'I hope you will like these little stories in verse. . . . You must remember, in reading 'The Heretic' that it is the heretic himself who is speaking, and that he only finds fault with *selfish* Christianity, which I am sure, dear, that *you* do not approve of.'").

³⁶⁹ *Id.*

sensible, honest, self-confident, yet unpretentious—just what a child would like to be and what she ought to be.”³⁷⁰ Why would a child wish to be that way? Perhaps it is because she may have known her parents preferred her not to be herself but to abide moral discipline and be what they would want. Why ought she be a particular way? If Frank had been suggesting that Dorothy was a typical role model, which Rogers detects but refuses to explore for its deeper psychological implications, then he may have ironically taken up what was perhaps society’s or his parents’ position,³⁷¹ and the Scarecrow and not Dorothy would have rebuked the Wizard of Oz, as an old paternalistic “humbug.”

It would thus appear that despite his repressed need to say symbolically and to confess unconsciously, Frank may have feared empowering children (and thus himself), for he did not realize that he himself lived in fear of truth telling.³⁷² Likewise, it is possible that his editor knew that parents bought books for their children, and Frank’s truth as I see it may have exposed those parents as batterers of their children. And so, while he removed the traditional horrors of the Grimm Brothers, Hans Christian Andersen, and Lewis Carroll from his fairy tales, Frank, like Freud, may have sabotaged the most frightening truth that would have destabilized his repression and would have probably caused him angst. What was that truth? In Freud’s day, it was that parents sexually molested their children.³⁷³ In Frank’s day, a period not too far in time from Freud’s, it was that parents symbolically murdered their children in the name of moral discipline. In this way, Frank could have used *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* to speak frankly and plainly about his experiences as a child; however, perhaps because his fear was deep and real, Frank could never have betrayed his parents³⁷⁴ even though he may have wished to end the internal fight between his thinking and feeling by healing and authenticating.

B. HEALING AND AUTHENTICATING

In the foregoing section, I argued that Frank ultimately constrained Dorothy and betrayed the children who read *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. This constraint and betrayal would have been linked to Frank’s desire to heal and to authenticate himself. None of us can truly compartmentalize our motives and actions. To focus on actions at the expense of motives implies that the agent is completely aware of and focused on that which the

³⁷⁰ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 76.

³⁷¹ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 88–91.

³⁷² See *id.* at 82. In discussing the extent to which journalistic program might go divert their viewers/parents from information about why they abuse their children and how to break the cycle, Miller writes:

The organizers of this program also had a childhood and also have parents. Were they to provide complete information to their audience along with a chance to absorb it, their own repressions might be badly shaken. That would produce great anxiety. . . . They . . . aren’t aware of any fear. If they were able to feel this fear, they wouldn’t have to provide so much diversion. But people whose feelings were deadened in childhood know nothing of their own fear. They don’t realize the lengths to which they go to avoid the feeling of fear.

Id.

³⁷³ See SIGMUND FREUD, *Letter to Fliess*, in THE FREUD READER, *supra* note 75, at 112.

³⁷⁴ See MILLER, *supra* note 36, at 88–90.

agent wishes to reject. So in Frank's case, it would follow that if he could not speak frankly and plainly about his need to dethrone the Wizard of Oz, or perhaps Benjamin, and to kill the Wicked Witches of the East and the West because he feared what was perhaps psychologically hardwired into his psyche, then it is possible that Frank's need to heal would have floundered on the rocks of his deep fears of knowing the truth about his lost childhood history. It was probably not that Frank had not been thunderstruck by epiphanies. Given his writings, he may have had "Ah ha!" moments; however, he may have resisted their broader implications, lest he would have been shaken from his emotional blindness.

At the same time, it is possible that Frank rejected the moral discipline on which his parents may have premised their child-rearing practices. I suspect that Matilda became his surrogate mother. By joining the Theosophy Society, he may have been able to share his insights with other like-minded folks, even though Frank and Maud did not easily make friends.³⁷⁵ Moreover, through Theosophy, he may have been able to breakdown the moral discipline of Methodism because his parents may have relied on it to rationalize their probably abusive child-rearing practices. The foregoing suggests that he may have needed an "enlightened witness,"³⁷⁶ and perhaps in Matilda he found one. Unfortunately, none of the foregoing shows that Frank embraced his unspoken fear and accepted the probable truth about his parents and his childhood. At his base, he needed to reconcile the tension between his thinking and feelings, which underscored what was possibly his life-long struggle. This struggle may also suggest that Frank had inner, conflicting sub-personalities, which he symbolically reconciled in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.

In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Frank's inner, conflicting sub-personalities would have been symbolized by Dorothy, Toto, the Cowardly Lion, the Tin Woodman, and the Scarecrow. Dorothy represents Frank's inner spiritual innocence, that knowing with which we are born. That innocence is completed with Toto, or natural instincts. Consider that when Aunt Em screams at Dorothy as the cyclone approaches, Toto jumps out of Dorothy's arms.³⁷⁷ Toto's reaction suggests that her guardian's treatment of her disturbed Dorothy at a very deep, instinctive level. By searching for and collecting Toto, Dorothy, now complete, avoids the small, dark hole because in her naturalness, such a place would be incompatible with her authenticity. Lastly, Toto seems to express feelings that she might have repressed. For example, after Dorothy meets the North Witch, who then leaves by spinning and disappearing, it is Toto who "bark[s] after her loudly enough when she had gone, because he had been afraid even to

³⁷⁵ LONCRANE, *supra* note 5, at 172 (writing to his son Harry, Baum admitted: "I miss friends at times. . . . Here I have many acquaintances, but 'outside my home no intimacies. I do not make friends easily, nor does Maud.'").

³⁷⁶ MILLER, *supra* note 145, at x-xi ("In adult life, a role similar to that of childhood's helping witness may be taken over by an *enlightened witness*. By this I mean someone who is aware of the consequences that neglect and cruelty in childhood can have. Enlightened witnesses support these harmed individuals, empathize with them, and help them gain an understanding of their feelings of anxiety and powerlessness as products of their own history rather than as some frightening, mysterious force.").

³⁷⁷ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 3.

growl while she stood by.”³⁷⁸ In the face of the North Witch, Dorothy felt what Toto actually expressed because the two characters are one.

Although Dorothy and Toto were one, Dorothy could not have come into her own existentially, spiritually, and psychologically without integrating her sub-personalities, which, by implication, I believe that she must have needed to cope with the loss of her parents and with her guardians’ child-rearing practices. In Frank’s case, the Scarecrow is the sub-personality that would have permitted Frank to accept his family’s mindset and rationalize how he was raised. Frank, like Dorothy, needed to be there. That is what we are taught. Long before children learn to think that way, however, they may consider running away from violent maltreatment. Consider the case of Renee Bowman in Maryland.³⁷⁹ Defendant Bowman had adopted three daughters; two, Minnet and Jasmine died at her hands.³⁸⁰ Even though the third daughter had no place to go, had been threatened repeatedly, had been choked so many times she lost count, and was dressed only in a shirt and underwear, she leaped from a second-story window, lest she be killed, too.³⁸¹ This surviving third child, who later testified against her mother,³⁸² thought not like Frank, or Dorothy, but like the brainless Scarecrow, who cannot fathom why Dorothy wishes to go home, a place in which her guardians do not support her authentic feelings. Indeed, the Scarecrow aptly states that if we had heads “stuffed with straw, like [his, we] would probably all live in the beautiful places, and then Kansas would have no people at all.”³⁸³ I read “beautiful places” to mean natural, imaginative, and authentic feelings. Kansas thus symbolized a repressed existence, in which parents or guardians continuously murder their children’s imaginations and authentic feelings by forcing them to reject their natural instincts and authentic feelings and to accept mental concepts like moral discipline. With each passing repressive moment, thinking dominated feelings, which would have been Frank’s life-long struggle. Interestingly, Rogers gets this point, without linking it to Frank’s probable abusive childhood.³⁸⁴ By having Dorothy rescue the Scarecrow, by having them travel the Yellow Brick Road, and by sharing experiences together not in which rational processes but rather intuitive actions

³⁷⁸ *Id.* at 16.

³⁷⁹ Scott McCabe, *Adoptive Mom Gets Life in Prison for Freezer Deaths*, WASH. EXAMINER, Mar. 23, 2010, <http://dev.www.washingtonexaminer.com/local/crime/Adoptive-mom-gets-life-in-prison-for-freezer-deaths-88853727.html>. Miller argues that children who can feel will not become angry, murdering people. Rather, she argues that children, who cannot feel, who have repressed their feelings around their childhood maltreatment, will probably kill proxies or surrogate. It is clear that Renee Bowman suffered traumatic maltreatment during her childhood, which she arguably repressed, so that she lost touch with her buried feelings. At the trial, “Bowman apologized but showed no emotion.” *Id.*

³⁸⁰ *Id.*
³⁸¹ Victoria Pollard, *U.S. Woman Convicted of Murdering Her Adopted Daughters*, PATTAYA DAILY NEWS (Thai.), Feb. 23, 2010, <http://www.pattayadailynews.com/en/2010/02/23/14030/> (“Her crimes came to light when a surviving girl was found then aged 7 years after she managed to escape. The girl was only semi dressed and covered in blood.”).

³⁸² Kealan Oliver, *9-Year-Old Says “Ex-Mom” Renee Bowman Murdered Step-Sisters, Kept Bodies in Freezer*, CBS NEWS, Feb. 18, 2010, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-504083_162-6217712-504083.html?tag=mncol%3blst%3b1 (“The girl said Bowman repeatedly beat her and her sisters with a baseball bat and a shoe. She also stated she was beaten the worst on “the back part and the front part,” using her teddy bear to demonstrate where she was hit. She pointed to its backside and its crotch.”).

³⁸³ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 27.

³⁸⁴ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 81.

effectively deal with challenges, Frank attempted to integrate his thinking and feelings.

Similarly, Dorothy needed to integrate the Tin Woodman into her wholeness. “Baum” means wood, in German, and, in this way, Frank hinted at his identity with him. The Tin Woodman would have symbolically flowed out of Frank’s abusive childhood. I speculate that Frank had a very deeply repressed memory of his parents winnowing away at him. Perhaps beginning in his childhood, they would have taken a piece here and there, until he eventually felt that none of his authentic feelings were left. In the Tin Woodman’s case, it was women who doomed “the son of a woodman” or perhaps the son of Benjamin.³⁸⁵ The old, lazy woman wanted to keep her daughter enslaved, exploiting and siphoning off her vitality.³⁸⁶ To do so, she had to deny her daughter love, happiness, and marriage.³⁸⁷ To achieve that bit of evil work, the old woman promised the Wicked Witch of the East booty if she enchanted the Tin Woodman’s axe.³⁸⁸ The Tin Woodman, who was building a new house (read: shifting, new consciousness) for them, cut off his own body parts, and, with the help of a tinsmith, eventually has an exoskeleton made of metal.³⁸⁹ Indirectly, Frank revealed that mothers, including Cynthia, used their status, backed by moral precepts, to undermine his heart’s desires. Eventually, his heart’s feelings would have been repressed to the point of deadening them.

Tragically, Frank implicated himself in the dirty work, possibly revealing that he suppressed his feelings, too. With increasing cunning by the Wicked Witch of the East, she wants to kill his dauntless spirit.³⁹⁰ By not yielding, the Wicked Witch of the East is perhaps like a parent who needs to kill the first sign of a child’s willfulness, which she must never tolerate if she is to rear a proper, obedient child.³⁹¹ By continuing to cut down trees to earn enough money, to build a house, and to marry the Munchkin girl—despite the degree to which he gradually lost his humanity—the Tin Woodman is continually disobedient. Despite what his disobedience costs him, especially not that he was simply a tinman, he continues to pursue a near prime directive—know love. To end the Tin Woodman’s impudence, the Wicked Witch of the East causes him to kill his heart, the very source of his indomitable spirit. The Tin Woodman’s axe falls, “splitting [himself] into two halves.”³⁹² It is the witch’s spell (read, Cynthia’s power) that fells the axe, but it is in the Tin Woodman’s (or Frank’s) hand. Frank had unconsciously done her work. Frank had repressed his feelings. Without a heart and his authentic feelings, he would be weak. To survive but not truly live, Frank would make peace, and in so doing, he would protect his fragile heart. Along the way, Frank (or the Tin

³⁸⁵ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 38–40.

³⁸⁶ *Id.*

³⁸⁷ *Id.*

³⁸⁸ *Id.*

³⁸⁹ *Id.*

³⁹⁰ *Id.* at 39–40.

³⁹¹ See GREVEN, *supra* note 7, at 21 (“Esther Burr surely was repeating the experiences she had had as a child herself, thus following her mother’s practice of resisting ‘the first, as well as every subsequent exhibition of temper or disobedience in the child, however young.’”).

³⁹² BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 40.

Woodman) would learn a valuable lesson about a mother's wicked power: do not question the power of a strong woman, who he has married, broker peace, and spare the heart any further pain.³⁹³

Without feelings he could trust, having worked so hard to distrust them, Frank, through the Tin Woodman, was at war with himself: perhaps thinking or feeling, but not both. "But, alas! I had now no heart, so that I lost all my love for the Munchkin girl, and did not care whether I married her or not."³⁹⁴ By loving her, Frank would have seen himself in her through his feelings. Once he was cleaved, Frank could think but not feel, and without such feelings, Frank would have identified not with his Higher Self, but with his small, egoistic self: his rational mind. Broken hearted, Frank would have become, bit by bit, what his parents perhaps wanted of him. But Cynthia, his primary caregiver, was perhaps the Wicked Witch of the West, who possibly enforced those wants. At some point, the Tin Woodman accepts his fate. He identifies with what he had become. With a hardened shell and a stronger ego, he can no longer be hurt, not even by his own mistakes with his axe.³⁹⁵ In the end, Frank would have become this way: perhaps thinking first, feeling later. And perhaps when he did feel, he probably suffered "obsessive regrets."³⁹⁶ For example, he made an impulsive decision to take a journalist job.³⁹⁷ Then he discovered that with each passing week, he made less money.³⁹⁸ Then, he had to quit.³⁹⁹ He also would have had to live with the impact on Maud and the children. Hence, through the Tin Woodman's character, Frank symbolically revealed to us that even after he became an adult, he may have suffered self-inflicted wounds because he may have struggled with integrating thinking and feeling.

Unfortunately, Frank perhaps did not heal, even though he more than likely authentically and unconsciously confessed what had happened to him. By telling his lost childhood history in part through *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, especially by realigning his sub-personalities as the Scarecrow, Tin Woodman, and the Lion, Frank perhaps had the potential to discover the truth, which would have been deeply associated with repressed emotions and experiences, and Frank would not have been able to confront them directly. For example, when Cynthia chided him for attending a baseball game on the Sabbath, Frank could have acknowledged his mother's religious values, and he could have said, "No thanks. I am an adult, and I will pick my own road to heaven." He did not do so. Rather,

³⁹³ See BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 47 ("His young wife, [Maud] however, had grown up in a sterner school which for all its advanced social ideas was actually truer to an older tradition . . ."); ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 30 ("When Maud was discontented and irritable, Frank did not blame her. . . .").

³⁹⁴ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 40.

³⁹⁵ *Id.* ("My body shone so brightly in the sun that I felt very proud of it and it did not matter now if my axe slipped, for it could not cut me."). For the Tin Woodman, or Frank, the only danger was living without oil. "There was only one danger—that my joints would rust; but I kept an oil-can in my cottage and took care to oil myself whenever I needed it." *Id.* At an unconscious level, was Frank saying that he could not live without his father's oil money? Or what his father, Benjamin, had come to symbolize through his oil investments and production? Power?

³⁹⁶ Cf. MILLMAN, *supra* note 51, at 205.

³⁹⁷ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 54.

³⁹⁸ *Id.*

³⁹⁹ *Id.*

when Cynthia visited Frank's family, he stayed away from baseball games if they were held on the Sabbath.⁴⁰⁰ When she was not there, he did as he pleased.⁴⁰¹ This timidity reveals that Frank may have been unable to directly accuse his parents, and thus he may have been unable to heal because accusations and healing require accessing the unvarnished truth, speaking it, and reliving the pain.⁴⁰² Few of us may speak that way and those who do may still be repressing what they potentially fear most—reprisals even from dead parents. In *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Frank did not speak this way; I believe, by possibly avoiding the pain, the truth, the healing, and hence the authenticity, he may have failed to confess, even if unconsciously, and his potential truth would have remained in the shadows of his imagination.

In many ways, Frank had deluded himself, possibly believing that despite the shadows of his imagination, the scarecrows in his dreams, he could raise his lost childhood history from the graveyard of repression and thus heal. For example, in a later book, *The Tin Woodman of Oz*, Frank asserted that despite the relentless chiseling away at him, in which, at some level, he may have participated by splitting and by becoming an "Unreal Self," he could have still fathomed his own authenticity. Janov suggests that Frank could not easily accomplish this degree of remembering.⁴⁰³ Nevertheless, Frank wrote: "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."⁴⁰⁴ In the beginning, a person is a child with real needs. As that child grows up, the child faces violence, humiliation, mockery, rejection, and manipulation. The child is faced with demands for strict moral discipline. Finally, the child gets the point: to get love, the child must become what makes the child's parents happy and proud. And so the child does. The child "must separate [the child's] sensations (hunger, wanting to be held) from consciousness. This separation of oneself from one's needs and feelings is an instinctive maneuver to shut off excessive pain. We call it *the split*. The organism splits in order to protect its continuity."⁴⁰⁵ After the split, so that the child potentially becomes a neurotic, chasing fame and status, so that the child can compensate for the love his father could never have offered to him, Frank awoke, and he was the Tin Woodman. He was also a neurotic, and by definition, he would have been unable to tell the truth. Perhaps he did. I doubt he would have ever if, as I believe, he possibly would not or could not confront the sacred name and image of his dead father. I speculate that if Benjamin had not ultimately died of

⁴⁰⁰ *Id.* at 66.

⁴⁰¹ *Id.*

⁴⁰² See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 16–17 ("But *there is no painless way out of neurosis*. In conventional therapy, a patient who promises to be 'honest' with his therapist and bare all his 'secrets' can't be honest because he doesn't know his secrets; and many of them lie deep in his cells.").

⁴⁰³ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 22 (explaining that while the maltreated child consciously shifts away from her authentic feelings and being so that she can please the parent, she acts increasingly "unreal, that is, not in accord with the reality of [her] own needs and desires. In a short time the neurotic behavior becomes automatic.").

⁴⁰⁴ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 81 (quoting L. FRANK BAUM, *THE TIN WOODMAN OF OZ* 30 (Reilly & Britton, 1918)).

⁴⁰⁵ JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 19–20.

complications from a freak head injury,⁴⁰⁶ Frank perhaps would not have felt compelled to “keep his father’s image sacred and displace his feelings onto other people and situations. All poets do this; they have to.”⁴⁰⁷

As, I believe, Frank’s profound interest in fantasy and fairy tales revealed, he would have rather taken refuge in the realm of the imaginative possibilities, in which he had absolute power, than perhaps to have dealt decisively and directly with what may have happened to him. In the former, he may have remained a powerful literary figure of great social fame, and in the latter, he may have healed, gradually weakening the possible vice grip by which his neurosis governed his life.⁴⁰⁸ Unfortunately, Frank chose power and fame, and, ultimately, betrayed himself and his child readers.

C. REPRESSION AND BETRAYAL OF CHILDREN

Glinda, the Good Witch of the South, may have been Cynthia when, in Frank’s eyes, she was meeting his needs. Yet, when Glinda helps Dorothy return to Kansas, which means helping her return to the emptiness of a world without imagination, creativity, or beauty, Glinda tells Dorothy that the power to return lies within her if she does the right thing.⁴⁰⁹ The silver shoes are given to Dorothy by the Good Witch of the North after Dorothy’s house lands on the Wicked Witch of the East and kills her. By wearing the shoes, Dorothy might not have gained appreciable knowing or experiences in dealing with the Land of Oz. Rather, whatever power Dorothy gains came from direct experience and from learning how to trust herself. In this way, the shoes suggest that Dorothy needs to learn how to use the things of a bad person for good purposes. Put differently—and Glinda helps her with this point—Dorothy had it within her power to return to home, or to get affection, or to get love, or to get support, by following instruction. Basically, then, if Dorothy wishes to get home, or affection, or a hug, or love, etc., she must do so in three steps.⁴¹⁰ And she follows those instructions, and she arrives home.⁴¹¹ Along the way home, though, she loses the shoes.⁴¹² Toto rushes toward the guardians, thus revealing the child’s natural instincts to get love and to be accepted, even by guardians who really do not get her.

Yet, why are things different when Dorothy returns from the Land of Oz? Is it because Dorothy is different, having gained invaluable experiences and garnered real healing by working closely and gaining trust with her sub-personalities? Or did Frank engage in a *deus ex machina* ending? He decided that now Dorothy can see beauty in a place where it

⁴⁰⁶ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 17–18.

⁴⁰⁷ MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 56. *See also* SIGMUND FREUD, *The Relation of the Poet to Day-Dreaming*, in ON CREATIVITY AND THE UNCONSCIOUS: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ART, LITERATURE, LOVE, AND RELIGION 44–54 (Benjamin Nelson ed., 2009).

⁴⁰⁸ *See* JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 20. Survival and continuity do not end the neurotic suffering. *See id.* His needs “continue through life, exerting a persistent, unconscious force toward the satisfaction of those needs. But because the needs have been suppressed in the consciousness, the individual must pursue substitute gratification. Because he was not allowed to express himself as an infant, he may be compelled to try to get others to listen and understand later in life.” *Id.*

⁴⁰⁹ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 183, 185, 187.

⁴¹⁰ *Id.* at 187.

⁴¹¹ *Id.*

⁴¹² *Id.* at 188.

once never existed. Is the beauty that perhaps Dorothy now sees what Miller refers to as “emotional blindness”? If so, then Frank betrayed all of the child readers of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. If so, then Kansas was either truly gray, washed out and barren, or Dorothy’s perspective made it that way. Frank suggested that whatever grayness existed in Kansas, it was Dorothy’s view. If so, then perhaps her guardians were not really that disinterested in her welfare. If so, then Frank took Freud’s route by blaming children for the sexual molestations they faced and suffered.⁴¹³ By analogy, then, if the guardians were mean, Dorothy perhaps brought it on herself. If they were not mean and she just misunderstood them, then perhaps they were right to treat her that way if it had been in their best judgment that Dorothy needed to play less, laugh lower, and fulfill more household duties.

Along the way, Frank revealed that Dorothy is weak,⁴¹⁴ despite learning how to trust herself and her split-off sub-personalities to use her voice and to rely on her inner, natural gifts. It is the Wizard of Oz who, upon seeing the silver shoes on her feet, understands that children are quite powerful because within their innocence they can destroy evil, dark, or frustrated adults who wish to control them, and so the Wizard of Oz manipulates her and her sub-personalities to kill something over which he has no real power.⁴¹⁵ Unfortunately, in Frank’s eyes, children had no rights.⁴¹⁶ Yet, given his repression, Frank would not have been “allowed to *know* it about himself on the conscious level.”⁴¹⁷ As a likely abused child, Frank may have found an authentic way to tell his childhood story through a number of different published pieces. I have argued, however, that Frank may have hidden the personal implications of his work from himself and his readers—children.

And so, when Frank presented Dorothy as weak, he did so by not permitting her to accept obvious facts. For example, Dorothy denies that she played any role in killing the Wicked Witch of the East. She even refuses to acknowledge that her house killed the witch, even though one of the munchkins says that it was the same thing. Dorothy remains silent. She may be in denial. In the face of powerful forces, Dorothy cannot gain the support and protection of the North Witch, and when Glinda, the South Witch helps her, it is because Dorothy had to purify herself through near ritual bathing⁴¹⁸ and then essentially plead her case.⁴¹⁹ She also did the

⁴¹³ See generally JEFFREY MOUSSAIEFF MASSON, *THE ASSAULT ON TRUTH: FREUD’S SUPPRESSION OF THE SEDUCTION THEORY* (1984).

⁴¹⁴ BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 87 (“I am Dorothy, the Small and Meek. I have come to you for help.”); *id.* at 89 (“Because you are strong and I am weak; because you are a Great Wizard and I am only a little girl.”).

⁴¹⁵ *Id.* at 89 (“‘But you were strong enough to kill the Wicked Witch of the East,’ said Oz.”).

⁴¹⁶ See, e.g., Robert W. ten Bensele, Marguerite M. Rheinberger & Samuel X. Radbill, *Children in a World of Violence: The Roots of Child Maltreatment*, in *THE BATTERED CHILD* 3–28 (Mary Edna Helfer, Ruth S. Kempe & Richard D. Krugman eds., 1997). See generally GREVEN, *supra* note 7.

⁴¹⁷ See MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 59.

⁴¹⁸ See BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 182. Baum writes:

Before they went to see Glinda, however, they were taken to a room of the Castle, where Dorothy washed her face and combed her hair, and the Lion shook the dust out of his mane, and the Scarecrow patted himself into his best shape, and the Woodman polished his tin and oiled his joints.

same with the Wizard Oz.⁴²⁰ In Glinda's case, by asking her help, especially from an adult-like figure, I believe Frank presents Dorothy as kind, but ineffectual.⁴²¹ Who has the power? Who has knowledge? Who guides her? Adults!

Here is another example. Dorothy has the silver cap, which controls the flying monkeys.⁴²² When she invokes its powers and the monkey king arrives, he tells her only that he cannot fly her across the desert. If she wanted to be powerful within the Land of Oz, she could. Yet, she would have to remain in the land of fantasy, where it seems she has more control over her circumstances by ruling one of the kingdoms.

Another example. Dorothy and her companion go south, and they finally meet with Glinda, who tells her that Dorothy has always had the power to get what she wants.⁴²³ And what does Dorothy really want? Frank perhaps expressed this want symbolically and symptomatically. Dorothy wants to go home, hoping to alleviate her guardians' arguable suffering and worry.⁴²⁴ In short, she wants to go home so that she can be loved or appreciated for not adding to their emotional burdens. According to Frank, Dorothy's ability to get love and appreciation was always within her control. She impliedly needed to follow instructions, and she needed to rely not on her inner wisdom or experiential knowledge, but on an external object, which came directly from the Wicked Witch of the East—her shoes.

Did the shoes contain a hint of the oppressive thoughts or negative energy of the dead Wicked Witch of the East?

By having Dorothy rely on an external object or talisman, Frank may have returned us to the split between thinking and feelings that possibly hampered him; he implied that children, in this case Dorothy, never come into power so long as they are little and must appeal to larger, physically powerful adults (that is, parents) to get the affection that they need. Even today, and especially in the minds of parents of the mid-1800s, that appeal positioned children as legally weak and arguably morally powerless,⁴²⁵ and because they could have been beaten or been denied on a whim what they wanted, children also had no legally cognizable rights or no affirmative defenses against physical punishment.⁴²⁶

When they were all quite presentable they followed the soldier girl into a big room where the Witch Glinda sat upon a throne of rubies.

Id.

⁴¹⁹ *Id.* at 182–83.

⁴²⁰ *Id.* at 86–90.

⁴²¹ *See id.* at 87 (“I am Dorothy, the Small and Meek. I have come to you for help.”).

⁴²² *Id.* at 119.

⁴²³ *See id.* at 185–88.

⁴²⁴ *Id.* at 13 (“I am anxious to get back to my aunt and uncle, for I am sure they will worry about me.”); *id.* at 183 (“Aunt Em will surely think something dreadful has happened to me, and that will make her put on mourning; . . .”).

⁴²⁵ *See, e.g., supra* note 267.

⁴²⁶ *See, e.g., State v. Kaimimoku*, 841 P.2d 1076, 1080 (Haw. Ct. App. 1992). In *State v. Kaimimoku*, the “Father testified that he used force on Daughter to punish her for yelling profanities at him, disobeying him, and being disrespectful. Daughter admitted that she yelled profanities at Father and that she did not obey him when he told her not to yell profanities at him.” *Id.* Under the statutory law of Hawaii at the time of the case, “parents [had] considerable autonomy to discipline their children, and as long as parents use moderate force for permissible purposes in disciplining their children and do not create a substantial risk of the excessive injuries . . . , they will not be criminally liable.” *Id.* For the case that

V. CONCLUSION: TO HATE A CHILD

Picasso, however, did not have the opportunity to express himself spontaneously as a child; . . . it took forty years before he was able to paint like a child, that is, to let his unconscious speak.

– Alice Miller

*The Untouched Key*⁴²⁷

In the end, why did Frank write *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*? Although this query arguably applies to all his writings, the Oz series seems to hold a special place in American fairy-tale literature.⁴²⁸ Was he like Picasso, stung by something so powerful (in Picasso's case, an earthquake when he was three-years old) as an infant or child, which was traumatic, he had to shut it away? Eventually, the unconscious, which never sleeps, had to speak about what Frank may have had hidden there, in a way that could not bring an end to his life. In Frank's case, that something was the abuse, manipulation, and humiliation from Benjamin and Cynthia—except in his mother's case, she may have both assaulted him and shown him loving tenderness. Without his mother's ambivalence and without his siblings and cousins, Frank may have compensated for his trauma and repression not by creatively using his imagination to write, act, sing, and dance,⁴²⁹ but possibly by hurting, maiming, and killing others.⁴³⁰

Just because Frank found creative ways in which to confess unconsciously his childhood trauma, does not mean that he did not struggle, suffer, and compensate for what his parents may have done to him. He struggled because he wanted Benjamin, his father, most of all to love him. And I also suspect that Benjamin did love him just as John had loved Benjamin—conditionally. According to Janov, such conditional love meets the parents' need for control, domination, and morality, none of which meets the child's need to be held and to be touched.⁴³¹ Hence, Benjamin's love may have caused Frank a primal pain, with which he may have only been able to cope by numbing the pain, possibly hiding the experience deep within his body, and becoming arguably what his father, and mother, required of him. By so doing, I argue that Frank may have unconsciously struggled to find out what it would take to garner that love.

That struggle would have caused Frank to suffer. Through his whole life, he favored thinking over feeling. This preference may have supported his need to repress what may have been denied to him when he was an infant. Eventually, he struck a balance between the two from time to time; however, this *détente* did not free him. Before and after writing *The*

holds that the Eighth Amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment does not apply to the use of corporal punishment in public schools, see *Ingraham v. Wright*, 430 U.S. 651 (1977).

⁴²⁷ MILLER, *supra* note 4, at 14.

⁴²⁸ See ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 92, 247–50.

⁴²⁹ See generally A-M. GHADIRIAN, CREATIVE DIMENSIONS OF SUFFERING (2009) (relating the creative process to suffering).

⁴³⁰ See MILLER, *supra* note 1 at 21.

⁴³¹ See, e.g., JANOV, *supra* note 28, at 16 (“[The child] needs not only to be touched, as he will for the rest of his life, but to be allowed to express his feelings—to be angry, to be negative, to say ‘no,’ and to not have to obey instantly when someone gives him an order. In short, his feelings must be respected.”); *id.* at 22–23.

Wonderful Wizard of Oz, Frank may have continued to put a blowtorch to the hinges that held fast the door to his deepest repressions. Put differently, his unconscious may have attempted to get him to confront his truth by placing symbolic clues in his conscious mind and on the pages in front of him and by hoping that he would be like the children in the Brothers Grimm classic *Hansel and Gretel* and discover that his mother may have fattened him up with love so that she could destroy him through mental concepts like moral discipline. I believe that unfortunately, Frank refused the invitation, ultimately because he may have deeply and unconsciously feared violent reprisals from his parents even though, by then, Benjamin had died. And so, Frank's suffering likely continued.

Yet, struggling and suffering may have conjoined when Frank sought a way out. The way out may have been writing, but this creative process may have served an unstated purpose: fame and fortune. Perhaps as a child's fantasy, Frank believed that if he acquired these things, his father, dead or alive, would love him. Or perhaps he hoped that if he acquired these things, then the pain would cease. And so, he was driven to write. When he and Maud took vacations, she wrote letters to the children because whenever he got a moment, Frank was writing his current project while musing on the next to come.⁴³² Relief never comes so easily, never purchased so cheaply. Frank's neurosis was so primal. Until he was willing to confront the truth, he may have never found his way to his authentic feelings. Still further, he pursued fortune, and, after the success of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, I believe that Frank did not just enjoy his well-earned success. After *The Wizard of Oz* was a hit on Broadway, he sought to build a greater fortune with his own theatrical, vaudeville, and film productions, including, *Fairylogue* and *Radio Plays*, which, despite its success, brought him financial ruin.⁴³³ As it would happen, he was bankrupt or suffered the fate of ill-advised investments.⁴³⁴ Biographers Baum and MacFall note that Frank often struggled with near bankruptcy, even though Maud could ably manage their finances.⁴³⁵ Why did he need more? If Frank unconsciously needed to validate who he thought he needed to become, and if financial uncertainty brought that need into doubt, then he may have needed what Benjamin had. He may have needed standing, power, and control. Without them, Frank did not know who he was because he may have been convinced that if he were Benjamin, he would be loved. In the end, he unconsciously longed for the love he perhaps never quite felt.

⁴³² LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 217–19. While touring Europe after the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906, Frank and Maud visited popular tourist sites, and all the while, Frank “continued to write, fulfilling the demands of the 1905 contract with Reilly & Britton. In Sicily, he wrote on the terrace of his hotel, from which he could see Mount Etna . . .” *Id.* at 219.

⁴³³ *Id.* at 234.

⁴³⁴ See *id.* at 244–45; ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 16 (“As Harry said, ‘Mother was Father’s exact opposite. She was serious, unimaginative and realistic—and it was a good thing, too. Father went bankrupt more than once [sic—actually only once] investing in some wild scheme. She finally took control and kept the family solvent.’”).

⁴³⁵ See BAUM & MACFALL, *supra* note 21, at 276 (explaining that Maud had been Frank’s business manager, and she had insisted that Frank assign copyrights to her as soon as they were issued); *id.* (“She deposited all checks in her personal account and paid all household expenses. [Frank] kept a small checking account under an arrangement with the bank that he was to be notified when it was overdrawn. . . . Maud would deposit enough money to keep her husband in funds for a while.”); LONCRINE, *supra* note 5, at 110.

In this way, struggling, suffering, and compensation may have become hopelessly intertwined. I will address how Frank may have compensated by looking to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. One of the ways that he attempted to compensate was through children. First, he may have needed to love children. This need would have grown out of his infancy in which Benjamin and Cynthia may have abused him. It was the very first time he may have felt powerless. He would have hated that feeling, and to end his pain, he may have wanted to be and not be Benjamin. To have become Benjamin, he would have had to have been loved or, at least, powerful. To have not become Benjamin, Frank may have to have slogged through the sludge of his repressed life to get to the probable truth. Ah, that may have been far too painful. And so, Frank compensated by loving children.

Second, I suspect that Frank actually hated children because he may have thought that they stood for weak, powerless, and right-less beings. And so, while he may have acted like the Pied Piper, he was not. He may have been beaten and abused because he may have been too weak to fight back. By extension, from him, all children might be too dependent, afraid, or weak, also. He may have been powerless to effect a different outcome, and so, to him, all children would have suffered this inability. He may have been unable to invoke authority, either within the family or from society, to save him from what Benjamin and Cynthia may have done, and so, to him, all children may have had this disability. Deep within himself, Frank perhaps loathed what it meant to be a child, and he may have been unable to consciously find a way out unless he was possibly deeply committed to unearthing what he repressed. He was not so committed. And so, when Frank wrote *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, I suspect that unconsciously, he may still have been that weak, powerless, and legally disabled adult child. He may have had to access that part of himself to tell his story of a world in which everything a child would ever want grew on trees. Yet, in *Adventures in Phunniland* or in the later Oz series installments, love never grows on trees. I speculate that in Frank's fantasy, he may have been able to get everything except what he would have really wanted: Benjamin's love. Without this ability, Frank would have remained what he unconsciously loathed because no matter how much he wrote and published, he may have never got what may have been deliberately denied to him—genuine, unconditional love.⁴³⁶

As such, Frank may have been singularly unable to construct a truly powerful child in Dorothy. Rather, he kept her innocent, and, when the Wicked Witches of the East and West are killed, they die from Dorothy's benign innocence. When the Wicked Witch of the West sends her wolf minions after Dorothy,⁴³⁷ the Tin Woodman cuts off the heads of the marauding wolves.⁴³⁸ Where is Dorothy? Sleeping, never seeing the power to kill those who are moved by dark, powerful forces.⁴³⁹ And so, Dorothy

⁴³⁶ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 22–23.

⁴³⁷ The Wicked Witch of the West also sent 40 wild crows, a swarm of black bees, enslaved Winkies, and the Winged Monkeys against Dorothy, Toto, the Tin Woodman, the Scarecrow, and the Lion. BAUM, *supra* note 40, at 101, 103–04, 106–08.

⁴³⁸ *Id.* at 100.

⁴³⁹ *Id.* at 99, 101.

stays innocent, while she garners enough experience so that she could arguably integrate her sub-personalities. In the end, Dorothy's greatest power comes from learning how to ask for help from adults and following a good witch's (or perhaps a good mother's) proper instructions. Why? Despite Cynthia's probable abuse of him, Frank desperately may have needed to believe in a "mother" who loved him, touched him, rescued him, and supported him. In so believing, Frank unconsciously may have faulted himself for not knowing how to be and act like Dorothy—possibly the perfect child of the 1850s and 1860s. Rather than faulting his parents for not accepting him and his authentic feelings, Frank would have laid the blame at his own feet, and thus at the feet of all children.

In short, I speculate that Frank may have hated himself, including the child within him, and thus he may have unconsciously despised all children.

In the end, how does a child return to the arms of loving parents or guardians? How should a child see the world? When can a child expect to get what he needs? According to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, a child must ask with the proper sense of self-awareness, which comes from experience and manners.⁴⁴⁰ To see the world correctly, I argue that a child may have to adopt the views of the child's parents or guardians. Rather, by inference, a child is apt to get what she needs not by following her heart, feelings, or imagination, on which Frank placed such value in the child's success and on human beings' progress,⁴⁴¹ but perhaps by following adult instructions on how to properly manipulate not inner but external objects that have always been within the child's (or possibly Dorothy's) reach.

In so saying, and in permitting good adults to guide Dorothy safely back to her world, I argue that Frank may have suggested that he may not have completely trusted an imaginative world in which adults, or parental authority, may not have played a key role in the child's ultimate survival.

⁴⁴⁰ See JANOV, *supra* note 15, at 23 (arguing that a well-mannered child must say "please" and "thank you," which thus permits a parent, who represses a child's natural in-born wellness and authenticity, to be in control and to feel like a good parent).

⁴⁴¹ ROGERS, *supra* note 9, at 92.

