Monsters of Film, Fiction, and Fable

Monsters of Film, Fiction, and Fable:

The Cultural Links between the Human and Inhuman

Edited by

Lisa Wenger Bro,
Crystal O'Leary-Davidson
and Mary Ann Gareis

Monsters of Film, Fiction, and Fable:
The Cultural Links between the Human and Inhuman

Edited by Lisa Wenger Bro, Crystal O'Leary-Davidson
and Mary Ann Gareis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

THE CULTURAL LINKS BETWEEN THE HUMAN AND INHUMAN

BY LISA WENGER BRO

Monsters are deeply embedded in our cultural fabric, moving across epochs from ancient mythology to folk and fairy tales to literature, and then film and television. The collected essays in this volume will explore the cultural implications of monsters, particularly those of the 20th and 21st centuries, delving into the various social, economic, and political issues that these monsters reflect. Long tied to ideas of the Other, the inhuman have represented societal fears for centuries. In fact, the dawning imperialist age saw a resurgence of these gothic horrors, particularly in fiction such as Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. Civilized Victorian society reinvented the monstrous myths, projecting their fears about those they were colonizing onto the monsters that populated the pages. This resurgence expanded during Modernist times with the advent of radio, film, and television. Society quaked in terror over the reported aliens in *War of the Worlds* and Count Dracula floated eerily across the screen— just as ideas related to eugenics and racial purity permeated the Western world. The monster fiction and media of the postmodernist eras still reflect societal unease when it comes to issues of race, gender, sexuality, and other cultural issues. Yet, a transformation has occurred in contemporary works, a cultural shift, so to speak. In his essay "Monster Theory (Seven Theses)," Jeffrey Jerome Cohen says, "[t]he monster is . . . an embodiment of certain cultural moments—of a time, a feeling, and a place. The monster's body quite literally incorporates fear, desire, anxiety, and fantasy . . . giving them life and an uncanny independence. The monstrous body is pure culture" (1996, 4). What we see as we move across the 20th and 21st centuries is a reclamation of the monstrous and an exploration of, as posthuman critics posit, the "us" in "them." Rather than provoking only fear, many of these monsters now inspire sympathy, forcing audiences to

question ideas related to the different social, political, and economic issues contemporary monsters represent as well as ideas about human nature.

First, we must explore just how early explorations of the monstrous intertwined cultural fears and psychological qualities starting in the early 20th century, particularly those of Sigmund Freud. For Freud, the monstrous was the *unheimlich*, or the uncanny—a repressed "revenant" that was once familiar but is now unfamiliar.[1] The uncanny, as Freud explains, is a feeling experienced "in the highest degree in relation to death and dead bodies, to the return of the dead, and to spirits and ghosts. . . . We can also speak of a living person as uncanny, and we do so when we ascribe evil intentions to him. . . . [and we] feel that his intentions to harm us are going to be carried out with the help of special powers" (2017, 240-42). While Freud attributed the uncanny to repressed sexual fears, particularly the castration complex, it was a return of repressed ideas projected onto an "unnatural" manifestation, onto something monstrous. As David Gilmore comments in *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* (2003), "monsters provide a convenient pictorial metaphor for human qualities that have to be repudiated, externalized, and defeated, the most important of which are aggression and sexual sadism, that is, id forces" (4).[2] These unacceptable characteristics demand a suitable vessel, a monster of equal proportion to the threat.

Expanding on Freud's ideas, Julia Kristeva explored the way our fears drive us until abjection, a casting off of the undesirable, occurs. Kristeva notes that the abject "has only one quality . . . that of being opposed to I" (1982, 1). Like Freud who associated the uncanny with death and the metaphysical, so does Kristeva, but she extends the abject to bodily excretions as well—anything we turn away from in revulsion and that we must expel in order to continue being "I." What causes abjection, according to Kristeva, is "what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite" (1982, 4). In other words, we cast off anything that disturbs or threatens the norm—that which is monstrous.

Casting off these fears and desires, they must find a new home, and in a colonial world, here is where we see the intertwining of monstrous Other and racial/sexual Other. The monsters of horror *are* the evil Other who put humanity and human existence at risk. Time and again, the same "us vs. them" scenario unfolds in works of horror and science fiction: (1) Invading evil (insert monster of choice) enters the picture; (2) Evil monster begins contaminating humanity, posing a threat to the very qualities that make us human; and (3) Humans must destroy the inhuman

before complete contamination occurs and/or humanity is wiped out.[3] At the core of these depictions is the idea of the racial Other, an idea Homi K. Bhabha delves into in *The Location of Culture*. Bhabha explores how the dominant, white hegemony utilized difference not only to shape ideas about the self, but also to marginalize any and all who fell into the category of Other—a category largely based on racial, gender, and/or religious differences. According to Bhabha, colonizers, "in the name of progress, unleashed the exclusionary imperialist ideologies of self and other" (1994, 19). Colonizers believed that any peoples who differed from themselves were inferior—they were the uncivilized Other whom the colonizers needed to control. Establishing a racial and gender-based hierarchy, the white imperialists were at the top, repressing and oppressing all that they deemed "beneath" them.[4]

Repression also was a key component of the colonizers' view of self, for the colonizers feared and suppressed any similarities to the Other that they found in themselves. Bhabha asserts that "[i]t is not the colonialist Self or the colonized Other, but the disturbing distance in-between that constitutes the figure of colonial otherness—the white man's artifice inscribed on the black man's body" (1994, 45). Ultimately, what occurred during much of the 19th and 20th century was this "Othering" of all who were not white and male. Difference, rather than celebrated and embraced as it is today, not only indicated what "I am not," but also what "I never want to be," which, in turn, firmly implemented a racial and sexual hierarchy, the devastating aftereffects of which are still seen and felt today in postcolonial societies. This Othering, however, is nothing new. In fact, we can trace dominant populations' tendencies to oppress feared cultural characteristics across time periods and across humanity's history. It should be no surprise that monsters are excellent indicators of this practice. As W. Scott Poole says in *Monsters in America: Our Historical Obsession with the Hideous and the Haunting* (2011), "[t]he marginalized are the monstrous and the monstrous is marginalized. The monster, more than our fears, also represents our hatreds. Whatever makes us lose our lunch, whether natural or supernatural, can be defined as a monster. The monster is the sickening Other" (13)[5] The inhuman Other abounds in contemporary fiction, television, and film—soulless and all-consuming vampires, invading aliens, horrific and unnatural man-made creations, just to name a few. What we see in these depictions is the feared Other with the inhuman representing the dominant populations' uncertainties about . . . well . . . everything related to other cultures.[6] Consequently, this volume will examine some of the varied ways and reasons society has collapsed the

inhuman into the category of Other and projected cultural anxieties onto their fictional creations.

These psychological and cultural ideas linked to monsters and the monstrous are echoed in traditional monster theory and, in fact, help set up the binary definitions of monster and human. While there are numerous, differentiating factors amongst the myriad types of monsters, through most of history, there have been several broad yet defining features of monsters, features set against those of humanity. Those characteristics include:

Monster	**Human**
1. Inspiring fear/horror	1. Inspiring admiration
2. Unnatural/abnormal	2. Natural/normal
3. Evil/immoral	3. Good/moral
4. Uncivilized/savage	4. Civilized
5. Chaotic[7]	5. Ordered

The first, of course, is the idea that monsters incite fear and horror and only fear and horror. If and when desire is associated with monsters, it is twisted back into fear and is one of those "unnatural" desires that must be abjected. As Gilmore notes in his opening sentence, "[m]onsters embody all that is dangerous and horrible . . . . [they are] fantasy creatures on which . . . fears could safely settle" (2003, 1). Hence, there is nothing redeemable in monsters, and the end result is the monster's death/defeat— a death/defeat that also reinforces societal values. Further setting them apart from humanity, monsters are unnatural creatures, creatures that cannot and should not exist in the human world and creatures that defy the natural (i.e. religious) order. If monsters are outside the natural order, the rest of their characteristics fall outside the natural order as well. Monsters cannot be good or moral if they are outside societal codes of what is normal and natural, if they are the holders of all that is undesirable, or as Elaine Graham says, "the tangible, corporeal manifestation of sinful and disobedient acts" (2002, 48). As follows, any beings prone to evil and sin, thus, are uncivilized and savage, the bringers of chaos bent on destroying and disrupting humanity. In the end, the monster is the "scapegoat," and Cohen reaffirms that it must be destroyed, exorcised, "purging the community by eliminating its sins" (1996, 18).

While this depiction of inhuman as Other still persists today, postmodern times also saw a radical shift in portrayals and long-held associations. The postmodern monster is by no means soft and cuddly; nevertheless, its depiction has evolved. Veering from the traditional, "us vs. them" dynamic, many contemporary works illustrate what posthuman

theorists refer to as the "them" in "us" correlation. These new monsters, often found in contemporary or urban fantasy as well as their original horror genre, eradicate the stark separation between human and inhuman as audiences recognize similarities between themselves and monsters. The shifted portrayal also means that these select postmodern monsters no longer highlight only cultural fears, but also cultural hopes, dreams, and desires. Frequently, when fears are addressed, those fears relate to they ways in which peoples are marginalized, specific economic and political issues that impact society, and, more and more commonly, humanity's inhumanity.

This evolution actually correlates with the vision posthumanists have for society. Posthumanism is concerned with the effects of science and technology on humanity. As Cary Wolfe notes in *What is Posthumanism?,* because of science and technology, both the "human animal" and human capabilities are evolving (2010, xxv). This evolution means a decentering of humanity, a decentering we must address in order to avoid the same problems of the past and to grow as humane individuals.[8] Posthumanism's primary challenge to us, therefore, is to look at difference, to look at the Other, and recognize both the similarities and differences in ourselves, in turn, eliminating any and all imposed hierarchies. According to Wolfe,

> the human occupies a new place in the universe, a universe now populated by what I am prepared to call nonhuman subjects. And this is why, to me, posthumanism means not the triumphal surpassing or unmasking of something but an increase in the vigilance, responsibility, and humility that accompany living in a world so newly, and differently, inhabited. (2010, 47)[9]

Or, as Neil Badmington asserts in his comparison of 1950s alien movies to the contemporary counterparts in *Alien Chic*, "[w]hat was once repelled is now embraced. What was once a 'Them' is now part of 'Us'" (2004, 33).[10] This is not to say that difference suddenly disappears or that there no longer is an Other, but that humanity now recognizes and embraces the Other within that was always present. The evolution of the inhuman in current media indicates the very shift in societal perceptions of difference and of the Other.

Not only do contemporary monsters reflect ideas about the psychological state of the self and the marginalization of the Other, but also they explore the ways in which the monster reflects larger, societal issues. Zombies are an excellent example of the way the monstrous highlights these issues. Much discussion already has occurred related to George Romero's early zombie movies, *Night of the Living Dead* (1968) and *Dawn of the Dead* (1978), and their commentary about the effects of

capitalism on society. Regarding the contemporary zombie resurgence, Chuck Klosterman comments in his essay "My Zombie, Myself,"

> [a] lot of modern life is exactly like slaughtering zombies. . . . Zombies are like the Internet and the media and every conversation we don't want to have. All of it comes at us endlessly (and thoughtlessly), and—if we surrender—we will be overtaken and absorbed. Yet this war is manageable, if not necessarily winnable. As long as we keep deleting whatever's directly in front of us, we survive. We live to eliminate the zombies of tomorrow. (2010)

These monsters of contemporary horror frequently are hideous, horrifying, and deformed—everything a traditional monster should be. However, contemporary rendering often refocus the monster metaphor toward larger social issues, issues including but not limited to political corruption, consumerism, economic injustice, the collapse of civilization, and even, as Klosterman notes, the tediousness of everyday life. Extending that posthuman idea of decentering the human, when reading the monster as a signifier of societal concerns, the "good" human frequently is upended, becoming the monster. In these scenarios, the monster then reflects who we are as a culture—the mindless office drones or greedy consumers or self-centered narcissists. Finally, whereas humans frequently become the monster, monsters often are humanized. In this sense, the monster is the hero, further highlighting humanity's monstrous tendencies as well as the ways in which society Others those who are different.

Given the many and varied implications of the inhuman in media and their long and diverse history, this volume will examine the cultural connotations behind the monstrous, focusing specifically on the monsters of modernism and postmodernism. While vampires and, more recently, zombies, have received much attention in recent works, a broader overview of monsters of all types has been neglected. For that reason, this collection will delve into depictions of everything from vampires to artificial intelligence, from nuclear giants to fairies—and not the cute, little pixies, but the return of the more monstrous, Celtic sidhe in contemporary fiction—and the cultural implications behind them. Furthermore, there also has been a dense focus on early, gothic works, including aforementioned novels such as Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, and even Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. While these works influence works of horror and urban fantasy found throughout modernism and postmodernism, an evolution in monsters and in genres, one based on an evolving society, has occurred. There is a movement of the inhuman from literary fiction into popular fiction, and from horror-bound into urban fantasy heroes, and with the

broadening of monster categories also comes an alteration in the ideas and issues the monstrous embody and in the cultural fears, anxieties, and even longings monsters represent.

Through the first few chapters, there is a strong focus on the links between the monstrous and the economic/technological and political. In "Running to a Still: Narratives of Energy and Care in Oz," Amanda Martin Sandino explores Frank Baum's *Oz* series, examining the way that robots and cyborgs reflect emerging ideas about energy as well as new ways of viewing disability. Eugenia Bryan also delves into issues related to energy in "The Dragon Fights Back: Dracula's 21st Century Enlightened, Bloody, and Unapologetic Response," exploring how the now cancelled *Dracula* series mirrors current issues related to oil, power, and wealth. Technology and loss, particularly as related to the natural world and as illustrated through the fairy world, are the focus of Lisa Wenger Bro's "Killing Tinker Bell: Re-Mythologizing the Fey in a Technocentric Age," and the collapse of civilization is at the forefront of Mary Ann Gareis' article on "Embracing Collapse: Our Uneasy Love Affair with *The Walking Dead*." In "Robot Rot: Mechanical Monsters in the Reagan Era," Reagan era robots films take center stage as Craig Ian Mann explores ideas related to conformity and capitalism as well as patriarchal oppression.

Moving into ideas related to gender and sexuality, Tracie Provost traces the transformation of the female vampire in "From Whore to Madonna: The Evolution of the Female Vampire," moving from her historic roots as a threat to man to contemporary renderings that emphasize brain over appearance and sexuality. Kelly Saderholm examines a similar thread related to the roles and depictions of female fairies from the Victorian "angel of the house" era to the empowered fairies of postmodern fiction in "Fairy Re-Evolution." Switching to horror, Crystal O'Leary-Davidson tears into female werewolves in "That Time of the Month: The Female Werewolf in Cinema" and how they both forefront and collapse ideas related to feminine beauty and sexuality. Kristine Larsen situates ideas about abnormality, particularly as related to sexuality and sexual norms, in her exploration of atomic era giants in "Nuclear Giants: Human Rights at Extreme Heights."

Marginalization is a key component in the next few chapters, with Shane Trayers, in "You Are What You Eat: Smart Zombies in Literature and Film," focusing on intelligent zombies and ideas related to ideas about race and sexuality. Ian Golding examines the link between werewolf films and ideas about disability in "The Transforming Lycanthrope: The Rhetoric of Werewolf Disability and Identity in Modern Cinema." José María Mantero's "*Espantapajaro*s by Gabriel Trujillo Munoz: A Tale of Genetic Mutations, Vampires, and Revenge Along the U.S.-Mexican

Border" illustrates the connection between vampires in contemporary Mexican science fiction and the plight of illegal immigrants.

One of the issues highlighted in the next few chapters relates to ideas about humanity and humaneness. "*Edward Scissorhands* as Gothic Fable: A 25-Year Retrospective" sees Dennis Yeo delving into the idea of the title character as gothic Other as well as the ways Edward is humanized. Similarly, in "*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Heroes from Grendel to Shrek," Kris Swank traces the evolution of the Grendel monster from his association with evil in early works to the humaneness he attains in contemporary depictions. Riccardo Gramantieri's "Artificial Monsters: From Cyborg to Artificial Intelligence" illustrates the transformation of the robot and cyborg through cyberpunk culture and Lisa Wenger Bro's focus on cyborgs and supernatural creatures in "What Happens When the Body's Gone? The Trans/Posthuman in Science Fiction and Urban Fantasy" pinpoints the way that ideas of identity and humanity are tied to the body and how bodily loss leads to a loss of both. In "The De-Evolution of Humanity in *The Walking Dead*," Rhonda Crombie also explores the de-evolution of human into monster in her exploration of the acclaimed show.

Finally, ideas related to monsters and religion appear in the last two chapters. Daniel Anderson examines the ways that the werewolf is linked to the sublimation of Jewish identity and even forced assimilation in "A Terrifyingly Fragile Border: Jewish Assimilation in *An American Werewolf in London*." Chris Cairney, in "Other Dragons or Dragon Others? A Cultural View of the Loch Ness Monster," focuses on the way contemporary renderings of the Loch Ness monster are actually linked to the Christian rewriting of pagan myth/legend in order to promote a specific, Christian agenda.

While monsters might seem like a pop culture phenomenon that ebbs and flows with people's changing tastes and whims, they are, in fact, much more, as their enduring presence across centuries of myth, legend, fiction, and film indicates. The literal monsters are signposts; in their marked distinction, they highlight our fears and our desires, getting at the root of the ideas, for better or worse, that shape identities, ideologies, and lives. As Cohen writes, "[t]he monster is the abjected fragment that enables the formation of all kinds of identities—personal, national, cultural, economic, sexual, psychological, universal, particular. . . . [they] align themselves to imbue meaning to the Us and Them behind every cultural mode of seeing" (1996, 19-20). This collection will delve into the widely varied facets of the inhuman across 20th and 21st centuries. Exploring the mythos, the history, and the culture surrounding the monstrous will shed light on

cultural fears and desires, both past and present, giving insight into humanity's mistakes and motivations.

References

Badmington, Neil. 2000. "Introduction: Approaching Posthumanism." In *Posthumanism*, edited by Neil Badmington, Readers in Cultural Criticism Series, 1-10. New York: Palgrave.

—. 2004. *Alien Chic: Posthumanism and the Other Within*. London: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Campbell, Joseph. 1949. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Bollingen Series XVII. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. 1996. "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)," *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 3-25. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dawn of the Dead. 1978. Directed by George A. Romero. Pittsburgh, PA: Dawn Associates, Film.

Freud, Sigmund. 2017. "The Uncanny." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XVII (1917-1919): *An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works*, Translated by James Strachey, 217-256. (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis). *Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing*. https://www.pep-web.org/document.php?id=se.017.0000a.

Graham, Elaine L. 2002. *Representations of the Post/Human: Monsters, Aliens and Others in Popular Culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Gilmore, David D. 2003. *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gordon, Joan. 1988. "Rehabilitating Revenants, or Sympathetic Vampires in Recent Fiction." *Extrapolation* 29 (3): 227-34.

Haraway, Donna J. 2000. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." In *Posthumanism*, edited by Neil Badmington, Readers in Cultural Criticism Series, 69-84. New York: Palgrave.

Kaplan, Matt. 2012. *The Science of Monsters: The Origins of the Creatures We Love to Fear*. New York: Scribner.

Klosterman, Chuck. 2010. "My Zombie, Myself: Why Modern Life Feels Rather Undead." *The New York Times*. Accessed February 7 2017. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/05/arts/television/05zombies.html.

Kristeva, Julia. 1982. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, European Perspectives Series. New York: Columbia University Press.

Night of the Living Dead. 1968. Directed by George A. Romero. Pennsylvania, U.S.A.: Image Ten, Film.

Poole, W. Scott. 2011. *Monsters in America: Our Historical Obsession with the Hideous and the Haunting*. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Skal, David J. 1993. *The Monster Show: A Cultural History of Horror*. New York: Faber and Faber, Incorporated.

Wolfe, Cary. 2010. *What is Posthumanism?*, Edited by Cary Wolfe, Posthumanities Series 8. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Notes

[1] As Freud writes, the "uncanny is in reality nothing new or foreign, but something familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only by the process of repression" (1919, 240).

[2] Similarly, in his 1949 work *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Joseph Campbell notes of mythology overall that it is "symbolic expression given to the unconscious desires, fears, and tensions that underlie the conscious patterns of human behavior" (256).

[3] Posthumanist scholar Neil Badmington, in *Alien Chic: Posthumanism and the Other Within*, writes about this scenario regarding the portrayal of aliens in 1950s films such as *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*. As Badmington says, "[a]liens are not just entirely different from humans; they are at once an enemy to be feared, hated, and destroyed. The film [*Invasion of the Body Snatchers*], it might be said, inscribes 'alien hatred', a clear sense of 'versus'" (2004, 3).

[4] In reference to colonized peoples, colonizers frequently applied such terms as "primitive" and "savage," to them, feeling that it was the colonizers' duty to "civilize" the Other. This "civilization" almost always meant that the colonized were denied basic human rights, stripped of their own traditions and beliefs (hence the evolution of what Bhabha terms hybridity), and both they and their land/resources were exploited. Bhabha details the colonizers' attitudes and actions as well as the colonial and postcolonial effects in *Location of Culture*.

[5] Jeffrey Cohen echoes this view in his essay "Monster Culture," writing that "[a]ny kind of alterity can be inscribed across (constructed through the monstrous body, but for the most part monstrous difference tends to be cultural, political, racial, economic, sexual" (1996, 7).

[6] Badmington corroborates this view in his essay "Introduction: Approaching Posthumanism." Discussing early horror/science fiction monsters, Badmington notes that in the portrayals, "[m]an faced a threat from an inhuman other: 'his' position at the centre of things was at risk. 'They' were ready to take over, to subject 'us' to 'their' rule" (2000, 8).

[7] These features of monsters are explored in many different works, including Gilmore's *Monsters, Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* (2003), Jeffrey Jerome Cohen's "Monster Culture (Seven Theses) (1996)," W. Scott Poole's *Monsters in America: Our Historical Obsession with the Hideous and the Haunting* (2011), Elaine L. Graham's *Representations of the Post/Human* (2002), Matt Kaplan's *The Science of Monsters: The Origins of the Creatures We Love to Fear* (2012), and David J. Skal's *The Monster Show: A Cultural History of Horror* (1993).

[8] Wolfe comments that one of the aspects posthumanism indicates is "a historical moment in which the decentering of the human by its imbrications in technical, medical, informatics, and economic networks is increasingly impossible to ignore, a historical development that points toward the necessity of new theoretical paradigms (but also thrusts them on us), a new mode of thought that comes after the cultural repressions and fantasies, the philosophical protocols and evasions, of humanism as a historically specific phenomenon" (2010, xv-xvi).

[9] Wolfe posits that posthumanism "forces us to rethink our taken-for granted modes of human experience, including the normal perceptual modes and affective states of *Homo sapiens* itself, by recontextualizing them in terms of the entire sensorium of other living beings and their own autopoietic ways of "bringing forth a world'—ways that are, since we ourselves are human *animals*, part of the evolutionary history and behavioral and psychological repertoire of the human itself. But it also insists that we attend to the specificity of the human—its ways of being in the world, its ways of knowing, observing, and describing—by (paradoxically, for humanism) acknowledging that it is fundamentally a prosthetic creature that has coevolved with various forms of ethnicity and materiality, forms that are radically 'non-human' and yet have nevertheless made the human what it is" (2010, xxv).

[10] Similarly, Donna Haraway says in her influential "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century," that "a cyborg world might be about lived social and bodily realities in which people are not afraid of their joint kinship with animals and machines, not afraid of permanently partial identities and contradictory standpoints" (2000, 74).

CHAPTER ONE

RUNNING TO A STILL:
NARRATIVES OF ENERGY AND CARE IN OZ

BY AMANDA MARTIN SANDINO

Lyman Frank Baum wrote fourteen books set in the utopian world of Oz between 1899 and 1919, drawing upon the vast technological changes and scientific developments of the era. Beginning with the immensely popular *Wizard of Oz,* perhaps best known by its 1939 film adaptation, the Oz books represent one of the best-selling series of the twentieth century (Baum 2000, xiv–xv). In addition to the original Baum texts, their canonical sequels by subsequent authors (1921–2014), and the great number of adaptations for screen, stage, and radio, the Oz books have spurred a large number of parallel texts (Gregory Maguire's *Wicked* series and the musical of the same name), retellings (*The Wiz*, SyFy's popular *Tin Man* miniseries), and non-canonical sequels and prequels (Disney's *Oz the Great and Powerful*).[1] Despite the numerous additions to Baum's stories that have extended far beyond Baum's own life, it is imperative that the series be understood as deeply connected to the time in which he lived, both in terms of technological innovation and his personal connection to disability—both his own conditions and those of his family members. By considering Baum's texts through the lens of disability and energy, the clear commentary on the concept of narrative in these works is clarified.

As Baum was fascinated with the optimistic futurity of his age, he drew much inspiration for his Oz novels from such contemporary figures as Thomas Edison, Theodore Roosevelt, and John D. Rockefeller. In the introduction to his *Lost Princess of Oz*, Baum offers his passion and fascination with the time in which he lived:

To My Readers:

Some of my youthful readers are developing wonderful imaginations. This pleases me. Imagination has brought mankind through the Dark Ages to its present state of civilization. Imagination led Columbus to discover America [sic]. Imagination led Franklin to discover electricity. 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 dreams, 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. (Baum 2010c, 223–4)

Through his literary creation of mechanical creatures and gadgets, Baum attempted to contribute to these discoveries in his own way, drawing upon these vast new energy sources and energy storage technologies while simultaneously dreaming through the creation of magical creatures. Alongside the classic fairies, gnomes (or "nomes," to use Baum's preferred spelling), dragons, and witches, Baum's Oz includes some of literature's earliest examples of cyborgs and robots, fueled by clockwork mechanisms, oil, electricity, and a number of other materials. The bodily difference implied by the different and specific energy sources of his mechanical creatures, I argue, demonstrates not only the manner in which Baum considered and interpreted the vast technological changes of his era, but also how the concept of disability is considered within the context of Oz. Writing at a time during which persons with disabilities were becoming far more present on main street and in popular cultural, and as a person who was himself disabled, Baum likely noticed the stigmatization that many persons with disabilities faced and the manner in which they fulfilled monstrous roles in fictional settings. As explained in disability theorists Snyder and Mitchell's 2001 study, the disabled body during this era does not only serve "the faulty body that prompts compensatory invention schemes. Disability also promises a longed-for access to the otherworldly, because bodily aberrancy has been historically interpreted as the material signature of a divine order. Throughout European history, the extreme physical marking inscribed by bodily excess or lack seemed to demand an explanation for its "unnatural" origins. Monsters and madness threatened the maintenance of an earthly order" (379). Persons with disabilities, in short, were seen as a living, legitimate depiction of the monstrous.

Perhaps partially in response to such depictions, Baum conceived of the human body itself as a type of machine, something that required energy sources that simply differed from those of more traditional technologies. He offers an early example of the narrative now contextualized by disability activist and scholar Christine Miserandino's "Spoon Theory." In this narrative to describe the experience of chronic illness, Miserandino breaks down the day into various tasks that require energy, such as getting out of bed, dressing, cleaning oneself, driving to work, etc. Unlike persons without disabilities, persons with chronic health conditions, such as Miserandino's own lupus, often must put considerable effort into even seemingly mundane tasks, such as forcing oneself to get out of bed, a quintessential example in online chronic illness communities. Miserandino, describes "Spoon Theory" as follows: "Most people start the day with unlimited amount of possibilities, and energy to do whatever they desire . . . For the most part, they do not need to worry about the effects of their actions" as compared to persons with chronic illnesses who must plan their use of a finite amount of energy accordingly with their day-by-day shifting energy levels and the energy use that particular activities require (1). This energy is visualized through the metaphor of spoons: each person with disabilities begins a day with a certain number of spoons that can be used for such tasks. Unlike the healthy person counterpart, however, this number really cannot be adjusted and is far fewer. These spoons can only be replaced through a recharging activity, such as sleeping, and, while one can borrow against the next day's spoons, it is only with the recognition that the next day will thus need to be completed with fewer spoons. If the cache of spoons is depleted entirely, a person with chronic illness is generally rendered bed-bound for a longer recuperation period.

As a whole, "Spoon Theory" has become a useful metaphor for many persons with many chronic illnesses, particularly chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS) and illnesses that have chronic pain and fatigue attached, such as lupus and fibromyalgia. Persons within these communities have formed support and community groups around the concept of "spoonies," persons with a limited number of spoons, working with the same limitations. Yet, I argue that this metaphor for chronic illness demonstrates well the method by which Baum understands energy in his land of Oz. In particular, by understanding each of his creations as, in some way, a "spoonie" or person with disabilities, Baum effectively normalizes the experience of disability within his Oz texts, offering a depiction of a wonderland in which persons with disabilities, such as Baum himself, can truly thrive. In particular, rather than portraying creatures who as disabled due to their reliance on care, these texts problematize the idea of the non-disabled person or the

normate as a whole, suggesting that each person requires different types of energy and care. In short, Oz normalizes the body with disability by demonstrating that we are all already disabled.

Energy Sources in Oz

Baum introduces various energy sources and energy storage technologies throughout his Oz books, including those enumerated below. This list of energy sources in Oz is far from comprehensive, yet well-demonstrates Baum's fascination with both the emerging and established technologies of energy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Source	Oil	Electricity	Solar	Coal
Example	Tin Woodman, Tik-Tok	Electra, Nomes	Erma's palace	Nome King

Source	Wind	Kinetic	Combustion	Magic
Example	Oz's balloon	Tik-Tok, Tin Woodman	Rak, Krizzle-Kroo	Powder of Life

One of these energy sources, however, is beyond scientific study. To quote Fredric Jameson, "[m]agic is indeed . . . problematic . . . [and] understood as a regression to the pre-technological era and an attempt to recreate the immediacy of a face-to-face conflict between individuals" (Jameson 2005, 63). Unlike those creatures fueled by new technologies and energy sources, creatures that draw life from magic may initially seem dispossessed from Baum's fascination with the innovations of his time. As Oz theorist Charity Gibson (2010) explains, "there is no class consciousness in Oz" (112)—perhaps due to magic's negation of both energy and labor:

> There were no poor people in Oz, because there was no such thing as money, and all property of every sort belonged to the Ruler . . . Each person was given freely by his neighbors whatever he required for his use, which is as much as any one may reasonably desire . . . Every one worked half the time and played half the time, and the people enjoyed the work as much as they did the play, because it is good to be occupied and have something to do. There were no cruel overseers set to watch them, and no one to rebuke them or to find fault with them. So each one was proud to do

> all he could for his friends and neighbors, and was glad when they would
> accept the things he produced. (Baum 2010b, 409–410).

Though it is a utopia, Oz, Jameson would argue, does not exist outside of the "great collective" (Jameson 1981, 37), but rather as a possible, fictional achievement of the Marxist intention. "Utopia as a form is not the representation of radical alternatives," Jameson explains, "it is simply the imperative to imagine them" (Jameson 2005, 416). By imagining "magical" devices, Baum conceives of a technology that facilitates labor without the problem of energy. However, while magic as an energy source and prerequisite for labor is a rich area for future study, it is by no means the only source of energy or production in Oz.

This paper particularly considers energy, bodies, and care in relation to beings of Oz whose animacies (Chen 2012) are greatly dependent upon the emerging and popularized fuel sources of Baum's day. Specifically, I consider the figures of Tik-Tok and the Tin Woodman (better known as the Tinman). These figures represent two examples of so-called mechanical men in the world of Oz while further demonstrating a flux between the animate and inanimate and the human and nonhuman in this utopian world. Both figures represent mechanized bodies; Tik-Tok acts as an early example of the robot, an animate object created by humans for human use (Dunn and Ehrlich 1983, 85), while the Tin Woodman represents an early example of the cyborg, defined as a human being with some mechanical part or parts (Abrahm and Kenter 1978; Ness 2010). Furthermore, these two characters draw their power from sources greatly personal to Baum's biography—namely, oil and mechanical energy— where such traditional forms of energy were quickly being replaced by newer technologies, particularly electricity.

It must be noted, for any readers with strong background in the hard sciences, that Baum, while enthusiastic about the scientific discoveries of his time, was far from an expert on these emerging technologies. In this manner, Baum and the science in his writings often transcends again into the realm of magic, foreshadowing the formation of fellow speculative fiction author Arthur C. Clarke's (1962) three laws. Clarke's three laws remarking upon the manner in which cultures adopt new technologies famously explains that: "Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic" (14). Aleksandr Volkov, a novelist and a mathematician at the Moscow Institute of Nonferrous Metals and Gold and *The Wizard of Oz*'s first Russian translator, notes one example of scientific misunderstanding in Baum's texts. In his translation of *The Wizard of Oz*, Volkov notably changes the Tin Woodman's name to the Iron Woodman—technically, only iron rusts, while other metals simply

corrode, and the Tinman is clearly stated as rusting at various points throughout the novel (Baum 2000, 90). Yet, despite his lack of scientific knowledge, Baum had a lifelong passion for the hard sciences—he saw technology as simply another form of magic, something that must be taken on faith alone and not examined too closely (Baum 2000, 88; Barett qtd. Gibson 2010, 113), similar to Clarke's formulation half a century later. Baum's interplay of magic and technology is thought to have contributed to what utopian theorist Andrew Karp deems (1998) "utopian tension" in Oz—a perceived contradiction between the science fiction and fantasy elements in this world likely delineated from cultural studies theorist Raymond Williams' (1978) essential "Utopia and Science Fiction." Williams' piece notably differentiates between utopias based upon technological transformation and those based upon the paradise, one based on magic that simply exists apart from any real world (1978). Yet I argue that Baum makes little distinction between machinations fueled by technologies and those fueled by magic, as, in his mind, the two are more or less interchangeable in the world of Oz. At the 1893 World's Fair, Baum was able to view many of Edison's electrical inventions, demonstrated as part of the "White City" filled with lights and gardens. This glowing, idyllic city, described as "fairylike" in Baum's editorial of the fair (Klein 2002, 168), must have seemed magical in the context of the lamp-powered darkness in late 19th century Illinois—as late as 1907, only 8% of U.S. homes used any form of electricity (Rogers 2002, 46). Electricity in itself makes a few cameos in the Oz books, where the nome's are able to work in the dark underground by wearing lights on their helmets, dragon's wander with Edison electric globes on their tails, and fairies draw their life from its presence in the atmosphere.

The Tin Woodman and Oil

While Baum's Tinman is transformed, in part, through magic, he notably recovers through the use of kinetic energy. Markedly said to have begun his life as a Munchkin, the race most commonly represented in Oz, the Tinman was a woodcutter with the ominous name of Nick Chopper. When he fell in love with a Munchkin girl named Nimmie Amee (Baum 2010g, 446), the jealous Wicked Witch of the East enchanted his axe so that it, in turn, severed Nick's legs, arms, and head, before splitting his torso in half. Each time a limb was removed, the aptly titled Tinman went to the local tinsmith and had the part replaced with one made of tin. While the Tinman proves to be extremely vain about his new body, polishing it quite often and eventually having it coated in nickel (Baum 2010d, 269), there are a

few demonstrative downsides to being made of tin; the Tinman's perceived loss of love via his lack of heart notwithstanding (see Eyler 2013). The Tinman easily corrodes, rendering him incapable of moving until a companion oils him—a relationship of care that ties the narrative to Christine Miserandino's aforementioned concept of "Spoon Theory."

In Oz, and particularly for the Tinman, "oil is a source of life"—it replaces the water as a life-giving source, to the point where many characters are rendered vulnerable to water, including, most famously, the Wicked Witch of the West (Moore 1974, 87–88). In the original illustrations by W.W. Denslow, the witch is consistently pictured carrying an umbrella to avoid such a danger, and she is further written as continuously holding the same umbrella (Baum 2000, 235). Additionally, the Tinman, despite his absence of a physical heart, cries quite often, rusting his jaws so that he is frequently incapable of speech. In this sense, water can be both inevitable and unexpected: because the Tinman does not consider himself capable of emotion, he is surprised each time he weeps. Yet, when Dorothy first finds the Tinman rusted and lifeless in a field, he eventually admits that the situation was the result of him forgetting his oil can when a storm was coming. Notably, many creatures live without a need for water—both the Tinman and the Scarecrow are continually reminded that the Lion, Toto, and Dorothy do require this substance. The Scarecrow, in fact, seems shocked when Dorothy asks for water, later pointing out that "[i]t must be inconvenient to be made of flesh . . . for you must sleep, and eat and drink" (Baum 2000, 87–88).

Oil's replacement of water as a life-giving power in Oz is emblematic of Baum's upbringing and early careers—he and his brother inherited Baum's Castorine Oil Company from his father, Benjamin Baum, as a young man. Benjamin accrued great wealth after purchasing an oil refinery in the mid-19th century (Schwartz 2009, 86). After losing nearly all of this fortune in the Panic of 1873 when oil prices plunged, Benjamin "organized a group of independent producers to break Rockefeller's grip by building a pipeline from Bradford to Rochester, where the oil could be transferred to tank cars and shipped to refineries in New York and Buffalo" (Rogers 2002, 3). While Benjamin's declining fortune led to him to "liquidate the Second National Bank of Syracuse, the savings and loan he co-founded . . . [and] mortgage more and more of his Rose Lawn property" (Schwartz 2009, 86), his decision eventually found success; Benjamin Baum became one of the few independent oilmen whose businesses thrived as Rockefeller came to control more than 90% of U.S. American oil refineries and pipelines (Schwartz 2009, 87). "As Rockefeller's wealth and power grew, he mushroomed into a national

villain, a popular target of hatred" (Schwartz 2009, 88), especially for those whose families personally lost from his gain, such as the Baums. Baum would often recall the slow loss of the many acres that had once comprised Rose Lawn, the Baum homestead which contained hundreds of rose bushes, fruit trees, and grapevines. In tribute to his childhood home, Baum utilized its memory in his composition of Oz's utopic gardens (Baum 2000, 61; Rogers 2002, 2, 262). By 1899, the year that Baum wrote *The Wizard of Oz*, Frank and his wife Maud were again in financial straits while Rockefeller's popularity continued to decline. Rockefeller gained a somewhat notorious status after numerous lawsuits were filed against him by none other than Theodore Roosevelt, the very figure on whom Tik-Tok's image is based.

Baum's love of oil and disgust for Rockefeller is perhaps best depicted in the popular 1908 stage adaptation of *The Wizard*, in which a line directly referencing Rockefeller was inserted. After the Tinman ponders what would happen if he were to run out of oil, the Scarecrow explains, "[y]ou wouldn't be as badly off as John D. Rockefeller. He'd lose six thousand dollars a minute if that happened" (Swartz 2000, 34). Oil makes its presence a total of 77 times throughout Baum's contributions to the Oz series and is used in the spells of such sorcerers as the Wizard (after he becomes a true magician) (Baum 2010a) and Dr. Pipt (Baum 2010f).[2] Throughout these texts, it is oil, rather than water, that is life-giving. As someone who runs on oil, the Tinman is further described in terms of a beneficial transhuman or cyborg, navigating the space between human and machine: "I was a much better man than ever," the Tinman explains of his tin body, "for my body could not ache or pain me, and I was so beautiful and bright that I had no need of clothing . . . but my tin body only needs to be oiled and polished" (Baum 2000, Baum 2010g, 26). This notion of the mechanical and magical creatures being superior to their meat (to use the Tinman's term) counterparts is a theme repeated throughout the Oz books. Due to their lack of reliance on food and rest (Wagenkgnecht 27), the mechanical creatures are often depicted as superior to their meaty companions, often saving their meat companions from biological factors that render them motionless. While Dorothy must stop at times to oil the Tinman or restuff the Scarecrow with hay, it is often noted that the meat-bodied companions' need to bathe, eat, and rest also hinders the Tinman and Scarecrow. Such a differentiation suggests that such figures are literally differently abled rather than dis-abled. Thus, the normate in the Ozian context, "the veiled subject position of the cultural self . . . outlined by the array of deviant others" (Garland-Thompson 1997, n.p.) is problematized. In other words, each character has a similar number of

spoons—it is merely the number of spoons required for different tasks that varies from person to person.

Tik-Tok and Care

Another character who depends upon oiling is Tik-Tok, the clockwork man created by the firm of Smith & Tinker. Tik-Tok is described on his instruction card as a creature who "Thinks, Speaks, Acts, and Does Everything but Live" (Baum 2010e n.p.), and notably must be both oiled and wound in order to remain animate. As noted by Abrahm and Kenter (1978 n.p.), "Tik-Tok is produced technologically, even though he exists in a fictional world where most things come about by magic" and significantly is neither alive nor has ever been alive, thus distinguishing him from the transhuman, or human to cyborg shifting, Tinman. In appearance, Tik-Tok is similar to Theodore Roosevelt, Baum's hero and Rockefeller's nemesis. Roosevelt is said to have "cut a dashing figure . . . posing in a wide-brimmed hat, a fringed buckskin shirt, alligator boots, and all the accouterments of a horseman: the leather belt, the ivory-handled Colt revolver, the Winchester rifle, the bowie knife, the silver spurs, and a belt buckle that shone like justice" (Rogers 2002, 116). Many of these features can be found in John R. Neill's illustrations of the mechanical man. Furthermore, Tik-Tok has three separate screws—one each for thought, speech, and movement—but is entirely dependent on other people to wind these gears.

In this manner, Baum's mechanized beings further and more clearly demonstrate Miserandino's (2003) "Spoon Theory." Baum wrote letters to many persons while lying on his deathbed, and he often noted his need to save his energy in order to write and his frustration with time lost when these energy levels merely allowed him to complete the basic functions of remaining alive (Schwartz 2009, 238; Wagenknecht 1929, 45). As described by his biographer, Katherine Rogers (2002): "[Baum's] heart pumped less and less efficiently, causing difficulty in breathing and easy fatigue. He developed kidney trouble, and the doctors could not predict whether he would live. After spending five weeks in the hospital, he was ordered to stay in bed for six weeks after he returned home. For some time he could not even sit up; all he could do was lie in bed and think of ideas for stories. In April, he could be propped up in a sitting position and was allowed to write for a few hours a day" (231). As a person with chronic illness, simply sitting became a spoon-depleting task for Baum, much as simply living drains his mechanical counterparts. The more that Tik-Tok and the Tin Woodman strive to help the heroes of Oz, the more quickly

they lose functionality and break down. They must apportion their energy, recognizing that they can only do certain activities, such as talking and moving, for a varying number of hours each day. Tik-Tok regularly must be wound up, and he must be wound more frequently when he exerts more energy, or he loses his abilities to move, think, and speak (Baum 2010e). Similarly, the Tinman must be oiled, or he will become incapable of all movement (Baum, *Wizard of Oz*). It is explicit that other people must wind Tik-Tok; his arms are too short to reach his winding mechanisms. While the Tinman can oil some of his parts, he usually needs help to reach his jaw, back, and feet. This reliance on the support of others for movement and continuation as an animate being further recognizes the position of care in Oz and the interdependency of care and energy networks within the *Land of Oz* series. Yet, these examples are not to suggest that the Tinman and Tik-Tok, two of the most outwardly disabled characters, are inferior. Instead, these few points may have been added so as not to make *their meat counterparts seem too inferior.*

Such forms of energy, in Baum's Oz books, are linked to politics, the personal, and the technological—these works complicated physicists' definitions of the term "energy" by applying this understanding to both material and transcendental energy sources. In this manner, the concept of science as a whole is understood as changing with one's cultures and contexts, offering an early cultural studies construction of the term. Baum, through his Oz texts, "provide[s] context . . . for the usage of [this] term by discussing how [its] meaning . . . has developed over time . . . [providing a] snapshot of the dynamic, interdisciplinary, and cross-methodological research conversations that currently traverse the fields of American studies and cultural studies" (Burgett and Hendler 2007, 1). Thus, as demonstrated by his use and explanation of energies and technologies in the land of Oz, Baum offers a more "flexible" (Williams qtd. Burgett and Hendler 2007, 2) approach to key concepts in science, understanding "energy" and "technology" as words whose meanings are in a constant state of flux.

Conclusion

Baum's life and interests are clearly reflected in his writings, demonstrating the wonder with which he approached the new technologies of his age, grudges against business foes, and a multifaceted understanding of the nature of care, even as it applies to posthuman beings. His works, much like his life in its final decades, illustrate a commitment to inspiring imagination, kindness, and awe in children. Via his writing, Baum offered

a complicated accompaniment to the science and scientific culture of his time, thus marking the first fourteen books of the Oz series as essentially linked to the contexts in which they were produced.

Baum wrote these books in what would be the final twenty years of his life, between 1900 and 1919. Simultaneously, the United States saw one of the greatest technological and industrial revolutions in its history, offering Baum limitless technologies to draw upon as he developed his fantasy world. In an effort to both contribute to and better understand these innovations, Baum imagined technologies and creatures that drew upon a wide array of energy sources, including emerging, established, and fanciful. As his "meat" people replenish by eating, drinking, and sleeping, Baum's robotic creatures reenergize through wind-up mechanisms and oil. In this context, requiring care to continue living is normalized; as "meat" creatures often require protection when sleeping and help finding nourishment, so too do the robotic persons require help being oiled and wound. And, notably, the person depicted as most out-of-place in this fantasy world is the person most similar to the books' most likely readers: an average, farm girl from Kansas.

This narrative choice asks readers to similarly consider their own dependence on care. In this manner, Baum troubles the idea of the normate both within Oz and greater U.S. culture. Persons with seemingly disabling conditions within the series, including the cyborg Tinman and robotic Tik-Tok, are seen as in some ways inferior but in other ways superior to their meat counterparts. Rather than seeing such bodies as aberrant within this utopic setting, Baum's Oz books normalize the disabled body by particularly forwarding the social model of disability as a whole: a person, whether human or monster, is only as incapacitated as a result of his or her circumstances. A person in a wheelchair is only disabled in the context of a world without accessible spaces and ramps. A person with a sight impairment is only disabled in the context of a society without audiobooks or books published in Braille. A cyborg is only disabled in the context of a space in which no one will oil him. Because Oz forwards a utopic world, however, the Tinman can rest assured that someone, eventually, will come across and oil him back to animacy. Thus, both care and disability are normalized within the context of Oz.

References

Abrahm, Paul A., and Stuart Kenter. 1978. "Tik-Tok and the Three Laws of Robotics." *Science Fiction Studies* 14 (5.1). Accessed 16 July 2016. http://www.depauw.edu/sfs/backissues/14/abrahm14art.htm.