



# THERE'S NO PLACE LIKE HOME: DOROTHY'S JOURNEY AND DOMESTIC IDEOLOGY IN THE WIZARD OF OZ

BY KAYLA GREER

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

"There's no place like home." With these words, Dorothy Gale clicks her heels three times and vanishes from the colorful, magical land of Oz, returning to the gray Kansas prairie where she began. This iconic moment from L. Frank Baum's 1900 novel *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* has resonated through generations as a comforting affirmation of home's irreplaceable value. Yet beneath this sentimental surface lies a more troubling narrative: Dorothy's circular journey represents not a heroine's triumphant adventure, but a story of feminine containment that ultimately reinforces early 20th-century domestic ideology. While Oz offers Dorothy agency, power, and significance, Baum's text systematically devalues these experiences, positioning the impoverished Kansas farm as the proper "home" for a young girl. This narrative structure reveals profound anxieties about female autonomy and exposes the mechanisms by which what historian Barbara Welter terms the "cult of true womanhood" was maintained at the turn of the century, even as women increasingly challenged their confinement to the private sphere.

Baum's opening description of Kansas establishes home as a place of profound deprivation. The prairie is gray, the grass is gray, the house is gray, and even Uncle Henry and Aunt Em have been drained of color and joy by years of harsh labor. Aunt Em, we are told, was once young and pretty, but "the sun and wind had changed her, too. They had taken the sparkle from her eyes and left them a sober gray; they had taken the red from her cheeks and lips, and they were gray also. She was thin and gaunt, and never smiled now" (Baum 11). This is the "home" to which Dorothy must long to return—a place where life itself seems to have been bleached away, where work brings no pleasure and existence offers no vibrancy.

EDITED BY ZEYNEP KILIC, COPY EDITED BY LAUREN HOOD,  
REVIEWED BY ANGELINA ROBERTSON, ART BY MADELINE BRADY

This portrayal reflects the harsh material realities of prairie farm life, where women's domestic labor was both essential to family survival and physically devastating. Yet the text insists this barren domesticity is where Dorothy belongs. The ideology Welter identifies as the "cult of true womanhood" positioned the home as woman's "natural" domain through four cardinal virtues: "piety, purity, submissiveness and domesticity" (152). By the 1820s, Welter argues, these virtues had become so deeply entrenched that "without them, no matter whether there was fame, achievement or wealth, all was ashes. With them she was promised happiness and power" (152). Baum's narrative echoes this ideology nearly a century later, insisting that Dorothy's proper sphere is the domestic realm regardless of that realm's actual conditions. Dorothy, an orphan with no agency over her circumstances, is being socialized into Aunt Em's fate—a future as a farm wife whose existence offers neither vibrancy nor prospects beyond domestic service. The contrast when Dorothy arrives in Oz could not be more stark. The cyclone tears her from the domestic sphere and deposits her in a world of vivid color, magic, and possibility. Everything Kansas lacks, Oz provides: beauty, wonder, friendship, and most significantly, a role for Dorothy that extends far beyond the domestic. She immediately matters in Oz in ways she never did in Kansas. Her house's landing kills the Wicked Witch of the East, and Dorothy is instantly hailed as a powerful sorceress and liberator. The Munchkins celebrate her, the Good Witch of the North kisses her forehead as protection, and she is given the silver shoes—objects of genuine magical power.

What follows inverts traditional gender expectations in remarkable ways. Dorothy embarks on a quest, that most masculine of narrative structures, and gathers a company of male companions who defer to her leadership. The Scarecrow, Tin Woodman, and Cowardly Lion all look to Dorothy for guidance and moral clarity. She makes the decisions, charts the course, and demonstrates consistent courage and resourcefulness. When the Wizard proves incapable of helping them, it is Dorothy who kills the Wicked Witch of the West, proving herself a witch-slayer twice over. This is not a passive princess awaiting rescue but an active hero whose competence exceeds that of her male companions and the patriarchal authority figure of the Wizard himself.

Jack Zipes, examining the subversive potential of fairy tales, argues that such narratives can challenge dominant ideologies by presenting alternative social arrangements. Dorothy's adventure in Oz does precisely this, offering a vision of female capability that directly contradicts the cult of domesticity's insistence on women's natural limitations. She operates successfully in the public sphere of adventure and quest—the realm coded as masculine—and proves herself more capable than the men around her. Significantly, in Oz she is not performing domestic labor. She is the protagonist of her own story, not its support system. As Zipes observes of subversive fairy tales, they "seek to illuminate the truth of social conditions" (125). Dorothy's journey illuminates the arbitrariness of gendered spheres by demonstrating her competence outside them.



The revelation of the Wizard's true nature is crucial to understanding the text's gender politics. The Wizard—the ultimate patriarchal authority figure whom everyone fears and obeys—is exposed as a fraud, a "common man" from Kansas who has used theatrical tricks to maintain power. He cannot actually help Dorothy or her companions; his power is entirely performative, built on deception rather than genuine ability. Yet the text's treatment of this revelation is remarkably gentle. The Wizard is revealed as a "good man" who simply isn't magical. The narrative reveals that the Scarecrow, Tin Woodman, and Lion never actually lacked brains, heart, or courage—they possessed these qualities all along and merely needed to recognize them.

This same pattern applies to Dorothy, but with a crucial difference. She, too, possessed the power to return home all along—the silver shoes could have transported her at any moment. Glinda knows this but doesn't tell Dorothy at the beginning of her journey, explaining later that Dorothy wouldn't have believed her and needed to learn the lesson for herself. But what lesson? That adventure is less valuable than domesticity? That her power and agency should be used only to return to powerlessness? The revelation that Dorothy could have gone home immediately doesn't empower her—it undermines the value of everything she experienced and accomplished in Oz.



Throughout her adventure, Dorothy repeatedly expresses her desire to return to Kansas. After defeating witches, navigating dangerous territories, and proving her courage time and again, she remains fixated on going home to Aunt Em. The text frames this desire as natural, even admirable—evidence of Dorothy's good heart and proper values. Yet this narrative choice systematically devalues her adventure, positioning Oz's wonders as problems to solve rather than experiences to embrace.

The mechanism of Dorothy's return is particularly revealing. The silver shoes' power is activated not by any external force but by Dorothy's own desire for home. She must click her heels three times while thinking of Kansas. The magic works only because she genuinely desires to leave Oz and return to the gray prairie. This appears to grant Dorothy agency: she is not forced back but chooses to return. Yet this represents what Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, in their analysis of nineteenth-century women's literature, identify as constrained choice within patriarchal narrative structures. Though Gilbert and Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic* examines Victorian texts, their concept of how "women have been denied the economic, social, and psychological status ordinarily essential to creativity" illuminates how Baum's 1900 text

extends nineteenth-century patterns of feminine containment into the Progressive Era (49). Dorothy has been so thoroughly socialized into believing that home—gray, joyless, limiting home—is where she belongs that she actively chooses her own containment.

One might argue that Dorothy's desire to return reflects genuine emotional bonds rather than ideological conditioning—that her love for Aunt Em represents something authentic that transcends questions of agency. Indeed, Dorothy's concern for her aunt demonstrates real affection. Yet this very emotional attachment reveals another dimension of gendered socialization. Dorothy has been trained not only to accept domestic limitation but to provide emotional labor, to prioritize others' needs above her own development. Even in Oz, she continues this caretaking role, comforting the Scarecrow and encouraging the Lion. Her love for Aunt Em is genuine, but that love has been cultivated within a system that teaches girls that self-sacrifice is their highest virtue. The fact that emotional bonds coexist with social constraint does not negate the constraint; rather, it shows how effectively ideology operates when it secures not just compliance but willing, even loving, participation.



What has Dorothy actually learned? The text insists she has learned that "there's no place like home," that Aunt Em's love matters more than adventure, power, or self-actualization. But the lesson beneath the lesson is more insidious: that female power and agency are less important than returning to one's proper domestic sphere. Dorothy's growth, her demonstrated competence, her genuine power—all of it is erased the moment she clicks her heels. She returns to the same gray Kansas, unchanged, with the same limited prospects. Her adventure leaves no tangible trace.

The narrative insists this is a happy ending, yet Baum's own descriptions undermine this claim. Dorothy returns to a place explicitly depicted as colorless and joyless, to

an aunt destroyed by domestic labor, to a future promising only more of the same. The text asks us to believe that this is superior to a magical land where Dorothy was powerful, respected, and genuinely needed. The very impossibility of this claim reveals the ideological work the narrative must perform: domesticity must be enforced through story because it is not naturally desirable to capable, adventurous young women.



*The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* was published in 1900, at a moment of profound tension around gender roles in American society. The women's suffrage movement was gaining momentum, with women increasingly demanding access to education, professional work, and political participation. The "New Woman" of the 1890s and early 1900s challenged the cult of domesticity by seeking lives beyond the home. Baum's text can be read as a cultural negotiation of these anxieties. It allows Dorothy temporary power and agency—acknowledging the reality of female capability—but ultimately insists she must relinquish this power and return to domesticity. The fantasy genre provides a safe space to explore the threat of female autonomy and then neutralize it. Dorothy can be powerful in Oz because Oz is not real; her return to Kansas represents the restoration of proper social order. As Gretchen Ritter observes, *The Wizard of Oz* "is a story about journeying away from home and then returning home, transformed but also restored" (172). Yet this "restoration" carries different meanings for Dorothy than for her male companions, who return to Oz to rule. Dorothy alone must be restored to domestic limitation. The cyclone itself becomes a metaphor for the social upheaval of changing gender roles. It violently disrupts Dorothy's domestic life, carrying her into unknown territory where traditional rules don't apply. The text allows this disruption but insists it must be temporary. Adventure is positioned as disorder, something to be survived and overcome rather than embraced. The goal is always restoration—getting back to Kansas, getting back to a world where girls know their place. This ideology

connects to broader mythologies of American identity. Kansas represents the heartland, traditional values, the "real America" of farms and family. Dorothy's return is framed as recognition of what truly matters, but it also represents a rejection of alternatives, an insistence that there is no legitimate life for women beyond domestic service.

The genius and the tragedy of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* lies in its creation of a genuinely powerful female protagonist whom it then cannot allow to keep her power. Baum gives Dorothy real agency, real competence, and real importance—and then insists she must give it all up. The text reveals the mechanisms of feminine socialization with unusual clarity: Dorothy must not only return home but must actively desire that return. She must believe that Kansas is superior to Oz, that Aunt Em's gray existence is more valuable than her own colorful adventure. The ideology succeeds not when it forces compliance but when it secures willing participation.

Yet the text unconsciously reveals the fragility of this ideology through its own descriptions. The very grayness of Kansas, the joylessness of farm life, the obvious superiority of Oz in every material and experiential way—all of this undermines the lesson the narrative attempts to teach. If home were truly so wonderful, would the text need to work so hard to convince us? If domesticity were naturally fulfilling for women, would Dorothy need magical shoes to make her choose it?

Dorothy clicks her heels three times and vanishes from Oz, but perhaps the real magic trick is the one Baum performs on his readers: convincing generations that the gray Kansas farm is truly worth more than Oz, that limitation is superior to possibility, that a young girl's proper place is always and inevitably the domestic sphere from which she started. This magic trick—the ideological sleight of hand that makes containment look like homecoming—reveals more about early 20th-century anxieties around female power than it does about the true nature of home. There may be no place like home, but for Dorothy Gale and the countless women whose lives she represents, that is not necessarily the comfort the story pretends it to be.

**Bibliography**

Baum, L. Frank. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. George M. Hill Company, 1900.

Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. Yale University Press, 2020.

Ritter, Gretchen. "Silver Slippers and a Golden Cap: L. Frank Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* and Historical Memory in American Politics." *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1997, pp. 171-202.

Welter, Barbara. "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860." *American Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1966, pp. 151-174.

Zipes, Jack. "Oz as American Myth." *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion*. Routledge, 2006, pp. 119-138.