Chapter IV
Changing Perspective on Manliness

Shepard, in his middle plays pardons rude male conduct by suggesting that it is just an outflow of men’s urgency to discover a method for carrying on like a man. Since Shepard’s characters endeavour to express their characters by assuming roles from myths and pop culture, it could be contended that the male characters’ proclivity towards participating in vicious conduct is just an impression of the path in which people are so vigorously impacted by the pictures which encompass them. There is a shift towards the perspectives of manliness in these plays and this examines the importance given to female characters in the middle plays of Sam Shepard.

In *True West* and *The Late Henry Moss*, Shepard utilizes a kind of technic while displaying the hero or child character. Shepard parts the character into two sides of a similar self. The characters show up as siblings engaging each different and in addition the heredity of the patriarch figure. One of the siblings, dependably the more youthful of the two, speaks to the more socialized of the siblings and the one that has separated himself the most from the holds of the patriarch. This more youthful sibling character is the hero of these plays. This character is spoken to by Austin in *True West*. These characters return as quiet and peaceful people whose underlying need, to deal with the family and return back to enlightened life, changes them into showcasing the viciousness and liquor abuse of the patriarch. The opposite side of this character, the more established sibling, is now following in the way of the patriarch and drags his
sibling down with him subsequently being obliterated by the more youthful sibling or supplanted by him. This character is spoken to by Lee in *True West*.

Lee, in spite of the fact that introduced as Austin’s sibling in the play, is in reality his alter ego, the a portion of Shepard’s isolated self that is unpleasant and rough, lives outside the law, and is drawn toward the tricky picture of his dad. The play, then, is less a session between two siblings as it is an externalized similitude of the rationalization between the double parts of Shepard’s mind. This parts the character into two is utilized by Shepard to show how the hero is torn between mother and father, reality and myth, effeminate and manly. This fight is the externalization of the fight to discover one’s claim to personality. The characters fight each other just to lose sight of what they speak of. The characters change into their contrary energies through the course of the play. Austin becomes the social recluse willing to live in a dessert and Lee becomes the writer, or may be dictator, the Texas-based violent Romance story that compels him to think overtime.

Every individual goes up against the weights of the eras going before him or her. In spite of the fact that Austin has made a decent attempt to get away from the impact of his family, the greater part of his endeavours have fizzled. He has attempted to get a feeling of character from his work and his achievements, yet at last they are all inane in connection to the personality shaped for him in the family. Austin tries to deny that he is a piece of the family, yet towards the end of the play he could not. At last he is precisely similar to his sibling and
those two resemble their dad who is unequipped for managing life in the consistent world.

*True West* is a play about the mission for personality, but at the same time, a play about trading characters. The absence of a strong feeling of self gets to be obvious, as one perceives a sudden change in the behavioural example of the primary heroes. On the written work of *True West*, Shepard notes:

I needed to compose a play about twofold nature, one that wouldn’t be typical or figurative or any of that stuff. I simply needed to give an essence of what it feels like to be two-sided. It’s a genuine article, twofold nature. I believe we’re part in an a great deal more destroying path than brain science can ever uncover. It’s not all that charming. Not some easily overlooked detail we can get over. It’s something we must live with. (qtd. in Harksoon 83)

The unmistakable refinements between the siblings as spoke to by Shepard in the opening of the play inevitably get to be obscured, and one may in this way address the strength of every sibling’s personality. After the disappointment of his film bargain, Austin uncovers another part of his identity by turning out to be progressively reminiscent of his sibling. He swings to liquor, trivial violations, and receives his sibling’s forceful state of mind; all the more critically, he gets to be fixated on life in the abandon. He in the long run chooses to forsake his socialized life and rather grasp whatever the betray brings to the table. Essentially Lee, out of the blue, accentuates that he loathes his rootless life and that he yearns for the strength probably implanted in socialized society. He
arranges himself before the play is out the part of Austin. As Lee endeavour’s to
focus on his written work, Austin unsteadily aggravates him.

   Lee: I’m a screenwriter now! I’m legitimate. [...]  
   Austin: Now I’m the intruder. I’m the one who is invading your  
   precious privacy! (True West 39)

Scene seven may in this way be contended to be an aggregate reversal of the
opening scene; at this point, the sibling have clearly traded personalities, or, as
William Kleb puts it: “the soul of every sibling really appears to have the other”
(Kleb 117-25).

   One of Shepard’s significant thoughts in True West is that what most
Americans have instructed to need and esteem is all off-base. He offers an
opposite vision to the customary American Dream that injects such a large
amount of life and writing. Austin understands that his whole personality –
which, since his childhood, has concentrated exclusively on accomplishing this
fantasy – is totally off-base. What is ideal, rather, is to paint outside the lines and
frame a personality all alone terms. For Austin that implies surrendering all that
he has worked for and withdrawing to the leave. It demonstrates the
disappointment of the American dream. Thematically, Shepard shows all the
terror and wonder of being faced with his new continent as done by early
American writers. Michael Earley in his essay on “Sam Shepard and the
American Literary Tradition” explains:

   Shepard tries to stride the expanse and keep the romance alive.
   And yet there is trouble in paradise. As Capt. Bovine tells the old
professor Bill in ‘Operation Sidewinder’: This country’s in trouble. Big trouble. Over the past few years there’s been a general break down of law and order and a complete disrespect for the things we’ve held sacred since our ancestors founded this country.” Despite, or perhaps, because of the gnawing repression that grips most of Shepard’s old-style heroes, they retreat into the vast open spaces of consciousness and imagination.

(Marranca 129)

Shepard’s moms missing themselves from the contentions that so expend the men, they are grasping an alternate arrangement of qualities that contents with the male emergency at the focal point of Shepard’s plays. The mother’s withdrawal is a refusal to intrigue in the male stories and their attendant demolition. She leaves since life in front of an audience in Shepard’s plays is generally a scene of pulverization, brutality, and passing. Besides, dissimilar to the majority of the men in the family plays, the women are regularly the main ones ready to leave the devastation that inundates Shepard’s stage.

The scenes of savagery have added to a pervasive conviction that, in Shepard’s reality, women are more regularly followed up on than dynamic, with men allotted focal place and capacity. Bonnie Marranca composes that in Shepard’s plays “Women are the foundation ...constantly regarded as subservient to men, their potential for development and change confined” (23). There is a key manliness to Shepard’s sensational world by anticipating the emergencies of his own creative sexual and psychic life in front of an audience. The world might
be manly, yet the women can see what that world needs, to comprehend its insufficiency and neediness, to uncover its cruelty.

The change that happens in *True West* is introduced as the siblings embrace every others parts. Towards the beginning of *True West*, Austin is a screenwriter attempting to deal with his screenplay while his negligible criminal sibling needs to go out and burglarize his mom’s neighbours. Before the end of the play, Lee has an arrangement with Hollywood maker Saul while Austin approaches taking every one of the toasters in the area. The two sides of these characters are not just illustrative of the beset sides of a similar self additionally the delegates of their folks. The past abusive behaviour at home that these characters have seen between their mom and dad has brought on every character to end up aligned with one of the guardians. The more youthful siblings get to be adjusted to the moms and the more seasoned siblings adjusted to the fathers.

In *True West*, the characters of these plays are no more extended ready to maintain unique thought or to envision new parts or exhibitions for themselves; their personality or presence is undermined or befuddled. Shepard’s men are likewise restricted in comprehension the ramifications of their activities or of the activities of others around them. Just in the stories of the women is there any expectation for survival or illumination. Edification is not really shared by the majority of Shepard’s women in the family plays. The mother of *True West* positively does not fall into this classification, but rather neither does she fall into the conventional part of the mother who tidies a great many her children’s wrecks keeping in mind the end goal to facilitate their direction.
The mother’s story in *True West* is composed off the stage much more totally. She seems just quickly as something of a town adaptation of the mother who advises her two developed children, who are slaughtering each other before her eyes, not to play harsh in the house. Inaccessible, dispassionate, and distant, she serves for the most part as foundation for the skirmish of character in which Lee and Austin are locked in, abandoning them to battle it out as she goes searching for a place she can perceive as home. In any case, in declining to consider the siblings’ battle important, her response offers an alternate, less pretentious perspective of the play’s focal clash. The mother of *True West*, in leaving the stage space, essentially overlooks the appearing significance of the male emergency of character, picking rather to seek after a superior life, a superior love, and a superior home. As opposed to these women, their spouses and children cannot imagine new lives for themselves once their present ones have fizzled. Rather than making new stories, new experiences, new strategies, the men stick to the past techniques for conduct, rehashing themselves in an interminable cycle of self-demolition.

All through *True West* Lee keeps on whining about his mom’s home. He takes objects from the neighbour’s homes and brings them back. Both of the siblings change the house into the father’s home by totally tearing up what the mother has so precisely put there. They change the house so definitely that upon the mother’s arrival she does not perceive her own home and should leave, “I can’t remain here. This is more awful than being destitute” (*True West* 56). This
change is for the most part done by the damaging activities of Lee, the character that is all the more firmly adjusted to the father.

In *True West*, Shepard keeps on investigating battles inside the family and to hunt down the significance of home. The father and the mother have isolated, so the men and women are more enraptured. Her urban estrangement from the land parallels his distance from individuals. The two children, Austin and Lee, take an interest in a serious, regional fight that recreates the division between the two guardians. The picture of rivalry and antagonistic vibe between relatives is tenacious and dangerous.

Lee: You go down to the L. A. Police Department and ask them what kinda’ people kill each other the most… Family people. Brothers... Real American-type people.

Austin: We’re not insane. We’re not driven to acts of violence like that. (25)

In any case, Austin winds up attempting to choke Lee with a phone string close to the end of the play. His poise and sensibility are as fanciful as the perfect arrangement of the rural kitchen. This mother is another case of Shepard’s inadequate women who cannot stop the savagery that, as indicated by Shepard, describes the American male and dishonours the vision of the current American family.

Before the end of *True West*, the siblings show up secured an unending confrontation, much the same as the characters of the script that they grew
together: “Everyone independently imagines that he’s the special case who’s apprehensive … . And the person who’s chasing’ doesn’t know where the other one is taking him. Furthermore, the person who’s being pursued doesn’t know where he’s going” (27) at the end of the day, despite the fact that Lee and Austin harbour parts of each other’s mind inside themselves, the opposing renditions of manliness shred them, and it appears that they never will have the capacity to accommodate their disparities. Genuine West delineates a case of selling out and exact retribution, which are two feelings intrinsic in the greater part of Shepard’s family plays furthermore innate in the American family. It demonstrates a break of family peace and amicability.

Shepard’s male characters are set apart with their utilizing inexhaustible savagery on the female characters. The reaction to this brutality is fascinating and unusual. Neither the oppressor hints at any regret, nor does the casualty give the impression of agony. Shepard condemns the viciousness and the untrustworthiness of men furthermore he is irate with the frail females who are dealt with as a material for man to manhandle and appreciate and after that to arrange. There is an absurdist feature in Shepard’s dramatization. The general picture of women depicted by absurdist writers is a minor one in the general public. Shepard’s plays open to what degree material viciousness is knowledgeable about a normal American working class family. Women are casualty of savagery, as well as thought of little by the male characters, quite the spouses or fathers. Aggressive behaviour at home is viewed as method for
control over the physically frail family units, especially women. This is a run of the crush patriarchal disposition at home.

The two siblings have shared threatening vibe. Austin furtively aches for Lee’s opportunity and freedom; Lee straightforwardly craves for Austin’s solace and security. Lee is keen on discharging the shrouded truths that lie behind social conduct. His verbal and physical strikes brings about uncovering the points of confinement of Austin’s mental continuance. At that point Austin changes the subject to the old man, their dad whose life has been destroyed by overwhelming drinking and who lives on the betray repelled from his family. This discussion turns out to be considerably more unstable due to the fondness between Lee’s conduct and his father’s.

Lee’s primitive drive is along these lines set against Austin’s refined conduct and gained with a contention that rises above the psychic competition of the two characters. The fight between compel and mind or primitive power and gained learning forms advance into an investigation of the way of human innovativeness when Lee endeavour’s Austin’s role as a screenwriter. In a clever remark on the condition of corporate greed in the craftsmanship, Kimmer acknowledges Lee’s venture in light of its verisimilitude, rejects Austin’s straightforward sentiment. Despite the fact that Austin is the author in the family, it is Lee, who truly is in contact with the harsher substances of human conduct.
The siblings are similarly unequipped for imparting their concealed feelings of dream and wishes in life; yet in the fictions they make reality of their internal encounters. Lee admits that he needs Austin’s assistance in depicting the anecdotal characters in his play and Austin will soon argue for Lee’s help with helping him escape from his manufactured world. At the point when scene eight opens, Austin seems to have effectively done the requests of Lee’s exchange, yet Lee has unmistakably neglected to change in accordance with his new calling. Lee’s disappointed endeavour to absorb into Austin’s way of life has driven him to perceive his own unsatisfactory quality for urban life. He admits that his way life is not a sort of philosophical choice but rather an aftereffect of his failure to make his living in the city. That is because of the social and social change.

As the play keeps on portraying the war between the siblings, Austin and Lee, contemporary man is appeared to be pitifully separated. To Lee the desert is an asylum. He tells Austin, “Out there it’s spotless. Chills around evening time. There’s a decent little breeze” (30). Austin, tired of the contaminated warmth connected with the life of a Hollywood screenwriter, yearns for the comfort of the desert. Till the end of True West, the siblings are as yet battling. Due to Austin’s acculturated conduct and Lee’s endeavour to end up more like his sibling, ironically toward the end of the play, the two are carrying on in an uncouth way. The play draws out Shepard’s perspectives on advance and its consequences for wild. It is anything but difficult to picture the socialized Austin at Mom’s table and the savage Lee in the desert with his dad. However Mom’s home is at the edge of the leave. That makes mindful of the almost negligible
difference between progress and absence of it. A humorous examination can be made between Lee, who has started going after the inhabitants, taking their TVs and house objects. Lee conveys unrefined conduct to the edified territory, and that is appeared by the sibling’s angry conduct toward the end of the play. Their battling gives an unexpected differentiation to the cultivated environment of their mom’s home. The land advancement in Southern California is an issue Shepard was worried about. The interruption of progress is later underscored when Austin says he might want to go live in the abandon with Lee. “There’s nothin’ down here for me. There never was. When we were children here it was distinctive. There was an existence here then… Fields that don’t exist any longer”(49).

From this trade, no doubt both men yearn for the boundless expanses. Before that, both siblings have communicated reverence for their rural environment, calling them a heaven. The consumerist society is portrayed by Lee as a heaven. After he has broken into one home, he depicts it to Austin as “Like a heaven kinda’ put that sorta’ murders ya’ inside. Warm yellow lights. Mexican tile all around. Copper pots havgin’ over the stove. Ya’ know like. They got in magazines… Kinda’ put you wish you sorta’ experienced childhood in, ya’ know” (12).

He is amazed how individuals accomplished bliss and make their homes a heaven by the new items which he can see just in magazines. He says that the media is the instrument utilized for ad of new items in a consumerist society. Here Austin concurs that they are living in a heaven in their rural region. Their
instability between needing both the opportunity and openness of the desert and the extravagance and structure of suburbia undercross the incongruity in their own identities. It is further unexpected that due to their physical battle with each other, they transform the heaven of mother’s home into a no man’s land. It implies they are dismissing human advancement and in addition their mom’s qualities.

The distinction in appearance reflects the men’s differentiating ways of life, as True West soon uncovers that the two siblings have picked totally unique ways in life. While Austin is an individual from the social world class, Lee is a pariah of society. “Austin speaks to objectivity, discretion and self-control, frame and request, the astuteness, reason. Lee stands for subjectivity, political agitation, experience, overabundance and distortion, instinct and creative energy” (56). Austin makes progress toward the perfect of manly accomplishment, to accomplish money related thriving in his part as the current agent. Lee, then again, takes a stab at the outskirts perfect of manliness. His interest with the model legend of the American past prompts him to maintain a strategic distance from the industrialized city. Lee and Austin speak to an exemplary manly split: the common man versus the social man. The American male is in strife, extraordinarily in struggle in the way of life of the West.

Understanding that Kimmer anticipates that he will centre his consideration on Lee’s film thought rather than his own, Austin gets to be incensed, and the contention between the siblings raises. The intensity inside the business world in the end shreds the siblings facilitate, as Lee affirms: “Rivalry’s
getting’ kinda’ near home, isn’t it?” (42) Kimmer speaks to the cliché corrupt representative. Manipulative, narcissistic and unsympathetic, he will do whatever it takes to get his direction. Lee reports, “[Kimmer] said it was the best story he’s go over in a long, long time” (46). Steadfastness and trust are clearly remote ideas in the business world to which Kimmer has a place. Expressions, for example, “business potential,” “a lot of legitimacy,” and “enormous studio cash” are Kimmer’s principle needs (59). He endeavour’s to purchase Austin into taking an interest in the written work of the script saying that the principal draft offer is three hundred thousand.

In True West, both siblings need to devastate or take a part of the other that each on the other hand admires and slanders. Requiring each other, they stay solidified in beyond reconciliation distinction. True West touches base at no determination between the extremes the siblings hint: contemporary, socialized West and Old, boondocks West, the family man and the maverick, social adequacy and insignificance, the request and train required of workmanship making and the adaptability and bedlam required for innovative thought. Lee thinks his stories of men dying for affection for stallions and his stereotyped yarns about cowpokes perpetually pursuing each other on the abandon are the genuine West. Austin thinks the genuine West is interstates, brown haze, and strip malls, and broadcasts that the legacy of the old West is a dead issue. In any case, the battle between the two siblings demonstrates that the most dangerous parts of old West myths have been fused into contemporary culture. Lee’s account of the interminable pursue by one startled man after another is precisely
what the two siblings recreated toward the end of the play. Neither has figured out how to live with the disagreements delivered by the American culture inside him and neither can help the other repair his one-sidedness.

Toward the end of *True West* Austin asks Lee to give him a chance to get to his auto so he can keep running off to the deceive to live like their dad. Austin holds Lee around the neck with a phone line as Schvey portrays the picture “Caught by the umbilical string of their connectedness, neither one of the brothers can get away, nor they are bound to proceed with their battle inconclusively” (Schvey 21).

In *Fool for Love*, the female characters’ perspective is constantly undermined as Shepard exhibits the male characters’ subjective perspectives on what is genuine or valid as being predominant. He develops implications for the gathering of people with the goal that subjects are situated to see the play from Eddie and the Old Man’s points of view, and get to be drawn into supporting their perspectives. At the point when May’s perspective is introduced, it is seen by the crowd from Eddie and the Old Man’s viewpoints and it is thus undermined. Trick for Love is, indeed, the narrative of male craving and control and shows the huge number of routes in which men command women. The play concentrates fundamentally on the father figure’s endeavours to control his child’s observations and conduct in arrange that the male perspective stay overwhelming. Shepard uses May to sensationalize the intensity which happens among kin, thus she is made as Eddie’s darling, as well as his stepsister. May
intermittently carries on like one of Shepard’s male characters, to give Eddie a reasonable contender, however shows up in a female body with the goal that she can speak to the protest of Eddie’s yearning. May’s character is consequently made so that the binds of men, not women, may be further sensationalized. The main route in which Shepard makes Mayas staying “consistent with herself” is by guaranteeing that she safeguards his development of sex progressive systems that place women in subordinate parts. Sam Shepard’s claim to have underscored a female perspective in *Fool for Love* is significantly undermined by his formation of the character of the Old Man whose subjective perspective is organized. In his opening portrayals of character, Shepard expresses that the Old Man, “exists just in the psyches of May and Eddie, despite the fact that they may converse with him straightforwardly and recognize his physical nearness” (*Fool for Love* 15). While the Old Man may not be seen by May and Eddie, his nearness in their brains is strong to the point that he can impact their conduct. In this sense the Old Man in *Fool for Love* impacts control similarly that Michel Foucault hypothesized that Jeremy Bentham’s structural outline for a jail, the Panopticon, was made to impact control: “The Panopticon is a generalizable model of working: a method for characterizing power relations as far as the consistently life of men ....” (*Foucault* 205) Bentham’s plan comprises of a huge patio with a tower in the middle and an arrangement of structures, isolated into cells, on the fringe.

Shepard additionally shows the nearness of the missing father by permitting the Old Man to break the traditions of conventional sensible theatre
and enter “the fourth divider”. This urges Eddie to relinquish his affirmation of May’s point of view on the occasions which have moulded her history. He urges Eddie to keep on treating May in decisively an indistinguishable way from he treated May and Eddie’s moms.

At the point when May voices her perspective on the occasions that have happened in her history, her adaptation of the story shows that the Old Man’s conduct, which included having two distinct connections and building families with two separate women, was the reason for her own particular mother’s wretchedness and Eddie’s mom’s passing. By leaving May with a specific end goal to pursue the Countess, Eddie repudiates the embodiment of May’s story and to shield the Old Man by living and carrying on as his dad did.

All through Fool for Love May’s perspective and her faith in what is the fact of the matter is occasionally tested by Eddie and the Old Man, who make their own renditions of reality and reality in their own particular personalities. What is risky is that they force their rendition of reality on everyone around them and Shepard shows their discernments more conspicuously than those of May, which permits the male characters’ perspectives to seem better than May’s recognitions and perspectives. This is shown in the way in which Shepard gives the Old Man the last words in the play. Eddie and the Old Man’s capacity to build truths and substances for themselves out of their dreams can be compared to the work of a writer who develops characters and occasions which do not really exist in the groups of onlookers’ “genuine living” presence, however
which are accepted to be genuine or valid by gathering of people individuals at the season of watching a play.

Eddie and the Old Man speak to both cattle rustler and craftsman figures. They speak to cattle rustlers in the way that they craving to live unconstrained lives. They long to meander indiscriminately, additionally to lock in involved with women, which they feel they can desert or resume at any given minute. To reduce assuming liability for their activities, which would confine them, they see occasions from their own particular subjective perspectives, changing reality and making their own particular adaptations of reality. Since craftsmen, and particularly dramatists, additionally participate in making truths or substances from their dreams, Eddie and the Old Man’s conduct is connected with an aesthetic procedure, and can thus be seen as adequate and even praiseworthy.

In *Fool for Love*, the Old Man teaches Eddie on the best way to change one’s dreams into being what one accepts is genuine:

The Old Man: I thought you were supposed to be a fantasist, right? Isn’t that basically the deal with you? You dream things up. Isn’t that true?

EDDIE: (stays on floor) I don’t know.

The Old Man: You don’t know? Well, if you don’t know I don’t know who the hell else does. I wanna’ show you somethin’.

Somethin’ real, okay? Somethin’ actual.

Eddie: Sure.

The Old Man: Take a look at that picture on the wall over there. (...
Ya’ see that? Take a good look at that. Ya’ see it?

EDDLE: (staring at the wall) Yeah.

The Old Man: Ya’ know who that is?

Eddie: I’m not sure.

The Old Man: Barbara Mandrell. That’s who that is. Barbara Mandrell. You heard a’ her?

Eddle: Sure.

The Old Man: Well, would you believe me if I told ya’ I was married to her?

Eddie: (pause) No.

The Old Man: Well, see, now that’s the difference right there. That’s realism. I am actually married to Barbara Mandrell in my mind. Can you understand that? (Fool for Love 26-27)

In this cooperation, Shepard constrains the gathering of people to desert obvious rationale, where a genuine marriage testament would affirm the Old Man’s marriage to Barbara Mandrell. The Old Man proclaims that in his mind his dream is in certainty his form of reality.

Eddie has acquired his dad’s routine of developing his own particular type of reality in his own brain. He builds a picture of May for himself which empowers him to control and possess her, and which permits him to view her as the question of his yearning. At the point when Eddie reviews the first occasion when he saw May, he depicts the experience for them two as though May’s experience of the experience was indistinguishable to his own. Eddie says, “It resembled we knew each other from some place however we couldn’t put where.
In any case, the second we saw each other, that exact moment, we knew we’d never quit being enamoured” *(Fool for Love 67)*. This discourse exhibits that Eddie is resolved to develop the truth of his and May’s relationship. It is his perspective of reality that he implements on May:

The manly point of view is displayed.... Who is we? For whose sake does Eddie talk? Most likely he talks dependably just of his own emotions; he saw May; he was infatuated with her thus quiets her experience of the moms. His constitution of May as the question of his yearning parallels the signal by which his dad constituted Barbara Mandrell as the protest of his longing. Eddie sees May as his darling. As of now “their” adoration turns out to be “genuine” on the grounds that he trusts it is. (Wilson 53-54)

The crowd individuals promptly acknowledge Eddie’s developed perspective of May and of their relationship, since they have as of now been situated to see the play from Eddie and the Old Man’s points of view. May’s endeavour’s to neutralize Eddie’s development of her as the coveted, and to express her own particular perspectives about their relationship are hence undermined before they are even voiced.

Like his dad, Eddie makes his own particular forms of reality out of his dreams. May, in any case, has endured the impacts of the male characters’ inclination for substituting dream for reality and their favouring of the picture over the genuine. It is consequently not astounding that May uncovers that she is all the more seriously hurt by dreams or pictures which frame in her brain than by things she has really experienced or seen:
May: All I see is a picture of you. You and her. I don’t even know if this picture’s real anymore. I don’t even care. It’s a made-up picture. It invades my head. The two of you. And this picture stings even more than if I’d actually seen you with her. It cuts me. It cuts me so deep I’ll never get over it. (*Fool for Love* 28)

May likewise uses dream in an urgent endeavour to preclude reality from claiming her association with Eddie:

Eddie: You know we’re connected, May. We’ll always be connected. That was decided a long time ago.

May: Nothing was decided! You made that all up.

Eddie: You know what happened.

May: You promised me that was finished. You can’t start that up all over again. You promised me.

Eddie: A promise can’t stop something like that. It happened.

May: Nothing happened! Nothing ever happened! (34)

In spite of the fact that May tries to imagine nothing happened between Eddie and herself, she uncovers that she knows about the contrast between what is “genuine” and what is dream at all times.

“Reality” of May and Eddie’s relationship, in any case, is that Eddie comes back to May for a timeframe which is sufficient for him to guarantee that he has her under his control, and afterward abandons her to resume his association with the Countess. Eddie can just stay in an association with May in the event that he occasionally abandons her, since the measure of his adoration is misfortune. The main time he verbalizes sentiments of affection for her is by
portraying the amount he missed her. His yearning to resume his association with May is additionally fuelled by the news that she has endeavoured to develop another life for herself and has a date with Martin. This is another case of male homosocial covet that Shepard used to perform.

Eddie is potentially misleading May about being back for good since he deceives her on different events in the play. At a certain point he asks, “You know what number of miles I went outa’ my approach to come here and see you? (21). Later on he advises her, “I didn’t know where one was going ‘til one arrived” (46). At the point when Martin touches base to bring May and sits tight for her to prepare, Eddie portrays his ideas of lying and coming clean to Martin.

Eddie proposes that Martin remain at home with May instead have to go to the films:

Martin: What would we do here?
Eddie: Well, you could uh - tell each other stories.
Martin: Stories?
Eddie: Yeah.
Martin: I don’t know any stories.
Eddie: Make ‘em up.
Martin: That’d be lying wouldn’t it?
Eddie: No, no. Lying’s when you believe it’s true. If you already know it’s a lie, then it’s not lying. (58)

Eddie’s perspectives on lying and coming clean uncover that he can never be considered in charge of lying. When he advises May that he needs to stay
with her this time, in the event that he trusts it’s actual, he would lie, since as per him, “Lying’s the point at which you trust it’s valid” (58).

In the above association between Martin and Eddie, Shepard draws a difference between the tough cowpoke, who can make his own adaptations of reality, and obliging Martin, who has customary convictions about lying. This complexity is as of now at work before Martin even shows up. At the point when May advises Eddie that Martin is coming to get her for a date, Eddie ridicules her for calling Martin a “man.” Shepard intentionally draws a qualification between Martin, the “man” who is clearly more tender than Eddie and approaches women with deference, and his male saint, the “fellow,” who is not fastened to living by any formal code of conduct and travels every which way from residential structures at his own will.

Despite the fact that Eddie’s rendition of the story is a manufacture of reality, the group of onlookers have as of now been controlled into tolerating the way that things turn out to be genuine and genuine on the off chance that one trusts that they are, thus comprehend Eddie’s form of the story to be genuine for him. They have likewise been situated to acknowledge the way that reality can be made out of manufactures, since they have been made to comprehend that coming clean is an innovative demonstration whereby one creatively changes one’s dreams into reality, and this cannot be called lying, since “On the off chance that you definitely know it’s a lie, then it’s not lying” (58). Along these lines, they are as of now situated to acknowledge Eddie’s variant of the story
despite the fact that it contains Eddie’s developed picture of May and his built reality of their relationship.

Even with Eddie’s cases, the Old Man urgently builds a reality for himself in which he stresses his blamelessness and spots the fault for participating in two connections on May’s mom. He helps Eddie to remember the risk of women, urging him to control it.

The Old Man: But your mother - your mother wouldn’t give it up, would she? ...She drew me to her. She went out of her way to draw me in. She was a force. I told her I’d never come across for her. I told her that right from the very start. But she opened up to me. She wouldn’t listen. She kept opening up her heart to me. How could I turn her down when she loved me like that? How could I turn away from her? We were completely whole. (74)

The Old Man, who beforehand precluded his paternity from claiming Eddie, now engages the way that Eddie is his child. He says. “You gotta’ hold up my end a’ this arrangement. I got no one at this point! No one! You can’t sell out me! You gotta speak to me now! You’re my child!” (75). The Old Man’s engages Eddie appear to put Eddie back in the Oedipal phase of improvement where the child understands that “certain things are the privilege of the father” (75). Since Eddie’s mom and May’s mom are given representation through the voice of May, she can be seen to speak to a mother figure. Eddie and May have a forbidden relationship since May is Eddie’s stepsister. Subsequently, Eddie’s leaving May and embracing the Old Man’s lifestyle sensationalize the male newborn child’s entrance into the Symbolic Arrange, which happens on the grounds
that he gives up his depraved longing for the mother and perceives the power of
the father.

In *Fool for Love*, there is a lot of sex multiplying that happens, as
characters go up against traits and roles which have as of now been doled out to
inverse sexual orientations earlier in the play. Shepard’s male characters have
occupied with physical brutality all through his work. At the point when Eddie
hears that Martin is coming to get May for a date, he plans to go up against his
adversary, by going into May’s live with a firearm which he disassembles and
cleans, accordingly exhibiting his brutal aims. May likewise, be that as it may,
resorts to fantasizing about freeing herself of Eddie and the Countess in a savage
way. She tells Eddie, “I’m going to execute her and afterward I’m going to
murder you. Methodically. With sharp blades. Two separate blades. One for her
and one for you” (20). This picture of phallic addition mirrors May’s kneeing of
Eddie in the crotch and exhibits that May fantasizes and acts in a way that has as
of now been connected with Eddie and male conduct. We discover that Eddie is
the character who leaves, just to endeavour to track May down when he needs
her back. He says, “I’ll track you down regardless of where you go” (50).
Following an accomplice down is initially connected with a male character.

In spite of the fact that Shepard’s utilization of sex multiplying speaks to
women as carrying on in routes other than in cliché, meek parts, female
characters in *Fool for Love* have a tendency to take part in stereotypical manly
conduct. May endeavours to rule Eddie by utilizing physical constrain and
receiving a male focused position to different circumstances. May’s capacity to
carry on like a man focuses more towards Shepard’s craving to make an aggressive adversary for Eddie, which he uses to perform kin contention, than towards his longing to show that women have the capacity to act in ways which do not include characteristically ladylike conduct. It appears to be impossible that he would attempt to enable his female character in this angle, when he undermines her capacity to express her perspective in such a large number of ways.

Shepard develops May’s character in a way which empowers her to carry on like a man, however she shows up as a female character to speak to Eddie’s craving. She is proficient consequently of exhibiting both a male and a female sexuality. In spite of the fact that May opposes Eddie’s development of her as the craved, she is controlled by Shepard to express, occasionally, parts of Eddie’s yearning, which brings about her carrying on in ways which are not reliable. She moves from telling Eddie, “I don’t love you. I needn’t bother with you. I don’t need you,” (50) along these lines endeavouring to challenge Eddie’s development of the truth of their relationship, to disrobing before him, in this manner speaking to the question of his craving.

Shepard’s expressed endeavour to make a female character who remains “totally consistent with herself as a social being, as well as an enthusiastic being, “is defective.’ May shows a total absence of consistency in her conduct. She resists Eddie’s development of her as his wanted protest, attests herself and instructs him to leave, just to negate herself:
May: I don’t need you!

Eddie: Okay (turns to go, collects his glove and bucking-strap) fine.

May: Don’t go!

Eddie: I’m goin’. (18)

May’s activities are likewise conflicting. The stage bearings in the opening scene of the play uncover that, at in the first place, she “all of a sudden snatches his [Eddie’s] nearest leg with both arms and holds tight covering her head between his knees”, yet later, when Eddie tries to push her back on her bed, “She emits irately, jumping off the informal lodging out at him with her clench hands” (17). May’s double sexuality, her twofold part as both a sibling figure and a significant other, and her concurrent fascination and repugnance for Eddie, keep her from staying consistent with herself.

The female perspective in Fool for Love is undermined from multiple points of view. The group of onlooker’s individuals are situated to see the play from the male characters’ point of view and May is required to express her perspective in a scene of representation which maintains patriarchal qualities. Any perspectives that are communicated are negated by her activities, since she is controlled to express Eddie’s longing and in addition her own. Caught in a representation which constitutes women’ assessments as subordinate, May cannot voice a female point of view.

A Lie of the Mind is, too, an account of two families with dismissing and merciless fathers, incapable moms, and their useless posterity. These two
families speak to all families that are gotten up to speed in the lies of the colossal myth of the conventional current American family. *A Lie of the Mind* concerns the relationship among the individuals from two families whose lives are inexactly associated by the marriage of one’s little girl, who is an on-screen character, to the next child. The two families are enduring of mental dysfunctions and an absence of comprehension. The opening stage heading of *A Lie of the Mind* may be a portrayal of the mental and otherworldly circumstance of a considerable lot of his characters: “Impression of colossal space and separation between the two characters with every one segregated in his own pool of light.”

In *A Lie of the Mind* the past throws a long shadow over present occasions. Jake’s beating of his significant other Beth sets up a bond with his sibling Frankie and his physically and mentally damaging father, who drank an excess of and again. *A Lie of the Mind* presents a background marked by Jake’s inconvenience making, refusal to acknowledge duty regarding his activities, and his damaging conduct. His dismissal of duty is an infringement of the standard of masculinity prompts to his inconvenience. His mom Loraine says, “Name a day he wasn’t stuck in an unfortunate situation? He was inconvenience from the very beginning.” (*A Lie of the Mind* 114) Jake experiences issues in associating the present time to that time-before he beats Beth, before his dad passed on, and before he lived in this adolescence home. Beth’s mom, Meg, as is confounded in her memory of Jake as Lorraine is of Beth. Mike advises that Jake dispensed the mind harm of Beth, his name appears to make no difference to her:
Meg: Who’s Jake?

Mike: Her husband, Mom. Jake… you remember Jake, don’t ya? (26)

Meg’s review of her own family is insecure. Discovering shelter in a romanticized rendition of adoration, Beth’s enthusiastic memory of Jake is disengaged from him. He is a name, a voice, a tricky past. Truth be told, when Jake shows up on her doorstep she does not remember him, trusting him to be an outsider. Also, when she recalls his face in a moderate movement, time has swung back to the first run through Beth saw him—not the last.

Close to the opening window ornament, the crowd of *A Lie of the Mind* quickly learns of Jake’s forceful conduct. Calling his sibling Frankie from a payphone, he agitatedly describes the beating he just caused upon his better half, Beth: “She’s not going to pull outa this one, Frankie. She’s not going to. I saw her face. It was terrible this time. Genuine awful. [...] All red and beat up” (4). Jake’s remarks demonstrate the consistency of his brutal driving forces, a reality expanded by Jake’s conduct while on the telephone. Not able to control his wrath even while conversing with his sibling, he more than once crushes the recipient down on the payphone.

However, similar to such a large number of Shepard characters, Jake cannot perceive that the savagery that penetrates his character is an inalienable component of his personality. Amid his telephone call to Frankie, Jake questions his savage motivations, over and over saying “I never at any point seen it
comin’. I shoulda known. Why didn’t I see it comin’. I been useful for so long” (19). Frankie, obviously, has no response for him, and presently Jake says he has as of now put the occurrence behind him. Endeavouring to prevent the repercussions from claiming his savage history, Jake points the finger at Beth for his fierce upheavals, guaranteeing that she was taking part in an extramarital entanglements that incited Jake to assault her. His endeavours to deny his contribution, and along these lines his duty regarding his past activities, exhibit his insensitive nature:

Jake: I killed her. (Pause)

Frankie: You killed her.

Jake: That’s right.

Frankie: She stopped breathing?

Jake: Everything stopped. [...

Frankie: Well, what’d you do? Did you call the police?

Jake: Why would I do that? She was already dead. What could they do about it? [...] I done my time for her. I already done my time. (12-13)

With these words, Jake rejects any idea of individual responsibility. He will leave Beth for dead without worrying about the points of interest.

Jake’s push to separate himself from his past, alongside his puzzling yet ungovernable rough driving forces, speak to his own failings, as well as the inborn defects of Shepard’s origination of national character. Shepard stresses Jake’s representation of American character by hanging him in the American
banner toward the centre of the play. While investigating the substance of his adolescence room, Jake finds the banner that was exhibited to him after the passing of his dad, which he continues to wear “hung around his neck,” (55) alongside his dad’s pilot’s coat enhanced with military decorations. The awards and the banner symbolize the brilliance of America yet overlook the dull undercurrent that shows up in its subjects. Like Kent in “La Turista,” however, Jake’s American outfit looks crazy since he is not wearing any jeans.

The picture of the American that Jake depicts is a halfway one, as is underscored by Shepard’s funny utilization of the deficient outfit. Earley identifies a hidden connection between the Postmodern heroes Shepard depicts with the heroes of classic American Literature. His sense of this fundamental conflict is a responsive chord in Shepard, too. His Jake, be that as it may, will be compelled to recognize the “entire rest of” American character. Mike, looking for reprisal for his sister Beth’s dilemma, tracks Jake down and represses him. In a profoundly noteworthy scene, Mike drives the now-resigned Jake onto the stage; Jake, staring him in the face and knees, has the American banner in his mouth like a steed’s bit, with Mike clutching the finishes of the banner like reins. Having repressed Jake, Mike conveys him to Beth with the goal that he may make amends for his past activities. In endeavouring to advance and authorize a particular national character to which all general public ought strive for, America breaks its natives much like an agriculturist uses a hackamore to break his steed. Mike even coos to Jake as though he was a ranch creature, saying “Atta kid. You’re going to do fine and dandy. Quite soon we can take you ideal out into the
forested areas. Drag some timber. You’ll like that” (Shepard, *A Lie of the Mind* 28). Mike’s utilization of Old Glory, the image of the country and its belief systems, to limit and control Jake stresses the effect of American character on the American. In this unique circumstance, “the banner has gotten to be, not a mythic token of freedom, but rather a method for persecution” (28). Jake, in the same way as other Americans, is commanded by an unachievable vision that leads him like an agriculturist leads his furrow horse. So, while Jake’s vicious disposition and harsh inclinations do not charm him to the group of onlookers, this specific scene gives him a role as the casualty of a bigger, overpowering power. While not offering a reason for Jake’s conduct, Shepard seems to give a clarification to it.

Shepard’s utilization of the banner in *A Lie of the Mind* obviously ensnares America as being in charge of denying Americans the capacity to accomplish any feeling of character, national or individual, since it advances an admired vision of the spearheading, independent soul while smothering the vicious reality of that picture in our country’s past. In this regard, *A Lie of the Mind* typifies the whole extent of American personality for Shepard: Americans are attracted to a dream of national character; it controls and at last annihilates the individual, advancing an unattainable picture of “the American”; lastly Lie endeavors to rescue Old Glory, holding out the likelihood that the banner play an imperative and conceivably redemptive part in the public arena. As the play advances, the banner turns out to be all the more physically conspicuous, as it turns into a noteworthy concentration of consideration for both the gathering of
people and characters in the play. On its first appearance in the play, the banner is created by Jake’s sister Sally, who discovers it “collapsed in a triangle military-style” underneath Jake’s adolescence bed alongside their dad’s war awards and flight coat. “Dusty,” Jake remarks, summing up with a solitary word the condition of an American personality that appears to be obsolete and blocked off to society. However, Jake’s adoration for the banner soon gets to be clear, as he wears it around his neck like a cape.

Shepard continues to use the banner to uncover the inconvenient results of American character in the exceptionally imagistic scene where Mike drives Jake in front of an audience with the banner in Jake’s mouth, as talked about above. Instantly after, Shepard suggests the inalienable savagery that saturates national awareness: in the wake of reining Jake in, Mike wraps the banner around his chasing rifle, expressly interfacing America to the viciousness which undergirds it; yet Shepard contends through such stage pictures that brutality is hidden by the banner, giving an enthusiastic or nationalistic cover for the savagery. The firearm wrapped in the American banner uncovered the beguiling way of an American personality that hides its questionable qualities.

At last, however, A Lie of the Mind leaves open the likelihood of recovery for American character, communicated through the banner’s last picture. Seeing Mike’s utilization of the banner as a firearm cover, his dad Baylor rebukes him for his activities. Whenever Mike tries to call attention to that “it’s only a banner” and that the more essential issue is that Mike has caught “the person who beat up your girl,” Baylor furiously reacts,
It’s not just a flag. That’s the flag of our nation. Isn’t that the flag of our nation wrapped around that rifle? [...] You don’t recognize the flag anymore? It’s the same color it always was. They haven’t changed it, have they? Maybe added a star or two but otherwise it’s exactly the same. How could you not recognize it? [...] What do ya think yer doin’, using the American flag like a grease rag.

When he has recouped the banner, Baylor keeps on treating it with an awed veneration. Helped by his significant other Meg, Baylor continues to precisely overlap the banner in the customary military style, advising Meg, “Don’t give it a chance to touch the ground now. Simply move in an opposite direction from me and we’ll extend it first. Try not to give it a chance to touch the ground whatever you do” (50). Before the end of the play, the banner has turned out to be practically consecrated, maybe proposing that its mythic esteem can some way or another be recouped.

Given its broadly separating imagery in *A Lie of the Mind*, the banner opposes complete understanding, which suits Shepard’s motivations in delineating a gathering of individuals whose future stays unverifiable. While the play ostensibly contains a larger amount of hopefulness than any past Shepard work, it stays vague, declining to offer any enduring feeling of determination.

The two components that are regularly distinguished as giving proof to idealism are the possibly sexual orientation liquid relationship between Frankie and Beth and the reconnection between Baylor and Meg. Leslie Wade attests that in *A Lie of the Mind* Shepard “expects an up to this time inconspicuous level
of absolution,” one that “leaves the gathering of people with a novel feeling of conclusion, determination, and for some, good faith” (125). Wade particularly refers to the “banner collapsing custom” as “the most striking element of the play’s decision”:

The two kiss, surprisingly, Meg uncovers, in a quarter century. Shepard here offers a snapshot of unique delicacy, an impression of harmony topped by Meg’s last line. Beth’s mom looks over the phase toward the blazing keepsakes [Jake’s mother] Lorraine and Sally touched off in the earlier scene and comments: “Resembles a fire in the snow. How might that be?” This minute shows an unobtrusive theatricalism on Shepard’s part. The performer playing Meg really observes a fire on the opposite side of the stage, and the line accordingly attempts to connect the typical hole that navigates the beautiful space […] and the play in this manner abandons one with a note of compromise, regardless of the savagery and division that has gone before. (Wade 213)

While this last scene without a doubt connotes a freshly discovered delicacy and maybe sympathy between Meg and Baylor, any confidence felt by the gathering of people ought to be tempered with a feeling of alert that Shepard likewise injects into the play. Baylor, who Wade herself brings up is “another embodiment of the outskirts attitude,” exhibits an irregular and over the top love for the banner; it envelops his consideration so totally that he disregards the showdown that is happening between Meg and Jake just before his eyes. Keeping in mind Baylor encounters a transient love for Meg, it is alleviated by his demonstration of partition just before the last drapery. Baylor inquires as to
whether she’s coming upstairs to bed, and when she says “I’ll be up in a while,” he answers, “Well, I’m goin’ up. You close the lights when you come. What’s more, don’t tarry. I don’t wanna get woke up amidst a decent dream” (A Lie of the Mind 47). Such asks for demonstrate that Baylor has really changed practically nothing, and that he stays as self-ingested as some time recently. The physical separation between the two characters, with Baylor upstairs and Meg first floor. At last, Meg’s remark about “flame in the snow,” to which Wade credits idealistic intentions, recommends scepticism and inconsistency as opposed to acknowledgment or compromise. The clashing picture, in run of the mill Shepard form, serves to convolute the closure instead of resolve it.

The second idealistic component that numerous commentators single out in A Lie of the Mind is the dynamic way to deal with sexual orientation parts that Beth and Frankie show all through the play, particularly as it shows itself in the closing scenes. Stephen Bottoms contends that the smoothness of sexual orientation parts in the characters of Beth and Frankie gives a “positive potential” in the capacity to defeat the confining implications of personality. Bottoms declares that a portion of the characters in Lie move past negligible acknowledgment of the issues of the past, recommending that “as opposed to just looking to mend wounds, a significant number of the characters really upset their conduct” (Bottoms 256).

Be that as it may, at the end of the day, any confidence found in the transformative and redemptive capability of Shepard’s characters’ capacity to refashion another picture of personality must be alleviated by the dramatist’s
irresolute presentation of that plausibility. While Beth’s vision of Frankie turning into a “lady man” supplanting the run of the mill American male (Jake, Mike, and Baylor) gives the picture of a more comprehensive American character that disposes of its characteristic viciousness, that vision is purchased at too high a cost. Beth’s “edification” comes just through her brutalization on account of Jake, Shepard’s American. Physically and rationally, she has persevered through Jake’s discipline and at last prevailing with regards to moving past it, yet at the cost of her mind.

Besides, Beth’s vision of a reformulated personality is dismisses by other people in the play. As the play closes, Baylor and Meg overlook Beth totally. What’s more, Frankie, the main other character left in front of an audience, disavows Beth after Jake advises her to remain with Frankie “Jake! Wait a second. Jake! What’re you doin’? [...] Jake, you gotta take her with you!! It’s not true, Jake! She belongs to you! You gotta take her with you! I never betrayed you! I was true to you!” (*A Lie of the Mind* 43).

Frankie’s censure of Beth works on an ideological level and in addition an individual one. Frankie rejects Beth’s “lady man,” rather keeping up his dedication to a national character spoke to by Jake. Not only agreeing with his sibling, Frankie additionally endeavours to reassert Jake’s power as the American. While Beth imagines a superior life for her and Frankie, Frankie treats Beth like an undesirable ownership.
So the completion of *A Lie of the Mind* stays undecided. However Bottoms is right to detect a “swoon, oddly elevating idealism” in the play. Maybe the good faith here is that despite the fact that America’s nationals have been rationally battered, they have survived and landed at a place where the likelihood for a recovery of character exists. Unquestionably, Jake’s readiness to renounce his position as Beth’s better half speaks to a recently discovered trust in Shepard’s work. Jake concedes the falsity of his vision of American character by uncovering the hallucination: “These things – i my mind – deceive me. Everything lies. Recounts to me a story. Everything in me lies. Be that as it may, you. You remain. You are valid. I know you now. You are valid” (53). His availability to expel himself from the photo opens up the likelihood for change, regardless of the possibility that that plausibility at last goes unfulfilled.

Shepard’s next play, *States of Shock*, proceeds with his push to drive the American mind to its snapshot of emergency through a think endeavour at encounter. Shepard composed *States of Shock*, a short play, amid the Gulf War and it was organized at the American Place Theatre in 1991. In spite of the fact that it has taken a solid hostile to war position, *States of Shock* is a naturalistic family play managing just externally with war in the political feeling of the word. Despite the fact that it got cruel judgment, it shows Shepard’s take-off from the more traditional style of his family plays and a redesign of his showy virtuoso.

The show is set in a centre American eatery into which the Colonel enters with Stubbs, a wheelchair-ridden veteran of some anonymous war. It is inferred
that Stubbs might be the officer’s child however the Colonel denies this claim.

The passionate devastation experienced by these two fundamental characters is portrayed by the troubling turn of the show, when it is accounted for that the young’s harm was created by inviting flame. “Stubbs rises as a challenger to the war mind-set and the numerous refusals of his dad” (Roudané 263).

_States of Shock_ performs a contention between Colonel and Stubbs. Their encounter, ordered before typical agents of the American open, proposes a fight between the patriarchal, pre-Vietnam myths of a honest American military and the broke, post-Vietnam substances of young fellows murdered and damaged in an expensive and neurotic war of expansionism. The Colonel is irate and terrible tempered character whose unstable identity overwhelms the entire play and Stubbs is a youthful veteran who is bound to a wheelchair enlivened with little American banners. Despite the fact that it is not straightforwardly said but rather it is suggested that Stubbs is Colonel’s child. Colonel demands that his child is dead in a chivalrous battle. He says Stubbs is his child’s closest companion who was brutally injured by neighbourly mounted guns shoot while unsuccessfully attempting to spare the life of his child, “This is the man who endeavoured to spare my child’s life by setting his body in the method for approaching ordnance discharge” and after that it is Stubbs who says: “It was well disposed discharge. It grinned in my face. I could see its teeth when it hit us. I could see its tongue” (States of Shock 6). Stubbs recalls occasions unique in relation to the way the Colonel does. He proposes that he was struck by his own particular powers when he was running from fight. Colonel has obviously brought Stubbs from a
doctor’s facility to the eatery to praise the commemoration of his child’s passing. The contention between Colonel and Stubbs heightens when Colonel needs Stubbs to re-enact the fight scene in which his child was slaughtered and Stubbs was injured, by method for toy troopers, tanks, planes, cutlery as shore lines and a sugar gadget as a mountain. Stubbs definitely presumes that Colonel cannot acknowledge him as his child since he has come back from the war seriously injured and inept. He does not encapsulate the photo of a war saint and a genuine American man Colonel has in his psyche.

*States of Shock* manages the subject of war through a performance of a father-child strife. “Over the span of the play, the two men battle a duel-by-dialect that closures in a physically savage standoff run of the mill of practically every Shepard play – to the sheer awe and aggregate absence of comprehension of the two different clients in the eatery, a more established working class couple called the White Man and the White Woman” (Willadt 273).

Colonel’s demonstrations of savagery are for the most part coordinated against Stubbs. He undermines to rebuff Stubbs each time Stubbs does not act the way Colonel anticipates that him will. Inevitably, Colonel works brutally, his activities are joined by the hints of blasts and by the photos of war showed on the cyclorama. “Shepard makes the association between male brutality and war self-evident, however he likewise makes it clear that, for him, the genuine war fumes on an individual, antihuman level’”(Willadt 276).
Stubbs has survived anonymous war quite recently to get back home and battle another and this one is truly key for him. He needs to battle his most ghastly foe: his dad. For both men this battle involves life and passing. Both men over and again consent to the way that, “WITHOUT THE ENEMY WE’RE NOTHING!” (States of Shock 15). For them, just male rivalry and forcefulness prompt to a really male character, and this is the thing that both men are going for.

A part change happens toward the end of the play. Stubbs must utilize brutality to suppress the viciousness of his dad. All of a sudden, Stubbs is move down on his feet stunning around the stage and Colonel who sits in the wheelchair. To reject Stubbs being his child and to demonstrate he is the main man, Colonel notice to Stubbs weakness: “No child of mine has a “thing” like that. It’s impractical” (34). At that point Stubbs moving on the floor with Glory Bee says: “My thing is returning.” (42). Both men attempt to demonstrate their masculinity with the utilization of a lady, Glory honey bee. Wonderfulness Bee is the sex protest and prepared to be utilized at whatever point Stubbs and Colonel are in need. To start with she demonstrates readiness to serve Colonel when he is in control. At that point he turns into the protest of rivalry for Colonel and Stubbs. She is a goal for two heroes through whom they can demonstrate their masculinity. Sexual intensity is a basic necessity for manliness, for being a genuine man. She adds much diversion to the play with her singing, hitting the dance floor with Colonel, moving around on the floor with Stubbs. She is there to emerged sexual sensation in men particularly cause Stubbs’ strength to be
revived. Her sexual capacity is her most critical capacity and it does not make a difference in the event that she as a server is uncouth at conveying things.

Greatness Bee as female character needs to get the enthusiasm of the male characters and emerge them to sexual sensation through her method for wearing and coquettish conduct. To play out her sexual work, she inactively sits tight for the requests of the Colonel and Stubbs to serve them with her sexuality. Eminence Bee’s scope of capacity is decreased to what is run of the mill of female exercises:

preparation to do local assignments, for example, taking requests, serving beverages and nourishment to male clients or tidying up the wreckage they make and to be utilized sexually at whatever point two male heroes are in need. She is not in any case ready to do her straightforward obligations satisfactorily. (Wilson 290-306)

Shepard’s States of Shock is generally organized around male heroes. What these characters do is to monitor social and legendary pictures of masculinity and develop their own particular personalities as far as those pictures. Not just does this play depict macho male and his energy yet it likewise uncovers the nerves and cracking of male characters and the youthfulness of their reasoning about their own particular personalities. Shepard scrutinizes the father figure as not being a genuine father in this play. By indicating male characters as imperative delegates of a rotting manly power, Shepard criticizes the picture of the patriarch and manly good example. The father is reprimanded for having shown his child the wrong beliefs.
In *States of Shock*, the Colonel freely asserts that Stubbs is a war legend, an overcome officer who endeavoured to spare the life of the Colonel’s child by putting his own particular body between his child and an adversary rocket. Colonel tells that the rocket has gone straight through Stubbs and executed his shocking child. Stubbs has been the fortunate one who has lived to tell the story. The Colonel is especially fixated on having Stubbs relate for him the exact conditions prompting to the passing of his child. He utilizes toy officers, plastic tanks and planes, and in addition flatware and fixings from the eatery stall to reproduce the correct arrangement of occasions.

Stubbs remembers occasions not the same as what Colonel compels him to reproduce. He is not inspired by the occasions paving the way to his tribulation which has changed his life. He needs to discuss his feelings, enduring, and loathsome agony. Stubbs who is limited to wheelchair recommends that he is Colonel’s child, and that he was running from fight, shouting his dad’s name, when he was struck around agreeable fire. Stubbs feels he had a mission however all that vanished in fight. Stubbs has been sold out by the patriarchal myths which drove him to war, terminated upon and surrendered by his kinsmen. His personality is denied by his dad who no longer perceives his family relationship.

*States of Shock* has no genuine completion or arrangement. Like Lee and Austin in *True West*, the two male heroes in *States of Shock* stand solidified in a place of everlasting encounter and ill will. It is not clear whether Stubbs will execute the Colonel. Toward the end it is Stubbs who remains behind Colonel
and holds him in a solid hold. He then discharges his hold and snatches Colonel’s sword in both hands and will execute the Colonel, yet then stops in that stance. He at last demonstrates that he has turned into a genuine man utilizing viciousness against Colonel. Stubbs has discovered his male personality.

Thus over the period of time one could find Shepard’s change of attitude towards the concept of manliness, which led to the better understanding of women characters in his middle plays. The ensuing chapter focuses on the shift towards alternative gender roles in the later plays of Shepard.