Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)
A Peer Reviewed (Refereed) International Journal
Impact Factor 6.8992 (ICI) http://www.rjelal.com;
Email:editorrjelal@gmail.com; ISSN:2395-2636 (P); 2321-3108(O)

Vol.13.Issue 2. 2025 (April-June)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA
2395-2636 (Print):2321-3108 (online)

Toxic Masculinity and State Violence: Gender Performance in Sam Shepard's *The God of Hell*

S. Abhilash Mathew
Assistant Professor in English,
St. Joseph's College Moolamattom, Kerala.

DOI: 10.33329/rjelal.13.2.291

Article info
Article Received: 27/04/2025
Article Accepted: 30/05/2025
Published online: 07/06/2025

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between toxic masculinity and state violence in Sam Shepard's play *The God of Hell* (2004), arguing that the play presents militarized masculinity as both instrument and product of authoritarian power. Through detailed analysis of gender performance, this study demonstrates how Shepard connects patriarchal structures to the erosion of democratic values in post-9/11 America. The character of Welch embodies a hypermasculine state agent whose violence enforces both political submission and gender conformity, while Frank and Haynes experience systematic feminization as part of their victimization. Emma's evolving resistance represents a crucial counter-narrative that challenges both patriarchal domesticity and state authoritarianism. Using theories of performative gender, masculinity studies, and political theatre, the study attempts to reveal how Shepard's play exposes the symbiotic relationship between toxic masculinity and authoritarian governance, suggesting that democratic renewal requires fundamental reconstruction of gender norms alongside political structures.

Keywords: toxic masculinity, state violence, gender performance, post-9/11 theatre, authoritarianism, political drama.

Introduction

Sam Shepard's *The God of Hell* (2004) emerged from the specific political context of post-9/11 America, when anxieties about terrorism, surveillance, and democratic erosion permeated national consciousness. While the play's overt political critique has received substantial scholarly attention, its sophisticated engagement with gender politics remains underexplored. This paper argues that Shepard's drama presents toxic masculinity not merely as a parallel concern to state violence but as fundamentally intertwined with authoritarian power structures.

The play's domestic setting—a Wisconsin dairy farm—becomes a battleground

where traditional American masculinity confronts its militarized mutation. Through the intrusion of Welch, a hypermasculine government agent, into the pastoral world of Frank and Emma, Shepard stages the violent transformation of democratic space into authoritarian territory. This transformation operates through explicitly gendered mechanisms: the assertion of dominant masculinity, the feminization of victims, and the suppression of female agency.

The study employs theoretical frameworks from gender studies, particularly Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity and R.W. Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity, alongside political theory examining the relationship between patriarchy and authoritarianism. Through close textual analysis, this study demonstrates how *The God of Hell* exposes toxic masculinity as both a tool of state oppression and a fundamental threat to democratic society.

Theoretical Framework and Militarized Masculinity

R.W. Connell's influential work on masculinity provides essential context for understanding how *The God of Hell* portrays gender as a power structure. Connell defines hegemonic masculinity as "the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy" (77). This form of masculinity maintains dominance not through force alone but through cultural authority and institutional power. In Shepard's play, Welch represents an extreme version of hegemonic masculinity tied directly to state power. His authority derives from both his hypermasculine performance and his governmental position, demonstrating how patriarchal and political structures reinforce each other.

Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity illuminates how *The God of Hell* presents masculinity as a repeated performance rather than an essential identity. Butler argues that gender is "performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results" (33). This understanding proves crucial for analysing how characters in Shepard's play enact, resist, or are forced into specific gender performances. The theatrical medium itself becomes significant—as characters perform gender on stage, the audience witnesses the constructed nature of these identities. Shepard exploits this meta-theatrical dimension to expose how political power operates through enforced gender performances.

Studies on toxic masculinity provides a framework for understanding Welch's character. Terry Kupers defines toxic masculinity as "the constellation of socially regressive male traits that serve to foster domination, the devaluation of women, homophobia, and wanton violence" (714). This definition directly applies to Welch's behaviour throughout the play. The post-9/11 context adds another dimension to this analysis. Susan Faludi's *The Terror Dream* analyses how national trauma triggered a resurgence of hypermasculine mythology in American culture, with increased emphasis on male protectors and female victims. Shepard's play critically examines this cultural shift, revealing how appeals to masculine protection mask authoritarian impulses.

From his first appearance, Welch performs an exaggerated version of American masculinity. His costume—"dark suit, American flag pin" (Shepard 15)—combines corporate power with patriotic symbolism, while his behaviour oscillates between aggressive salesman and military interrogator. This dual performance reveals how contemporary authoritarianism operates through both commercial and militaristic registers. Welch's language reinforces his hypermasculine persona through constant sexual innuendo, aggressive rhetoric, and dismissive attitudes toward anything perceived as feminine. His repeated use of electrical torture explicitly sexualizes violence: "You want me to juice him up for you?

Give him a little tickle?" (Shepard 38). This fusion of sexual and violent imagery exemplifies how toxic masculinity eroticizes domination.

Welch's authority depends on his performance of dominant masculinity as much as his governmental position. He establishes control through physical intimidation, invasive questioning, and demonstrations of technological power—all coded as masculine displays. His treatment of Frank and Haynes reveals how state violence operates through gendered humiliation. The character's name itself suggests multiple meanings: "welch" as betrayal of agreement, but also the metallurgical process of welding—forcing disparate elements together through heat and pressure. This mirrors how Welch forces others to conform to his vision of American identity through violence and intimidation.

Welch's use of technology, particularly the electrical torture device, represents a specifically modern form of masculine dominance. The device extends his physical power while maintaining distance—a technological enhancement of traditional masculine violence. His demonstrations of the equipment reveal how toxic masculinity fetishizes instruments of control. This violence also represents the militarization of domestic space. Welch transforms Frank's home into an interrogation site, using advanced equipment to enforce submission. The play suggests that contemporary authoritarianism operates through such technological extensions of masculine power.

Gender, Victimization, and Resistance

In the beginning, Frank is a representation of traditional rural masculinity—a dairy farmer connected to the land and animals. However, Welch's intrusion systematically strips away his masculine identity. Frank's initial resistance crumbles as Welch invades his space, intimidates his wife, and ultimately reduces him to a passive victim. The progression of Frank's emasculation follows a clear pattern. He loses control over his home (traditional masculine domain), cannot protect his wife (failure of the protector role), and eventually suffers physical torture that reduces him to helpless screaming. Welch explicitly feminizes Frank through language, calling him "weak" and mocking his rural lifestyle as insufficiently masculine.

Haynes appears already broken by state violence, representing the complete destruction of intellectual masculinity. His past work at Rocky Buttes—a site of classified atomic research—marks him as a figure of scientific authority, a form of masculinity based on knowledge rather than physical force. However, his current state shows this alternative masculinity crushed by militarized power. Throughout the play, Haynes exhibits behaviours deemed as feminine within patriarchal frameworks: hysteria, helplessness, and emotional volatility. His inability to maintain coherent speech or control his body represents the ultimate failure of masculine self-possession. The electrical burns covering his body serve as visible marks of his emasculation, while his paranoid behaviour suggests the psychological destruction of masculine rationality.

The systematic feminization of male victims reveals how state violence operates through gender shaming. By forcing men into positions coded as feminine—weakness, emotionality, penetrability—authoritarian power reinforces patriarchal hierarchies while breaking individual resistance. This process simultaneously upholds toxic masculinity as the ideal while using deviation from it as punishment. The play's torture scenes explicitly invoke sexual violence, with electrical shocks administered to genitals representing both literal and symbolic emasculation. This sexualized violence demonstrates how political oppression operates through gendered mechanisms, using patriarchal norms as tools of control.

Emma's character represents the play's most significant transformation. She begins as a stereotypical farm wife—hospitable, domestic, politically disengaged. Her initial responses to Welch involve offering food and maintaining household routines, performing traditional feminine hospitality even as her home is invaded. However, Emma's growing awareness of the violence occurring in her house triggers a political awakening. Her transformation challenges both Welch's authority and Frank's passivity, suggesting that resistance to authoritarianism requires abandoning traditional gender roles. Her final act—following Welch to continue the fight—represents a rejection of domestic containment.

Throughout the play, Emma demonstrates greater perceptiveness than the male characters. She recognizes Welch's threat before Frank, understands the significance of Haynes's condition, and ultimately sees through the government's deceptions. This gendered distribution of knowledge inverts traditional assumptions about feminine naivety and masculine worldliness. Emma's questions consistently penetrate masculine performances: "What's this all about, Frank?" (Shepard 32). Her demands for explanation force male characters to acknowledge realities they prefer to ignore. This persistent questioning represents a form of feminine resistance that undermines masculine authority through exposure.

Emma's relationship with the American flag evolves throughout the play, representing her changing understanding of patriotism and gender roles. Initially, she helps Welch display flags throughout her home, participating in nationalist performance. However, her growing skepticism toward these symbols parallels her rejection of traditional feminine compliance. The flag becomes a contested symbol of both national and gender identity. Welch uses it to assert masculine authority disguised as patriotism, while Emma's eventual resistance suggests that true patriotism requires challenging both authoritarian governance and patriarchal structures.

Patriarchal Structures, National Mythology, and Political Theatre

Shepard's play reveals deep structural parallels between patriarchal and authoritarian systems. Both operate through hierarchical dominance, enforcement of rigid roles, and punishment of deviation. Welch's character embodies this connection—his masculine performance is inseparable from his authoritarian methods. The domestic setting emphasizes these parallels. The transformation of a family home into an interrogation site mirrors how patriarchal structures operate within private spaces while serving larger power systems. The play suggests that authoritarianism begins at home, in the gendered relationships that normalize dominance and submission.

Both patriarchy and authoritarianism maintain power through violence—threatened or actual. Welch's electrical torture device serves as a literal instrument of both political and gender enforcement. The sexualized nature of the violence reveals how political oppression operates through patriarchal mechanisms. The play demonstrates how state violence amplifies existing gender hierarchies. Welch's authority depends on his ability to perform superior masculinity while forcing others into feminized positions. This gendered violence serves both to break individual resistance and reinforce systemic hierarchies.

The God of Hell portrays post-9/11 America as a period of intense masculine anxiety. The terrorist attacks challenged fantasies of masculine protection, leading to overcompensation through military aggression and domestic surveillance. Welch represents this anxious masculinity—his hypermasculine performance masks deep insecurity about American vulnerability. The play suggests that authoritarian responses to crisis often involve intensified gender policing. As national security

becomes paramount, traditional gender roles are enforced more rigidly, with deviation branded as un-American. This connection between gender conformity and patriotic loyalty reveals how authoritarianism exploits masculine anxiety.

The reference to Rocky Buttes—the classified atomic research facility where Haynes worked—introduces another dimension to the play's gender analysis. Nuclear research represented the pinnacle of mid-twentieth-century masculine achievement: the domination of nature through scientific rationality. Haynes's destruction suggests the failure of this modern masculine ideal. The atomic age promised ultimate masculine control—the power to split atoms and reshape matter. However, Haynes's radioactive contamination reveals this promise as destructive illusion. His body, burned and broken by the very forces he studied, embodies the self-destructive nature of masculine technological ambition.

The transition from Rocky Buttes (scientific research) to Welch's torture (military application) traces the evolution of American masculinity from intellectual to purely violent forms. Where mid-century America celebrated scientist-heroes, post-9/11 culture elevates military and security personnel. Haynes represents the older model's obsolescence, while Welch embodies the new hypermasculine ideal. This shift reflects broader cultural anxieties about American decline. Scientific masculinity's failure at Rocky Buttes—implied by the facility's classified status and Haynes's condition—necessitates Welch's cruder form of masculine dominance. The play suggests that as American technological superiority wanes, toxic masculinity intensifies to compensate.

Shepard employs specific theatrical techniques to expose the gender dynamics underlying political violence. The confined domestic setting intensifies gender performances, while the presence of torture equipment makes violence viscerally present. The play's dark comedy highlights the absurdity of toxic masculinity while maintaining its genuine threat. The progression from realism to surrealism mirrors the escalation of gendered violence. As Welch's behavior becomes more extreme, the play's style becomes more expressionistic, suggesting that toxic masculinity itself represents a break from reality—a destructive fantasy that nevertheless has real consequences.

The play implicates its audience in the gender dynamics it portrays. Spectators watch Emma perform domestic femininity, witness the emasculation of Frank and Haynes, and observe Welch's hypermasculine display. This viewing position raises questions about complicity—how does watching staged gender violence relate to accepting real-world patriarchal structures? By making gender performance visible as performance, Shepard's theatrical medium denaturalizes toxic masculinity. The audience sees Welch's masculinity as an act—compelling and dangerous, but ultimately constructed. This visibility potentially enables critical distance and resistance.

Written in 2004, *The God of Hell* responded to specific post-9/11 conditions, but its analysis of toxic masculinity remains urgently relevant. The play's connection between authoritarian politics and gender violence anticipates contemporary discussions about the relationship between misogyny and political extremism. The rise of explicitly misogynistic political movements, the discourse around "traditional" gender roles, and the connection between masculine grievance and authoritarianism all find expression in Shepard's play. Welch prefigures contemporary figures who combine hypermasculine performance with anti-democratic politics.

Conclusion: Gender Transformation and Democratic Renewal

The God of Hell ultimately suggests that resisting authoritarianism requires transforming gender relations. Emma's

evolution from compliant housewife to active resistor demonstrates how challenging patriarchal structures enables political agency. Conversely, Frank and Haynes's destruction shows how toxic masculinity makes men vulnerable to authoritarian control even as it promises dominance.

The play's dark ending—with Welch apparently triumphant—reflects pessimism about America's direction in 2004. However, Emma's continued resistance offers hope that gendered hierarchies can be challenged. Her rejection of both feminine passivity and masculine violence suggests alternative forms of democratic citizenship. *The God of Hell* suggests that democratic renewal requires not just political reform but fundamental reconstruction of gender relations. The play's enduring relevance lies in its recognition that the personal is indeed political—that the violence enacted in American homes connects directly to violence exported globally. As contemporary democracy faces renewed authoritarian threats, Shepard's analysis of toxic masculinity's political function becomes increasingly urgent.

Through its portrayal of gender performance under authoritarian pressure, *The God of Hell* contributes to understanding how democratic societies slide towards tyranny. The play reveals that such transitions occur not through dramatic rupture but through the intensification of existing hierarchies—particularly gender hierarchies that normalize dominance and submission. Recognizing these patterns becomes essential for resistance, making Shepard's dark comedy a vital text for understanding the gender politics of democratic crisis.

Works Cited

Butler, Judith. Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. Routledge, 1990. Print.

Connell, R. W., and James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." Gender & Society, vol. 19, no. 6, 2005, pp. 829-859. Print.

Enloe, Cynthia. Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link. Rowman & Littlefield, 2007. Print.

Faludi, Susan. The Terror Dream: Myth and Misogyny in an Insecure America. Metropolitan Books, 2007. Print.

Kimmel, Michael. Angry White Men: American Masculinity at the End of an Era. Nation Books, 2013. Print.

Kupers, Terry A. "Toxic Masculinity as a Barrier to Mental Health Treatment in Prison." Journal of Clinical Psychology, vol. 61, no. 6, 2005, pp. 713-724. Print.

Pateman, Carole. The Sexual Contract. Stanford University Press, 1988. Print.

Puar, Jasbir K. Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times. Duke University Press, 2007. Print.

Shepard, Sam. The God of Hell. Dramatists Play Service, 2005. Print.

Sjoberg, Laura. Gender, War, and Conflict. Polity, 2014. Print.

Young, Iris Marion. "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State." Signs, vol. 29, no. 1, 2003, pp. 1-25. Print.