UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SANTA CRUZ

CASE STUDY OF INCORPORATING THEATRE OF NEURODIVERSITY INTO THE CURIOUS INCIDENT

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THEATER ARTS

by

Joel Moore

June 2022

The Thesis of Joel Moore
is approved:

_____
Professor Patty Gallagher, Chair

_____
Professor Michael M. Chemers

_____
Professor Marianne Weems

_____
Peter Biehl
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Copyright © by

Joel S. Moore

2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS iii

ABSTRACT v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi

INTRODUCTION 1

PART 1: THE BUILDING BLOCKS 4

Social Model of Disability 4

Before Theatre of Neurodiversity and Disability Theater 7

Theatre of Neurodiversity and Disability Theater Defined 13

Disability Theater 15

Theatre of Neurodiversity 17

The Manifesto 19

The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time 23

PART 2: THE DIRECTOR'S EXPERIENCE 27

Pre-Production 27

Rehearsal Process: Standard Rehearsal and Setting the Tone 28

Rehearsal Process: Breakthroughs and Disruptions 32

Performance 38

PART 3: CAST INTERVIEWS 42

Interview Questions and Format 42

Interview Responses 44

CONCLUSION 50

APPENDIX A: REHEARSAL GUIDELINES 54

APPENDIX B: DIRECTOR'S NOTE 55

BIBLIOGRAPHY 56

ABSTRACT

Case Study Of Incorporating Theatre Of Neurodiversity Into The Curious Incident

By Joel Moore

When the play *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time* premiered in 2012, it was one of the most significant representations of autism produced for the stage up to that point. However, the production was not accessible to autistic people, with the script and staging unaccommodating to the needs of autistic people.

As an autistic director, I attempted to stage a version of the show that was accommodating to the autistic community and empowering to them. For this, I adapted the Theatre of Neurodiversity created by Sarah Magni for online performance to an in-person rehearsal environment and used myself as an autistic individual to determine the success of this adaptation. I created a manifesto that defined Theatre of Neurodiversity to evaluate the result.

Ultimately, while the production did not fully meet the standards of the Theatre of Neurodiversity, it was closer than the original production.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am first and foremost grateful to my faculty advisor Patty Gallagher. You were always available to quell them through all my moments of doubt. This thesis would not exist if it were not for you, so thank you so much for sticking by me through all the missed deadlines and misspellings.

I would also like to thank the faculty at large in the PPD department at UCSC. Your lessons informed my research and prepared me to tackle such an overwhelming task as directing a fully-fledged production. Thank you for all the knowledge.

I must also acknowledge that the land my program and production took place on is not my own but is the unceded territory of the Awaswas-speaking Uypi Tribe. The Amah Mutsun Tribal Band, composed of the descendants of indigenous people taken to missions Santa Cruz and San Juan Bautista during Spanish colonization of the Central Coast, is today working hard to restore traditional stewardship practices on these lands and heal from historical trauma.

Lastly, I dedicate this paper to my wonderful cast and crew for making the production possible. Without you, I would be a director with an empty stage and bold ideas. Your hard work made the final performance a night to remember. So thank you, this paper is dedicated to you.

INTRODUCTION

Theater is an art that has always appealed to me since my first introduction to it. It was a connection that was instant and total. The transformative nature of theater was a fascinating aspect for me as I could shed my skin and become another person entirely, even convincing an audience that I was someone else. However, I felt I could never be myself in theater, for I was autistic. Autism was not a topic tackled in the theater that I held dear. I had acted alongside fellow neurodivergent actors, but our applause was louder than it should have been whenever we performed. The stories we were presenting were not for us but reluctantly accommodated us. Thus when I heard of a play that not only featured an autistic main character but made autism central to the plot, I was instantly drawn to it. When I read the script for *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time (The Curious Incident)* for the first time, I could not believe how central autism was to its story. The script features a firsthand perspective of the autistic experience through the main character of Christopher. It was unflinching, front and center, and I was giddy with joy. As bell hooks described in *Teaching to Transgress*, I had received a gift of liberation:

> To have work that promotes one's liberation is such a powerful gift that it does not matter so much if the gift is flawed. Think of the work as water that contains some dirt. Because you are thirsty, you are not too proud to extract the dirt and be nourished by the water (50).

However, I soon learned of the criticism surrounding *The Curious Incident.* I read up on critical reviews by many autistic critics that argued it fell short of ideal autistic representation. These critics argued that the lack of autistic consultation and

actors involved in the original theatrical productions had harmed the autistic community (Kuppers 15). I compared these criticisms to the more mainstream reviews of the neurotypical critics. These reviews highlighted the moving story and intensive tech, often praising both as inspirational. However, I found they lacked a discussion of the autistic experience I thought was merited based upon the story. These neurotypical critics seemed to be minimizing the role autism played in the script; it was like they had seen a different show from one I had read. These criticisms and reviews are what prompted me to commit to directing *The Curious Incident* in a way that addressed these issues adequately. Given my inexperience in direction, I searched for a praxis that would inform my direction and address the challenges presented by the script. My research would eventually lead me to discover the Theatre of Neurodiversity, a form of disability theater designed by and for neurodivergent artists. I would utilize this form of theater and incorporate it into *The Curious Incident* to create a more accommodating and liberating version of the show. I evaluated the success of this integration of Theatre of Neurodiversity and *The Curious Incident* based on my personal experience and the interviews with the cast involved in this experiment. I would eventually create an eight-point manifesto to aid in my evaluation of the success of this integration, a manifesto that personally defines what the Theatre of Neurodiversity is based mainly on Sarah Magni's writings.[1]

To help elucidate this experience, I will break this paper into three parts. The first part will focus on establishing the theories that informed my praxis and

[1] Theater creator and director based in Toronto, Canada, and founder and director of Thatz Showbiz. They have worked with developmentally disabled people to create empowering theatrical shows. They are the founder of Theatre of Neurodiversity.

manifesto and discussing the production history of *The Curious Incident*. The second part will focus on my personal experience directing *The Curious Incident* and how I implemented Theatre of Neurodiversity. The third and final part will discuss the interviews I conducted with three cast members to gauge the overall cast experience and ground my analysis. The interviews also informed me how the Theatre of Neurodiversity interacts with neurodivergent and neurotypical actors. I relied on the writings of Sarah Magni from her Theater Arts MA titled *Towards a Theatre of Neurodiversity: Virtual Theatre and Disability During a Global Pandemic* to inform my understanding of the Theatre of Neurodiversity. In addition, I will primarily reference *Theatre & Disability* by Petra Kuppers[2] and *Bodies in Commotion: Disability & Performance (Bodies in Commotion),* edited by Carrie Sandahl and Philip Auslander, to define and establish disability theater. Disability theater has no single creator or manifesto but is a broad categorization that applies to many disability-focused theatrical movements, including Theatre of Neurodiversity. Disability theater shares every single characteristic that defines it with the Theatre of Neurodiversity. Since these two terms share most characteristics, I will dedicate significant time to analyzing and discussing disability theater as it simultaneously defines the Theatre of Neurodiversity.

[2] Petra Kuppers is a disabled artist and professor of drama, disability studies, and disability theater. She is also the leader of the international disability culture collective The Olimpias.

PART 1: THE BUILDING BLOCKS

Social Model of Disability

Throughout my research, the social model of disability kept reappearing as foundational to the work I am engaging with. I have determined that the social model of disability is the unwavering foundation that supports my work as well. I firmly believe that any form of theater that lacks this foundation cannot reasonably claim to be Theatre of Neurodiversity or modern disability theater. Therefore, the social model of disability is the keystone tenet of my manifesto, a manifesto that I will discuss later in this paper. However, because the social model informs this paper, I must first describe it on its own.

Mike Oliver developed the social model of disability in the late seventies and early eighties as a framework to guide disability researchers in the study of disability issues.[3] The social model of disability proposes that disabilities are not inherently debilitating for disabled people. The social model supports this proposition by defining the disabled experience as two components: impairments and disabilities. Impairments is the neutral term to describe the embodied nature of everyone's physical existence. An impairment only becomes a disability when interacting with a society that does not accommodate or respect it (Kuppers 7-8). For example, a blind person's impairment of their eyes is not why they are disabled; it is only when their blindness and society intersect that a disability manifests. Suppose a blind individual

[3] One of the first professors in Disability Studies, Oliver helped found the field of Disability Studies within the context of the disability rights movements in the late twentieth century. Born in England and an activist for disability rights, he worked at institutions such as Kent University and University of Greenwich to create the social model of disability which he is most well known for.

wants to cross the street. If that crosswalk does not have accommodating features such as an audible alarm, which informs the blind person when it is safe to cross, they will be unable to do so. The lack of accommodating features disables the blind person, not their blindness. The social model observes that if the crosswalk designers had included accommodating features from the start, the blind individual would be able to cross with the same ease as a seeing individual.

Oliver originally intended the social model to be utilized by fellow disability studies researchers for studying the disabled experience. Still, disability activists quickly adopted the framework in England, where Oliver was based, and then spread the social model across the western world. The social model became standard in the advocacy of disability rights activists. As Mike Oliver states in a retrospective paper written thirty years after creating the social model of disability:

> The social model took on a life of its own, and it became the big idea behind the newly emerging disability equality training. It also soon became the vehicle for developing a collective disability consciousness and helped to develop and strengthen the disabled peoples' movement that had begun to emerge a decade earlier (Oliver).

The social model of disability is not the only model for understanding disability, but it was one of the first and only aimed at liberating and empowering disabled individuals. The social model became paramount in creating a collective disability consciousness, a community. Other models of disability often isolate and shame disabled people, such as the medical model of disability (Sandhal and Auslander 3-4). The medical model individualizes disabilities into diseases that afflict

disabled people, dividing the disabled community by diagnosis (Dirth and Branscombe 414-15). Since the medical model postulates that disability is a disease, much power resides in the doctors that treat disabled people. Doctors are needed to determine if one is medically disabled, choose appropriate treatments, and focus on curing and eliminating disabilities (Dirth and Branscombe 415). The medical model also pressures disabled people into a mindset where they must try and fix themselves to become able-bodied. These pressures usually result in feelings of intense shame for disabled people, lowering their quality of life (Dirth and Branscombe 436-37). For this reason, a disabled person can experience immediate relief when they incorporate a personal outlook that includes the social model. Petra Kuppers provides a personal perspective on this relief in *Theatre & Disability*: "The value of the social model of disability . . . lies in its instantaneous lifting of guilt . . . a quick afternoon's workshop that invites you to think differently can be life-changing" (8).

The social model of disability is one of the only models that empowers and liberates disabled people, while models such as the medical model actively undermine this endeavor. Any production that does not have the social model of disability as the framework for the production risks isolating, shaming, and fetishizing disabled people. Theatre of Neurodiversity demands better than that. While I believe the other tenets of my manifesto are essential in achieving some form of Theatre of Neurodiversity and disability theater, the social model is the one tenet that supports all the others. If one does not understand this model, one cannot understand disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity.

Before Theatre of Neurodiversity and Disability Theater

Before I can begin the analysis of the three intellectual progenitors of modern disability theater, whom I will begin discussing in the next paragraph, I must take a moment to acknowledge that the history of disability and performance is far older than the development of disability theater. People with physical and mental disabilities have been performing since at least the beginning of modern western theater, starting in the late medieval era. These early performances would often highlight the disabilities of performers, primarily for the entertainment of non-disabled people. Non-disabled people in the audience disregarded the consent and well-being of disabled performers. These voyeuristic performances could be deeply traumatic for disabled people. Freak shows originate from this early theater and have faced criticism and protests from disability activists because of this history. However, many disabled performers who perform in freak shows have claimed it is personally empowering for them,[4] pushing back against the criticisms of disability activists (Kuppers 45-46). Regardless of whether freak shows can be empowering, they do not have many similarities to disability theater because they prioritize voyeuristic ogling by non-disabled individuals. As Michael Chemers[5] states in his article *The Mortification of Harvey Leech*, "Performances of extraordinary-bodied actors in the 19th century . . . are unquestionably firmly within the realm of fetishization. They are designed to magnify the 'otherness' of the unusual body" (26).

[4] A thorough examination of the complicated relationship between disabled people and freakshows can be found in Michael Chemers' *Staging Stigma: A Critical Examination of the American Freak Show*. Palgrave Studies in Theatre and Performance History. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.
[5] Professor of Dramaturgy, Theater History, Monster Studies,Theory and Critical Studies, and Dramatic Literature. As of this writing he is a professor at University of California Santa Cruz.

While modern freak shows may deemphasize this fetishization, it does not erase the tainting legacy of its origins. Thus despite having a long and well-established history of disabled performers, freak shows are not the progenitor of disability theater. While it may be an empowering performance with disabled performers, it is not a form of disability theater. Disability theater's origins reside in the radical theatrical movements of the twentieth century.

Theatre of Neurodiversity is only three years old as of writing, while modern disability theater utilizing the social model has only existed for approximately thirty years (Sandahl and Auslander 6). The novelty of these two theatrical forms obscures the reality that they are built upon the shoulders of giants. Many radical twentieth-century theatrical movements provided fertile soil from which disability theater could sprout. The works of Antonin Artaud, Bertolt Brecht, and Augusto Boal have had the most influential impact and continue to inform disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity. All three intellectual progenitors' theories, themes, and techniques have proved indispensable to disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity, despite the three creators having minimal to no involvement in disability movements. None of these three created disability theater, but they created the methods that would later become the building blocks for disability theater. Whenever I found myself confused or uncertain about how to proceed in rehearsal in a way that fulfilled the tenets of Theatre of Neurodiversity, I resorted to the techniques of these three performers, which would inevitably become a part of my eventual manifesto.

Antonin Artaud was born in France and was heavily involved in post-war art movements, such as surrealism. However, he is most well known for developing his Theatre of Cruelty. While his Theatre of Cruelty and its theories have been a source of inspiration for disability theater, the topics of his art and personal writings are more important in the creation of disability theater. Artaud's writings concerned his experiences within the mental asylums of France. He is the only one of the three progenitors I have mentioned that was disabled, having received treatment in mental asylums several times in his life, even dying in one. Artaud's horrific experiences within the asylums inspired his poetry and journals. These writings contain an implicit critique of the asylums, with Artaud's suffering revealing subtle political arguments against ableism. There is no explicit stated argument against the doctors, medications, and electrotherapy he experienced. These political arguments buried in his writings are so abstract that it is difficult for scholars to distinguish between genuine insanity and political critiques of language itself (Lukes 105). In his clearer writings, Artaud utilizes a proto version of the social model of disability, evident in the following poem by Artaud,

> A mental asylum, under cover of science and justice, Is [sic] comparable to a barracks, a prison or a slave colony . . . We protest against any interference with the free development of delirium. It is as legitimate, as logical As [sic] any other sequence of human ideas or acts. The repression of anti-social reactions . . . When, without knowing their language, you attempt to converse with these people, Over [sic] whom, you must admit, You [sic] have only one advantage, namely, force (Artaud qtd. Kuppers 62).

These observations would inform Artaud as he created the Theatre of Cruelty, which has been influential to many artistic movements worldwide, including disability theater. Artaud's work is the origin of the intersections between theater, disability, and the social model. While Theater of Cruelty is influential, it is not the most accommodating framework for disability theater, especially Theatre of Neurodiversity. People who are neurodivergent can have sensory disorders, and considering the goal of Theatre of Cruelty is to assault the audience's senses, it is not the ideal framework. Bertolt Brecht and Augusto Boal's theories provide a more practical framework for implementing disability theater.

The theatrical forms of Brecht and Boal are both left-wing activist forms designed to help liberate oppressed peoples. Since disabled people are often on the receiving end of oppression, the works of Brecht and Boal are particularly informative for disability theater. As Petra Kuppers describes in *Disability and Theatre,* "Much disability theatre is political theatre in an overt way. It works against the unity of action and character that characterizes the naturalist theatre tradition, and it plays with fragmentation as a way to open up the seams of the world as we know it" (22). The world's seams are torn through a melding of these two artists' methods, with elements from both in combination becoming the framework for disability theater.

Bertolt Brecht was born and lived most of his life in Germany. He created most of his early work in the context of great political upheaval in post-World War One Germany, which was rife with political violence. Brecht identified as a left-wing communist, advocating for the overthrow of the bourgeois and the empowerment of

the proletariat. Brecht's political views attracted the ire of the fledgling Nazi regime, which forced him to leave Germany in 1933. Brecht eventually settled in America during World War Two, where he began to publish his theatrical theories. He called his theatrical methods Epic Theatre. Brecht designed Epic Theatre to be a form of dialectical theater, a theater that could maintain a critically engaged audience and suppress catharsis in favor of political action (Boal 92-95). From Epic Theater, we get the concept of the alienation effect, a technique of staging and playwriting that maintains an audience's critical mind by discouraging the suspension of disbelief (Boal 92-95). No single concept from Brecht is as essential to disability theater as the alienation effect, as disability theater needs a critical audience that will be politically engaged. Since a critical mind is not prone to sympathy, it is helpful for disability theater in limiting unhelpful pity. Disability theater must minimize sympathy from an audience as this can blunt the desired political messages of disability theater (Kuppers 22).

Augusto Boal is a theatrical activist born in Brazil. Partly because of the socioeconomic realities of his home country, Boal focused his work on the liberation of formerly colonized people. *Theatre of the Oppressed* is one of his most well-known works, published while he was in exile in similar circumstances to Brecht. An oppressive military junta government had taken over Brazil in the late sixties and suppressed left-wing ideology, including Boal’s. Boal's work aimed to educate and assist oppressed people in literally revolting and securing their communities, mainly through non-violent means (Boal 119). Boal designed Theatre

of the Oppressed to be accessible to those unaccustomed to traditional theatrical procedures. As such, Theatre of the Oppressed encourages theatrical devising: the joint creation of all aspects of performance, including the text, through collective rehearsals. Boal prioritized rehearsal games and collective actions to create a generous space for people unfamiliar with theater. The rehearsal process is for the benefit of the participants, even at the expense of a final performance. These are practices that are essential when working with disabled and neurodivergent people. Since disability theater should prioritize the liberation of disabled people, it becomes apparent why Theatre of the Oppressed has had the most influence of any theatrical form on disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity. As a result, Theatre of the Oppressed was the dramatic form I most incorporated into my rehearsal process. I felt it was essential in our attempts to find a form of community and liberation. This sentiment is one that Sarah Magni, the creator of Theatre of Neurodiversity, cited as a reason why Theatre of the Oppressed was indispensable, stating,

> It also considers how theatre can be used as a tool to build and a vehicle to move towards social change. Utilizing the theories and adapted exercises of Augusto Boal, we are looking at the gaping holes in our systems and rehearsing for the revolution we need (10).

These three artists and their theatrical forms are the origins of disability theater. As rocks, water, and cement form a concrete base, the theories of Antonin Artaud, Bertolt Brecht, and Augusto Boal form the foundation that supports disability theater. It was their work I would refer to as a new director to help expand and

explore Theatre of Neurodiversity and, therefore, disability theater. As a result, their work informs my manifesto on disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity.

Theatre of Neurodiversity and Disability Theater Defined

Theatre of Neurodiversity was the form I actively relied upon to stage *The Curious Incident* in a manner that would assist in the liberation of autistic people and create a rehearsal process that was accommodating to autistic people. The first professional productions of *The Curious Incident* received criticisms from autistic activists for the lack of autistic representation and a script that relied on stereotypes (Kuppers 16). I hoped to sufficiently address these criticisms by incorporating and adapting Theatre of Neurodiversity into the production. Sarah Magni created the manifesto and guidebook on implementing the Theatre of Neurodiversity to create a theatrical form that would prioritize the stories and experiences of neurodivergent people. While Sarah Magni is the sole creditable creator of the Theatre of Neurodiversity, she notes that the Theatre of Neurodiversity is a form of disability theater (Magni 40). Disability theater is not the creation of a single entity. There is no manifesto or guidebook for disability theater; it is the cumulative work of hundreds of disabled theatrical artists who create performances based upon the social model of disability. Disability theater is to Theatre of Neurodiversity as a genus is to a species. Theatre of Neurodiversity incorporates all aspects of disability theater, but it also has additional adaptations to support the neurodivergent community specifically.

The goals of Theatre of Neurodiversity and my directorial intentions for *The Curious Incident* aligned perfectly. However, the methods provided by Sarah Magni

for Theatre of Neurodiversity would prove challenging to implement. Sarah Magni focused her work on implementing Theatre of Neurodiversity in an online environment, specifically live workshops through Zoom (Magni 5). I intended to direct a live production on a stage. I needed to adapt various techniques to achieve the same goals as Theatre of Neurodiversity did for Sarah Magni in a digital setting. Since the Theatre of Neurodiversity is a recent development without much literature, I referred to techniques of disability theater that informed Theatre of Neurodiversity. Since there is no single creator of disability theater, I relied on Petra Kuppers' *Theatre & Disability*, which provides a comprehensive descriptive analysis of theater and disability, including elements of disability theater. I reviewed the research by Sarah Magni and Petra Kuppers and from the previously mentioned progenitors of disability theater, Antonin Artaud, Bertolt Brecht, and Augusto Boal, to find and develop my methods to implement Theatre of Neurodiversity. As a result of my research and directorial praxis, I would eventually create a descriptive manifesto that concisely defines the tenets of Theatre of Neurodiversity and disability theater.

Before discussing the characteristics of Theatre of Neurodiversity and disability theater that informed my manifesto, I must note two characteristics that are mistakenly assumed to be a part of modern disability theater. First, disability theater is not a form of medical therapy for disabled individuals. As Sandahl and Auslander say in *Bodies in Commotion:* "Art as therapy held little interest for many disability scholars who were diligently redefining disability as a minority culture, peeling away the label of pathology with its concomitant demand for cure" (6). While disability

theater can be very therapeutic in practice, it must not become a part of medicalized treatment. I came across several articles from medical journals during my research for disability theater that showcased the medical benefits of theater on mentally disabled individuals. While this is necessary research, this treatment using drama is based upon a medical model of disability and is therefore incompatible with disability theater. Second, disability theater is not merely a representation of disabled people on the stage, either through the characters or the actors, nor is it just implementing accommodations to make theater baseline accessible to all disabled people. Acknowledgment of a group of people does not equate to a social movement but is the bare minimum that is required. All theater should ideally assist in dismantling ableist structures, which creates more generous theater, but not specifically disability theater. Disability theater aims to not only stage disabled actors despite their disabilities but to allow space for disability to exist on the stage, neither invisible nor fetishized (Jim Ferris qtd. In Sandahl and Auslander 66-67). The performance of disability can be empowering to individuals, and disability theater prioritizes this.

Disability Theater

The social model of disability is the primary reason disability theater often prioritizes politically engaging with the liberation of disabled people from societal oppression. This characteristic is not unique to disability theater, but it is crucial. Since the social model postulates that society does not value disabled people, it inspires many productions of disability theater to focus on actively combating this oppression. One aspect of how disability theater combats this oppression is having

disabled people take control of the artistic process, which is vital for people who believe in the social model of disability. As Sandahl and Auslander state in *Bodies in Commotion:* "Activists developed and advanced these models during the Civil Rights era in the United States, rallying to the cry, 'Nothing about us without us' - a demand for disabled people's leadership in anything having to do with disability" (Sandahl and Auslander 7). Disability theater prioritizes the leadership of disabled people in directing, producing, and acting jobs in line with the social model. These factors increase the visibility of disabled people on the stage and in the narrative, combating their marginalization, and transforming the stage into a place of disabled liberation that benefits disabled and non-disabled audiences. This representation also combats the theater industries' unfortunate willingness to allow non-disabled people to write and perform the stories of disabled people, which degrades and limits the creative opportunities for disabled people (Sandahl qtd. in Sandahl and Auslander 255).

Disability theater's last major characteristic is its incorporation of accommodations. These accommodations have no limit and usually empower the participants of disability theater. Carrie Sandhal's "The Ethic of Accommodation" from *Theatre & Disability* lays out the explicit goals of what accommodations in disability theater should do (Kuppers 71-2). Accommodations prioritize the participants, equity, and good-natured collaboration. This prioritization of the disabled participants of disability theater is why it is common for disability theater to be focused on workshops or reject a standard audience altogether. Disability theater aims to reject a voyeuristic audience in favor of a critical audience, an aim that is not

unique to disability theater. What is unique is that disability theater will hold private performances that only include fellow participants (Kuppers 18-19; Magni 31-33). It is an immense task to maintain a critical audience. Since the priority of disability theater is the disabled participants, disability theater may close off a performance to accommodate these performers. Disability theater will always accommodate its participants first and foremost.

Theatre of Neurodiversity

Theatre of Neurodiversity shares all of the characteristics of disability theater discussed in the previous section; this is why Theatre of Neurodiversity is a form of disability theater. Two unique characteristics differentiate Theatre of Neurodiversity from disability theater: The devised aspect of the Theatre of Neurodiversity and the invisibility of neurodivergence. The first characteristic comes from Sarah Magni. The second is my proposed addition to the Theatre of Neurodiversity based on my experience incorporating the Theatre of Neurodiversity in staging *The Curious Incident.*

The characteristic Sarah Magni identified as key to the Theatre of Neurodiversity is devising. Devising is the collaboration and creation of a theater piece with no script or major components provided in advance. The ensemble creates all show components communally through improvisational techniques that encourage equity and balance. Magni argues that neurodivergent people often defer to supposedly more intelligent people, such as doctors, family members, friends, and even strangers (Magni 40). Through its collaborative process, devised theater

accommodates the needs of various neurodivergent people and creates a generous rehearsal space. Magni found that despite some initial challenges, the online environment helped create a secure collaborative rehearsal space (Magni 47). It placed everyone on an equal footing, something I had to translate to an in-person environment. This adaptation is what eventually led to my discovery of an additional characteristic.

I discovered the last characteristic of Theatre of Neurodiversity when adapting and implementing Theatre of Neurodiversity with a cast with various neurological statuses. Initially, I feared the presence of neurotypical actors could prove detrimental in creating a secure collaborative rehearsal space that accommodated neurodivergent actors. However, I soon realized that I could not determine who was neurotypical or neurodivergent. I could not ethically inquire about the neurological status of the cast, but this turned out to be irrelevant, for even if I could inquire, I determined it would be impossible to know. Neurodivergence is complicated and nuanced in how it manifests in individuals. It was more than possible for an actor who identified as neurotypical to be neurodivergent and vice versa. I became aware of the invisibility of neurodivergence. Like Schrödinger's cat, the cast was simultaneously neurodivergent and neurotypical. As a result, I determined that the Theatre of Neurodiversity must assume all participants are neurodivergent and that participants should not prove their neurodivergent status by offering their diagnosis. It was also possible because of shame and genuine misunderstanding for neurodivergent people to be unaware of

their status. By recognizing the invisibility of neurodivergence, I could create a secure rehearsal space accommodating all neurodivergent actors, including invisible ones.

The Manifesto

This manifesto was designed not to be prescriptive. I aimed to distill the personal tenets I followed during rehearsal to implement the Theatre of Neurodiversity. This manifesto is also not a guidebook to teach disabled people how to perform, as Sandahl and Auslander state: "The notion that disability is a kind of performance is to people with disabilities, not a theoretical abstraction, but lived experience" (2). Disabled people play the part of disability every day, so this manifesto details the methods for accommodating and welcoming the historically excluded disability community into a collective theater. There are eight tenets in total, informed primarily by the works of Sarah Magni, Petra Kuppers, and Carrie Sandahl. The three progenitors and my works also inform this manifesto, albeit in a far smaller capacity. The first six tenets define the entirety of disability theater and are the same as the first six tenets of Theatre of Neurodiversity. The seventh and the eighth tenets are exclusive to the Theatre of Neurodiversity. This manifesto and its eight tenets may not encompass all forms of disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity. In addition, I do not believe that all eight tenets are required to identify Theatre of Neurodiversity or disability theater. The first tenet of the social model of disability is the only tenet that definitively defines disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity. In addition, I intend this manifesto to be a genesis of a robust discussion attempting to classify disability theater and Theatre of Neurodiversity.

Therefore, I welcome criticism, as I expect this manifesto to be rendered inadequate by time or the praxis of future theatrical artists. Theater tends to reject classification and genres, and I expect disability theater to be no different. The manifesto is listed below.

1. **Social Model of Disability:** Disability theater is rooted in the social model of disability and relieves the guilt and shame disabled people experience. The social model is the bedrock framework for all disability theater (Kupper 7-8).
2. **Disability Led:** Disability theater expects disabled people to be in positions of creative power, able to control their own stories through direction and writing.
3. **Disability Focused:** Disability theater is about the disabled experience, explored through either performance or story. Representation alone is often insufficient to satisfy this tenet (Kuppers 43-44).
4. **Disability Theater is Politically Engaged:** Generally, this is where the framework of Brecht's Alienation Effect and Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed manifest (Kuppers 22; Magni 18-22). Disability theater prioritizes combating the oppression and erasure of disabled bodies in society.
5. **Aesthetic of Access and Ethic of Accommodation:** Disability theater focuses on creating an accommodating rehearsal process.

Accommodations are the second most crucial factor in disability theater. I specifically used “The Ethic of Accommodation" to guide my rehearsals, developed by Carrie Sandahl. The breakdown of Carrie Sandhal’s accommodations framework is sub listed below:

5.1. At its core, the majority does not rule. Changes will be made with goodwill, creativity, and a strong dose of humor (Sandahl qtd. in Kuppers 71).

5.2. The Ethic includes the politics of listening and the politics of speaking. Disability communities often place listening on the same plane as speaking. Listening, here, means to be taken into consideration, being attended to (Sandahl qtd. in Kuppers 71-72).

5.3. The Ethic means making room for difference possible, letting go of preconceived notions of perfectibility, and negotiating complex sets of needs. Marketability is not our concern (Sandahl qtd. in Kuppers 72).

5.4. The Ethic inspires creative aesthetic choices from casting, choreography, costuming, and the use of spaces through accommodating. In creating new material, practicing The Ethic enhances theatrical practice (Sandahl qtd. in Kuppers 72).

6. **Participants as Audience:** Disability theater prioritizes the well-being of participants over an audience, never accommodating an audience at

the expense of actors. Disability theater often utilizes workshops, rejecting an audience altogether (Kuppers 45-46).

The six tenets above define disability theater as I synthesized them from the various sources that informed me. They are also the first six tenets of the Theatre of Neurodiversity, as both forms of theater share them. The following two additional tenets are exclusive to the Theatre of Neurodiversity and are how the Theatre of Neurodiversity prioritizes neurodivergent people.

7. **Devised Theatre:** Theatre of Neurodiversity must be a form of devised theater. Devised theater encourages self-advocacy and the creation of a secure communal rehearsal space that accommodates all participants (Magni 44).
8. **The Invisibility of Neurodivergence:** Theatre of Neurodiversity must operate on the assumption that all participants are neurodivergent. The Theatre of Neurodiversity must accommodate those who may be unaware of or unwilling to share their neurodivergent status.

This manifesto is the personal roadmap I used in my direction of *The Curious Incident.* I hoped to create a version of *The Curious Incident* that incorporated the Theatre of Neurodiversity, and I used this manifesto to evaluate the success of my endeavor. I also used this manifesto to evaluate the original Broadway and West End productions of *The Curious Incident* to see how they compared to my version of *The Curious Incident*. Most importantly, this manifesto allowed me to evaluate what

success came from attempting to direct *The Curious Incident* in a manner that satisfied the tenets of the Theatre of Neurodiversity.

The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Nighttime

Before I analyze the original productions of *The Curious Incident* with the tenets from my manifesto, I must summarize the history of this play and its story. *The Curious Incident* originated as a novel written by Mark Hadden and published in 2003. The novel became a bestseller in the United Kingdom, even rivaling Harry Potter in its publishing year. Mark Hadden utilized a first-person perspective in the novel, writing from the perspective of the autistic protagonist Christopher. Hadden is not autistic, so he could only rely on second-hand accounts to emulate the autistic experience as he wrote as Christopher. It is most likely because of this reliance on second-hand information that issues regarding stereotypes of the autistic experience became embedded in the novel. These issues would carry over into the script written by Mark Hadden and playwright Simon Stephen. Eventually, one of the most renowned experimental theater companies, The National Theatre, hosted the play's world premiere to international acclaim. The production moved to the more prestigious theaters on West End and Broadway to sold-out theater audiences. *The Curious Incident* would eventually receive nominations for eight Laurence Oliver Awards, six Tonys, six Drama Desk Awards, two Drama League Awards, and six Outer Critic Circle Awards. It won over twenty awards. *The Curious Incident* became one of the most famous shows with an autistic protagonist based on one of the most famous novels with an autistic protagonist. However, throughout this seemingly

untarnished streak of success, autistic activists criticized the show and novel for its use of harmful stereotypes and excluding the autistic community from a phenomenon that was ostensibly about their experience (Kuppers 15). *The Curious Incident* may be the highest-profile example of autistic representation experiencing widespread success. Despite this, many autistic people find the story tainted by unfortunate instances of stereotypes, myself included.

Mark Hadden and Simon Stephens intertwine potentially harmful autistic narratives into the basic plot of *The Curious Incident*. These narratives are not relegated to side plots but affect the very structure of the story. *The Curious Incident* is about the story of Christopher, an autistic teenager living in an ableist world. The discovery of a dead dog in his neighbor's yard upends Christopher's life. An unknown assailant has killed the dog, which belonged to his neighbor, Mrs. Shears. Christopher decides he will investigate the dog's untimely death, much to the chagrin of his father, teacher, and neighbors. Halfway through the plot, Christopher learns that his father, Ed, has been lying to him about the whereabouts of his mother, Judy. Ed had lied and said she had died of a heart attack when in reality, she had abandoned Christopher because she was overwhelmed by his autism. Judy left with Mr. Sheers to London to escape her life of raising a child with autism. Ed confronts and apologizes to Christopher for his lie. He admits that he killed the neighbor's dog due to his anger. Upon learning this, Christopher decides it is unsafe to live with Ed. Christopher decides to travel to London to live with Judy, a challenging task for the easily overwhelmed Christopher. After a nerve-racking journey, he finally finds Judy and

Mr. Sheers in London. However, life with Judy is not the escape he had hoped for. Eventually, Christopher and Judy leave Mr. Sheers, moving back together to his old neighborhood. Christopher has begun to forgive his father and mother by the end of the story. His adventures through London have made him more confident, but he continues to live with his parents despite their continued mistakes. Flawed as his parents are, they are the only parents he has.

The story contains a few harmful stereotypes, but none is more harmful than the idea of disabled people being burdens on non-disabled people. This narrative originates from the medical model, which places a higher value on non-disabled people. This value is made explicit by the letter Judy leaves for Christopher explaining why she had abandoned him, "Maybe if things had been different, maybe if you'd been different, I might have been better at it. But that's just the way things turned out" (Hadden and Stephens 31). Christopher's mom explicitly states that he would have been easier to raise if he had been born different, meaning neurotypical. The authors narratively use this to showcase how Judy has fallen short as a mother and do not seem to be condoning her actions. However, there is not a robust rebuttal within the text that justifies the presence of such a harmful narrative.

Another harmful aspect of the script is the abuse Christopher receives from Ed. Similarly to Judy, The authors do not seem to be condoning these abusive actions but are trying to showcase how flawed Ed is as a father, "Christopher screams. Ed and Christopher tussle. Ed hits Christopher hard. Ed stands above him. ED: 'I need a drink.' He goes and picks up the book. He leaves. He comes back without the book.

ED: ‘I’m sorry I hit you. I didn’t mean to.’” (Hadden and Stephens 25). Violent ableist assaults are some of the worst things that can occur to neurodivergent people. Even though the script's authors do not condone Ed’s actions, it is an action that can quickly breach the boundaries that are meant to contain it.

The first significant performances on West End and Broadway also produced two additional issues that were not present in the original script. The first is the lack of autistic individuals. No autistic writers, actors, directors, or producers were involved in the original productions.[6] This lack of representation is the source of most criticism from autistic activists. This lack of representation meant autistic people could not tell their own stories; the creators of *The Curious Incident* excluded neurodivergent people as neurotypical people took the lead. The second issue was the design of the tech. The tech for the original shows aimed to make a neurotypical audience sympathize with the experience of autistic people by using loud noises, horns, and flashing lights to overstimulate an audience. By attempting to create the desired effect for neurotypical people, the show designers excluded a significant portion of the autistic community. Nevertheless, this component became one of the most highly praised aspects of the show. It is the first subject mentioned and praised by New York Times theater critic Ben Brantley in his critical review of the Broadway opening of *The Curious Incident* (Brantley “Plotting the Grid of Sensory Overload”).

The story of *The Curious Incident* is compelling and, at its core, is the coming-of-age story of an autistic teenager. His assertion of independence and

[6] The original production had an autism consultant, they can be seen in the following video https://youtu.be/k2bV75ITXJw from 2:30 to 2:40.

strength in the face of an ableist society is something that can be genuinely inspirational for autistic people and embodies a story based on the social model of disability. In the play's maths appendix, Christopher states, “Thank you very much for staying behind to listen to how I answered the question on my maths A Level. Siobhan said it would not be very interesting but I said it was” (Hadden and Stephens 79). This scene is a moment where Christopher receives an accommodation according to the social model. The script has incorporated the social model, meaning that all versions of *The Curious Incident* have the potential to incorporate the Theatre of Neurodiversity. Using the social model of disability means that *The Curious Incident* satisfies the first tenet of my manifesto for Theatre of Neurodiversity. My production aims to build upon that sliver and address the issues apparent in *The Curious Incident*.

PART 2: DIRECTOR’S EXPERIENCE

Pre-Production

During callbacks after the auditions, I asked a wide variety of actors to read for Christopher. I was open to cross-gender casting to ensure I had the best possible actor for the part. The scene I had the actors read for Christopher is where he has peed himself on the train to London, and in response, Christopher asks where the toilet is on the train (Hadden and Stephens 48). All the actors read the scene with either a comedic tone or a voice meant to imitate the autistic monotone voice stereotype. I was increasingly disheartened as I felt the weight of mockery upon my shoulders, despite it being unintentional. My mood changed when the actor I would eventually cast as Christopher began reading the lines. As they went through their lines, I could

feel the weight and shame they gave this seemingly simple interaction, one of self-doubt and failure. In that intonation, I recognized a person who carried the weight of disability. I began to cry from the shock and joy of recognition. It was apparent enough that I felt compelled to hold up my notebook in front of my face to obscure my face from the view of the actors on the Zoom call. I had called the actor later that day to inform them that they had gotten the part of Christopher, to which they gleefully accepted. The actor then revealed what I had already suspected, that they were autistic. The rest of that phone call was the actor and myself discussing our shared experience with being autistic. I sensed I was on the path to purifying the water.

Rehearsal Process: Standard Rehearsal and Setting the Tone

I eventually cast ten people for my production of *The Curious Incident*. I spent the first day of rehearsal not reading the script but discussing my personal story and what I aimed to create with *The Curious Incident.* It was preparing for the casting of the nine other cast members that led to my discovery of the ninth tenet of Theatre of Neurodiversity, which is the invisibility of neurodivergence. I realized that not only could I not determine who was neurodivergent, but the actors themselves may also not know. I implemented the ninth tenet from the beginning. I first made sure everyone understood how my rehearsal process would differ from the traditional process they may have previously experienced. I explained in detail what Theatre of Neurodiversity was and how this was informing our rehearsal process. The first part of our process was implementing a circle check-in system. A circle check-in system is

where all actors and the director sit in a circle at the top of rehearsals to prioritize equal standing and then begin talking. These check-ins focus on discussing our personal feelings and creating an opportunity to discuss the day's events.

Circling is essential as it creates a sense of equality and community at the beginning of rehearsal and helps set expectations for what everyone, myself included, is hoping to accomplish. The circle was an intentionally fluid process, not rigid, but the guiding structure of the circle check-in was the Rose and Thorn system. At the beginning of rehearsals, I would invite the actors but did not require them to describe something good that happened in their day and something not so good that happened in their day. I would then either invite them to journal or invite them to answer a so-called Joel Question of the day. A Joel Question is what I call the question I would ask to inspire a discussion on a personal but non-sensitive opinion or fact about oneself that encouraged bonding and warmed the actors up to each other. Essentially, they are enthralling ice breakers. An excellent example of a particularly successful Joel Question would be the time I asked, “What position do you take as you sleep?” This question inspired a discussion that lasted 25 minutes, as we discussed with shock and awe the different ways we slept. Such questions are crucial for not only do they create engaging conversations, but they allow us to practice listening as the Ethic of Accommodation requires—to be attended to.

Journaling would appear periodically during the beginning circle check-in or later in rehearsal as part of a decompression process for our devising. Regardless, we would always circle up after journaling. I would sometimes provide a prompt for the

journaling, but usually only to give the cast members something to write about if they needed something to inspire them. I emphasized that journaling was a private endeavor and that I had no expectations of what they wrote. I even encouraged drawing as an option and engaged in it myself. After fifteen minutes of journaling, we would circle up again and have space to share what we had all written if we so desired. I did not pressure the cast to share what they had written, and I would always emphasize the optional nature of sharing before we began each sharing session. Some days, no one would share, and we would continue to rehearsal without another word. This showcases the Ethic of Accommodation because not only did I leave space open for sharing, but I designed the offer not to be disruptive if people accepted the offer to remain silent. This showcased that the offer was not hot air but was honest and genuine. I would always journal with the cast, so journaling became something we always looked forward to.

I knew that incorporating devised theater techniques would require the use of games, mainly as described by Augusto Boal in *Games for Actors and Non-Actors.* Unfortunately, this ritual became the most affected by practical issues. Ideally, I would have the first half of rehearsal be theater games that also warmed up and prepared the actors for devising, giving them tools and themes to either incorporate or reject in the devised theatrical process. This did not fully happen due to my time limitations. In ideal conditions, this process would usually involve a form of viewpoints.[7] However, I have no formal training and would mainly utilize the process

[7] Originally a dance technique developed by Mary Overlie, it was adapted by Anne Bogart and Tina Landau in the late twentieth century to become a theatrical technique that utilized nine physical and five vocal viewpoints to assist in the staging of actors and performers.

I had grown accustomed to from previous rehearsals that utilized it at UCSC. My process would involve the students walking around the room as close to neutral as possible and asking them to embody certain emotions. These emotions would then be placed on a scale from one to ten. A one is an almost nonexistent emotion, a five is the upper limit of what someone would reasonably express in reality, and a ten is the maximum physically possible to embody. I would then call out an emotion, such as happiness, and state a number. I would usually start on low numbers for the emotions, work up towards ten, then work back towards one. I would also make a point to use either confusing or specific emotions, such as saying "envy" and then "jealousy," to inspire moments of reflection. Besides viewpoints, I would also engage in theater games that inspire bonding. This could be improv games, circle name games, indeed anything. The point of these theater games was to create a sense of community bonding and vitality and surprise as I would introduce new theatrical games every rehearsal if I could. The cast and I eventually did these theatrical games less and less as we became strapped for time because of COVID disruptions.

The last overarching rehearsal process I would like to emphasize was the creation of community guidelines for all of us to follow. It was important to myself and the Theatre of Neurodiversity that we establish guidelines that would help create a fair, open, and secure environment for our rehearsal process. I knew that the guidelines could not be a prohibitive and punitive list, for that does not create a feeling of a secure space but a defensive one. So on the first day of rehearsal, the second action I took was opening up the floor to create community guidelines. Every

guideline was to be agreed upon by us all, everyone could propose something, and I emphasized that the guidelines were always open to revision if we felt like they did not work. Once we began rehearsals in person, we opened up the floor to create a more permanent set of guidelines.[8] These guidelines were then physically typed up, voted on by unanimous consent, and then printed out to be placed in the very front of the actors' scripts. The printed guidelines created a physical representation of the ideas we developed together. Creating guidelines is far more critical than the basic guidelines that we created. This process was a chance for myself and the actors to implement the Ethic of Accommodation in a literal manner. These guidelines would also help secure the rehearsal space, the circle check-in, and the devising theatrical process we would engage in.

Rehearsal Process: Breakthroughs and Disruptions

Implementing the ideal average rehearsal process would be difficult, but it was exponentially more difficult due to the ongoing coronavirus pandemic.[9] UCSC required remote instruction for January, so my auditions and first two weeks of rehearsal would occur online. The department had us scheduled to go back in person partway through the allotted rehearsal time. I was worried that these two weeks away would do nothing but waste our time until we could begin rehearsal in earnest. Instead, we engaged in some of the most robust, deeply personal table work I have ever been a part of. For the first time, I began openly discussing my identity as

[8] See Appendix A.
[9] A pandemic that has been particularly deadly to disabled people https://ncd.gov/progressreport/2021/2021-progress-report#:~:text=KEY%20FINDINGS%3A%20NCD%20found%20that,report's%20seven%20areas%20of%20focus.

autistic to my cast, comparing my experience to the text and my fellow autistic castmates. In one particular rehearsal on January 24th, I felt comfortable enough to share a profoundly traumatic memory regarding my autism and youth. This admission sparked an intimate and personal conversation as we discussed our experiences in a society with such strong expectations. It built trust and camaraderie amongst ourselves.

Not every rehearsal was like this, as sometimes issues would come up that seemed like a setback, but these showcased our ability to understand and grow from experiences. I am still a new director, and I made a few mistakes in this process. In one particular rehearsal, I highlighted our tendency as people to stereotype sometimes. To showcase this, I had the actors play a game where they would state their name, an “I am” statement and a relationship they have. Once the actors had done this with each other, I had them do it in character without any previous character work. Once they completed the task, I highlighted how their choices could potentially be stereotypes. In highlighting this, I singled out a specific actor to showcase what I meant by using stereotypes in character creation. My intention was not to tell my fellow actors that this individual actor had chosen a stereotypical backstory but merely to demonstrate how stereotypes could inform our choices.

The individual actor then became withdrawn from the rehearsal and afterward sent an email apologizing for their withdrawn behavior, saying they were upset they had disrupted the rehearsal space. This incident was my first experience of the director's outsized power and why self-advocacy was essential to cultivating a secure

environment. I quickly wrote back to the actor, apologizing for my actions, and insisted that I had made an error, not them. The response I received to that email was elation and joy and included the sentiment that a director had never apologized directly to them before. Several more events like this would occur, but each time I made a mistake, I would apologize to the cast, promise to do better, and follow-through. This humble admission of fault was a bare minimum step required by the Theatre of Neurodiversity to maintain the tenets. With time the actors became aware that I would apologize for errors. Since I would follow through on the apology, this helped create a more secure environment where they knew I would be open not only to criticism but ideas as well, especially as we began devising the show.

In late January, we eventually met in person, where we established the new guidelines that would guide our devising. I offered February 18th as a rough deadline for completing our blocking in its totality. However, otherwise, I stated that our schedule would be collectively decided based on our desires as a cast. We then got to work, but I found my role as director frustratingly unclear regarding Theatre of Neurodiversity. My desire to implement perfect equality between myself and the actors is a perfect example. I wished to share the authority of a director, creating a schedule, actor blocking, and creating scenes together, while the reality was far different. Instead, the reality of the first few rehearsals was one where I would suggest an idea, and the cast would unanimously approve it. It was standard directorial practice, but it was not Theatre of Neurodiversity, and my cast could sense my unease. Traditional directorial roles have often been harmful and exclusionary to

disabled people and neurodivergent people, all in the name of directorial authority and conformity (Carrie Sandahl qtd. in Sandahl and Auslander 257). I would not offer an overbearing proactive presence in the rehearsal space; I did not want to risk becoming a tyrant.

I did not prepare the cast and an uncomfortable dynamic developed where the cast would try and learn my intentions and implement that. This dynamic would finally be disrupted as we blocked the first scene. As we began blocking, I purposefully gave simple staging ideas to promote the actors to offer potential blocking or encourage improv. I had not prepared the actors properly, and I assumed they would start devising immediately. The tension rose as the actors and I were unsatisfied with the blocking, but neither the actors nor I actively stepped up to resolve it. I did not want to implement something on my authority alone, as I felt this violated the self-advocacy that the Theatre of Neurodiversity requires. As such, I asked out loud of the entire cast if they were satisfied and wanted to "solidify" this blocking. One actor mentioned the scene lacked intention and started to become visibly frustrated, and I encouraged them to give voice to their opinion. The actor sat down on the ground to indicate we should circle up; for the first time, an actor called for a circle-up.

The actor told a deeply personal story regarding the death of a dog and cited the lack of gravitas and respect for Wellington's death in the current blocking as an issue. We proceed to have one of our most productive and raw conversations regarding death, loss, and how we should deal with the opening scene. I specifically

concluded that we must throw out the entirety of our work and start anew, keeping in mind the conversations from the circle-up. The scene was now collective, fellow actors chiming in, and the tension was gone. This actor's decision to speak up and take authority was a breakthrough. The cast noted how grateful they were for the actions of their fellow actor who had spoken up. They stated that they were shocked, believing an actor could not do or say these things to a director, but that the resulting work became better for it. They said it was one of the single most potent and memorable rehearsals of their life. I kept this lesson in mind for future rehearsals.

Whenever tension arose in the room, I always made space for it. In a similar vein as the previously mentioned rehearsal, there was another rehearsal with tension in the room. However, a collective cast apathy seemed to cause this tension. I decided to honor this feeling, stating that we did not have to if we all did not want to work on the scene. I invited the actors to journal, and once we circled up to share, some actors stated that they did not want to be at rehearsal that day, and to have a director acknowledge and honor it was impactful for their work. Moments like this continued to occur throughout rehearsals, as the actors became more understanding and trusting of each other and the process of Theatre of Neurodiversity. A disruption always accompanied every breakthrough we had. Two weeks into in-person rehearsals, one of the actors was diagnosed with COVID-19. We would have to go remote again, while the actors themselves would have to quarantine for ten days. The immediate result was the canceling of that day's rehearsal, and we would use the next rehearsal to gauge the next steps we would take as a group. I was dreadfully worried about

what this development would mean for the show, especially for the morale of the actors. Nevertheless, as we circled up over Zoom and did our check-ins, I was pleasantly surprised with good-natured humor and a solid resolve to overcome this obstacle. I admitted we would blow past our blocking deadline, as we would lose a few days of rehearsal. The actors' response was to create a collective plan to move forward. I was impressed and overwhelmed by their strong self-advocacy. From that point on, I did not doubt that we would be able to tackle any disruptions that came our way.

With every additional rehearsal, the actors became more and more sure of the methods prescribed by the Theatre of Neurodiversity. As a result, so did I. A director must showcase a strong facade with an unwavering commitment to the project, for if a director is not confident, why should the actors be? While I became convinced that the ethics and accommodating nature of Theatre of Neurodiversity created a far more supportive and caring rehearsal environment, I have to admit that I still reserved doubts about its ability to create a successful finalized show. Since the focus of Theatre of Neurodiversity is on the actors and the rehearsal process, I feared this might come at the expense of the end product. To meet our deadline of a complete blocked run-through on February 18th, when we could not start blocking until two weeks into the rehearsals, we would have to block 15 scenes a week. In actuality, we were accomplishing approximately four scenes a week, and then the disruptions from Covid stopped proper blocking altogether for three days. I became concerned that we

would not be able to finish the show in time. By February 18th, we had only finished most of Part One of the show.

I asked that the cast attempt a stumble-through of the first part to see how it flowed together. I was expecting a very difficult run-through, one where actors would have to ask the stage manager to clarify what the blocking was and become disheartened, and where we would all realize the show was in trouble. Instead, the actors performed Part One almost flawlessly. We had not reviewed some scenes for over four weeks, yet the actors performed with choreographed perfection. Once we completed this stumble-through, several actors exclaimed with shock and awe at how easily they could recall the blocking. In this moment of overwhelming pride in my cast, I became convinced that Theatre of Neurodiversity was not only working for the cast but superior to other methods of staging. The next few weeks were undoubtedly stressful as the cast and I had to devise Part Two's entirety in two weeks, but I no longer doubted during those two weeks. While the actors would express stress regarding line memorization, blocking would never be a cause of worry for the actors or myself. We knew we would have a spectacular opening.

Performance

I must now acknowledge the glaring omission of my personal emotional experience, the kind of experience I had at the callbacks. After all, I began this process out of a strong desire for my self-advocacy because I felt I was losing my identity. This seeming absence of my own experience is not one of literary omission but a reflection of reality. The experience of directing, while isolating, was essential

for me to discover that the Theatre of Neurodiversity could work on a fundamental level with the cast and the show. The breakthroughs showed me how the obstacles would not derail the show but only strengthen our faith in our methods. The breakthroughs also built up my confidence as a director. However, being a director did not provide me with a comfortable avenue for self-advocacy, nor did it satisfy the desire that I had to be seen by my community. This more profound wish to be seen by my community would come from the performance, not rehearsals. That is when I found the personal emotional satisfaction missing since callbacks.

Theatre of Neurodiversity demands that creative power be collective, not monopolized and prescribed to a cast. I decided to abdicate total creative control but retained a monopoly on managerial duties. These managerial duties meant I retained some power over the cast, and I kept a professional distance from my actors, as I feel a good supervisor should do. Thus, I became uncomfortable seeking the validation and support I actively desired, only sharing personal stories of my experience if they supported our rehearsal work. As time wore on, these opportunities became more sparse. I became cognizant of the issue during the rehearsal; I even noted it in my journal halfway through the rehearsal process, stating, “I have not had a robust discussion or moment of self-validation regarding my identity in a while. Not since we started devising . . . I feel like I need to be authentic but can’t. But what even is authentic? I wish I knew.” I craved the experience I had during callbacks when I was moved to tears by recognition. I wanted to be recognized, and it would be through the unlikely candidate of an audience that I would feel this sense of recognition.

I was a director, not a performer, and I would not be on the stage. However, my name was on the poster alongside the writers of *The Curious Incident*. As we approached the performance dates, I realized that I had an opportunity to claim my autistic self in front of an audience through a director's note.[10] I ensured our show would have a program to facilitate a robust director's note and dramaturg's note. I spent over a week on the director's note, trying to crystallize my suddenly nebulous thoughts about my production of *The Curious Incident.* It was a shockingly personal affair. I was terrified to admit such intimate things as "My identity comes from my community and not a doctor. I am autistic, and I am proud" (Moore 2022). I ran the director's note by several close friends and educators with experience in disability studies. I ensured that anyone who read the program would be encouraged to watch with a non-voyeuristic and critical eye. I claimed this production as belonging under the banner of the Theatre of Neurodiversity. I hoped that this would cause a critical audience to see me on the stage with my actors.

I would join the audience and witness my work performed by ten talented actors, yet I could not help myself as my eyes would wander and look at the audience. I was not looking for approval but recognition. In the hundred-plus audience was my own family, whom I had kept in the dark regarding my impetus for directing *The Curious Incident.* As the show started, I worried not whether the show would be a success, for I knew it would, but if I would feel a sense of recognition and liberation from the performance. Had the position of director robbed me of this possibility? It

[10] See Appendix B.

only took until intermission for my worries to be proven wrong, as several people came up to me from the audience to complement the show with tears in their eyes. There were no claims of understanding, no sympathy, merely recognition and an acknowledgment of a successful show. I could not have asked for a better response and was overwhelmed with joy. When I went outside for intermission, I saw my grandmother leaning against the wall crying. I went to comfort her when she looked me in the eyes and asked, "You never felt this way with us, right?" Upon inquiring, I was taken aback as I realized she was asking if I felt abused by my family the way Christopher is for his disabilities in *The Curious Incident.* I assured her that I never felt that way with them, my family. This recognition that a link between myself and the show existed was the most satisfying comment I received throughout production. I was profoundly and intimately understood, especially by those closest to me. Once the actors had finished their bows and exited the stage, I rushed backstage to join the celebrations. One of my cast members with autism began chanting "Autism, Autism, Autism" with great enthusiasm as we leaped up and down. I quickly joined the chorus of celebration, celebrating my neurodivergent and autistic identity.

After the show had closed, my grandparents invited me to have lunch with them. When I met them, my grandmother repeated her question from opening night, only this time without the tears. I again said no, but stated I enjoyed directing a show about my autistic identity. My grandmother then laughed with relief and then asked for me to tell her more. We talked for over thirty minutes, ranging from the show to my own identity and experiences being autistic. My grandmother was listening just as

the tenets of Theatre of Neurodiversity command. I could not have been more secure in my identity at that moment. I am autistic, which is something I am no longer afraid to say. I am autistic, and I am proud.

PART 3: CAST INTERVIEWS

When I initially proposed this project, I did not think interviews would be necessary. My project was going to be hosted and staged as part of the UCSC Theater Arts audition process, and as such, there was not an ethical nor appropriate way to cast an entirely neurodivergent cast. I could only be sure that I would be a neurodivergent individual involved in this experimental production. I was prepared only to use myself as a test subject. Once I had cast the show, I began to understand the effects of Theatre of Neurodiversity on all my cast members. I discovered the practical realities of the tenet of invisibility: despite the cast not necessarily knowing their neurological status, they were deeply affected by Theatre of Neurodiversity. The actors wished to voice their experiences, and I decided that interviews could reinforce my observations as well as record the experience of my actors.

Interview Questions and Format

At the beginning of the rehearsal process, I informed all of my actors that a potential interview follow-up would occur at some point in the rehearsal process. I interviewed the actors approximately a month and a half after the final performance. This delay might have affected the answers, so the actors were able to review the five questions I would ask during the interview in advance. I invited all ten actors to participate in the interview, but only three would volunteer for the interviews due to

scheduling conflicts. The three actors were all in their early twenties and currently attending college, but otherwise, the study was self-selecting from the cast of ten people. I will refer to the three actors as Actors A, B, and C to help track responses by individuals. These interviews are not of the highest scientific standard, but this is what I desired. I designed the interview to inquire about the qualitative experience of the actors and note how they relate to my own experience.

The five questions are open-ended to help the actors reflect upon the rehearsal process, so I provided the actors with the questions well in advance of the actual interview. They are numbered below in the order I emailed them.

1.) Did you notice any ways that neurodivergence assisted our rehearsal process?
2.) Did any specific routines help/hinder in creating a secure rehearsal space for neurodivergence?
3.) How did this rehearsal process interact with your neuro status?
4.) Do you feel that your neuro status is a source of artistic innovation?
5.) Anything else you would like to say about the experience? This can be truly anything, final thoughts, critiques, a specific rehearsal, or nothing at all.

As I stressed to the actors interviewed, some of these questions may elicit similar or no answers. Once I asked the question, I would not hesitate to engage in a conversation if it felt appropriate. I designed the final question to allow the actors to give voice to anything they had on their minds. This question is important not for its research potential but because it allows me to listen to my actors and attend to them. Since the Ethic of Accommodation would require listening to your colleagues in

Theatre of Neurodiversity, I felt it was essential to incorporate this ethic within my questions.

Interview Responses

The interviews took place in one day, with an hour scheduled for each of the three volunteers. Since the interview question would often encourage lengthy conversations, I will not categorize the specific responses by the question but combine answers that share a common thread. Once I had concluded the interviews, I determined four significant threads that were of interest to me. They are the evidence for my proposed tenet of invisibility, shared experiences within Theatre of Neurodiversity between myself and neurodivergent actors, successful methods for rehearsal, and ways I could improve the rehearsal process. Lastly, I will include some surprising revelations I did not expect. I will not note every response, just the ones that best represent these four threads. The following responses have been edited for clarity and repetition but are otherwise the actors' own words.

I discovered the tenet of invisibility as we rehearsed and discussed neurodivergence and *The Curious Incident* together. My conclusions regarding this tenet came from my observations but not from explicit conversations with the actors. However, the interviews with the cast members provided a clear indication that they were aware of this tenet as well. Actor A discusses how this had had upon our rehearsal space, our devising, and how this tenet enriched the show.

> The thing I really liked about this process is that you got a lot of very multiple perspectives and people on like different ends of neurodivergence contributing to the process. I felt like everyone offered a very unique

> perspective on the devising process, and even if the person wasn't neurodivergent, they had input that they could offer that could help the production feel more real and genuine for example. I don't know, like when we were blocking the beginning scene and everyone spent time talking about their experiences they had had with dogs, and I feel that this added a very human element . . . even if people in the cast aren't necessarily neurodivergent, the practice of neurodivergent theatre helps create more human theater (personal interview).

Actor A notes that diversity in neurological status created a more human rehearsal environment. This environment was created not despite the neurotypical actors but because of their presence. Now I must clarify that I am not claiming that all Theatre of Neurodiversity must incorporate neurotypical people but merely highlighting how their presence can benefit a neurodivergent production as long as all participants follow the tenets of Theatre of Neurodiversity. The other function of the tenet of invisibility is to protect and welcome those who may not know their neurological status or are uncertain of their identity. All must be assumed to be neurodivergent for the Theatre of Neurodiversity to work, as Actor C explains when discussing their rehearsal experience.

> I have multiple people, in my life, friends and family, that have ADD and ADHD and stuff. I've always kind of suspected that I might have that, or something similar, or some form of it. But I've never really taken the time to like really sit down and think about it, and I think that this rehearsal process and the way we're doing it and everything really helped me with some of the things that I'm like 'those things are weird' and the way I go about rehearsals can be kinda weird . . . if I do have it or something, or some traces of it, like that's okay and I've kinda come to terms with that a little bit (personal interview).

Actor C has not received any kind of formal diagnosis and was only beginning to understand their neurological status at the beginning of the rehearsal process. They began to only come to terms with their neurological status while going through the rehearsal process. This sentiment is what the tenet of invisibility aims to accommodate, the reality that those who are neurodivergent may not know they are so. Without this principle, the Theatre of Neurodiversity could not be properly accommodating to all neurodivergent people.

The other thread I must highlight was the thread of community I felt with my fellow actors who did identify as neurodivergent. It was in the moments when the cast and I would collectively celebrate our neurodivergent status that I felt the most validation of my neurodivergent identity. However, I would also struggle in these moments to feel worthy of claiming to be autistic so publicly. It created feelings of shame that I was an imposter who did not deserve to direct any show that followed the tenets of Theatre of Neurodiversity. This emotional roller-coaster experience also happened to Actor A, stating,

> I felt like this kind of pressure to say something . . . about autism as a movement and like talk about my perspective and being very open, but I felt kind of weird commenting on that because I didn't feel like informed enough to be speaking for [autistics] . . . I felt this need to be like 'I must represent the entire experience and give everyone the most holistic autistic [person],' but I realized that's unrealistic and not helpful (personal interview).

I was surprised that a fellow actor had a similar experience to mine. I struggled with feelings of inadequacy throughout the rehearsal process, so the knowledge that I was

not alone was informative. The director does not have a monopoly on the imposter syndrome.

While none of my interview questions explicitly asked for reflections regarding the rehearsal process I implemented, the interviewees offered reflections unprompted. Some of these reflections were positive. All three actors explicitly mentioned the circle check-in at the top of rehearsal as impactful and distinctly useful for cast bonding and devising. The journaling process came up more frequently than I expected, with all three actors reporting positive experiences with journaling. Actor B's testimony showcases how the journaling process assisted the actors with rehearsal.

> The journaling process, I know, was super helpful, like getting your ideas out to yourself. Thinking through them kind of on paper before like bringing them to a larger group; where you can have a moment to yourself to go like 'okay, this is my idea' kind of like figure it out (personal interview).

The other interviewed actors similarly described this experience. While I had intended the journaling to aid in explorations of emotional discovery, I had not realized it would translate so seamlessly to devising. Journaling aided the actors by allowing them to solidify their thoughts themselves before sharing them with the whole group. While I did not expect this revelation regarding the journal, I had expected the shared criticism that the lack of explicit deadlines made the rehearsal process more challenging and less welcoming to those who are neurodivergent. The lack of deadlines was an issue I became aware of with time, but it was too late for me to rectify it by the time I realized. The interviews provided more clarity regarding the

experience from the actors' perspective, and something Actor B describes in vivid detail,

> I don't want to say more expectations, but like more expectations of the—like this is what we're by this date, this is what we're doing by this date. Even if they were flexible, like an off-book date. I think it really snuck up on me and I had to memorize that whole monologue in like a week because I realized tech was soon. That was something that I talked to other people about (personal interview).

The lack of dates and structure was not empowering but immobilizing. As Actor B noted, having an established but flexible schedule would have reduced anxiety and created less overwhelming goals. I did not set a personal off-book date, for I felt that would stifle my actors as I imposed deadlines. Just as we created plans for individual rehearsals, I realized that we could have shared the responsibility of creating deadlines for ourselves.

The last thread I want to highlight is some responses that I did not expect. One thing I did not expect was the answers to question four, which was "Do you feel that your neurological status is a source of artistic innovation?" I designed this question based on my own experience when researching and learning about the Theatre of Neurodiversity. When I learned about the Theatre of Neurodiversity, I remember having intense moments of realization that my neurological status was not a hindrance. It was a source of power and intellectual diversity that could strengthen a theatrical endeavor. I assumed that my fellow actors would have had the same experience. However, Actor A did not answer the question from a personal perspective but from a group perspective, and both Actor B and Actor C replied

negatively. This was surprising to me but served as a potent reminder that neurodiversity is diverse. Sarah Magni designed the Theatre of Neurodiversity to accommodate the vast diversity of neurodivergent people. This diversity of experience is also present during the rehearsal process, including the responses to the disruptions—another thing I did not expect. I viewed the reality of remote rehearsal over Zoom with disdain. I thought it would be inferior to in-person rehearsals and hinder our rehearsal process. I assumed all the actors shared this disdain, yet Actor B reported an unexpected benefit of the remote rehearsals.

> I really liked, I think it was a product of Zoom—of being on Zoom for the first month, but something that I specifically really liked was how close I felt like the cast got, like just doing theater games and getting to know you and stuff, cause then it was just like everything we did after that felt much more safe. Like, I know these people, they're not gonna judge me . . . especially since we got to know each other before actually meeting in person (personal interview).

Zoom created the unexpected benefit of leveling the social field, providing the halfway point between a formal in-person meeting and the domestic sphere. This liminality allowed the first in-person rehearsal to feel equal, amicable, and accessible to Actor B. I was embarrassed to hear this because I carelessly disregarded Zoom as a sufficient rehearsal space. I realized that I could have unintentionally created a less accommodating rehearsal space. Theatre of Neurodiversity requires very robust accommodations, and even a director such as myself who has researched Theatre of Neurodiversity can still accidentally engage in ableism. I intend to keep a far more open mind to the possibilities that Zoom and any other tools could provide.

Interviewing the three actors ended up complimenting my own experiences with the Theatre of Neurodiversity. These interviews also provided additional evidence to support the tenet of invisibility. In addition to evaluating the actors' experience compared to mine, the interviews provided helpful insights that informed my reflections about improving as a director and ways to implement the Theatre of Neurodiversity more effectively in the future. After these interviews, I feel confident stating that the actors recognized and felt the effects of Theatre of Neurodiversity in our rehearsal space. These effects provided innumerable benefits for their theatrical experiences, as well as in their daily lives. It can safely be said from the interviews that the cast's experience with the Theatre of Neurodiversity was a positive one.

CONCLUSION

I began this experiment years ago when I decided to direct a piece of theatre because it contained something I could not identify, something I needed. As bell hooks described, I was craving liberation. I viewed my autism as an obstacle in my youth, and after years of internalized oppression, I learned it was not my autism but the society around me that was an obstacle. I found a nugget of liberation with *The Curious Incident.* However, it was only with my discovery of Theatre of Neurodiversity that I found a tool that could help me achieve liberation through theatrical means (hooks 50). Exploring Theatre of Neurodiversity with my cast proved far more challenging than anticipated. Based on the interviews and my personal experience, I think we succeeded in creating some form of more human and equitable theater.

While the production of *The Curious Incident* that the cast and I made was more human and accommodating, I do not know that I would describe the endeavor as a successful implementation of Theatre of Neurodiversity. I feel that the Theatre of Neurodiversity must utilize the strictest interpretation of devising possible, having no preconceived notions from the beginning. While we engaged in communal forms of blocking, the presence of a final script from the beginning happened without any strict devising constraints. In addition, the disruptions due to COVID altered our schedule significantly and threatened our secure space. These are some reasons I do not think the production is a prime example of Theatre of Neurodiversity. Our endeavor to incorporate Theatre of Neurodiversity did improve the show and our experience. The low-tech final scene was a high point for myself and the cast. Indeed in a devised fashion, with no limitations of any kind, we created a moment of authentic autistic joy onstage. Compared to the original West End and Broadway productions, I feel our ending did far more to develop a sense of community.

I do not consider this project a failure, despite my assessment of the production falling short of being a prime example of Theatre of Neurodiversity. The project was a Sisyphean struggle, one where we would never accomplish the goal, but the joy was in the struggle. While I do not think it was a waste of time, I would like to resolve some of these tensions to create a performance that is unquestionably a part of the Theatre of Neurodiversity. I would aim to strictly adhere to The Ethic of Accommodation and devising techniques to solve these issues. The primary reason the lack of clear deadlines was such a stressor for the actors on this project was that

we had a set performance date. The cast could not opt-out of a performance, nor could they change the date of the performance. In addition, having a finalized script at the top limited the devising options available to us. While I even encouraged the cast to consider changing some lines potentially, we would not have the time or permission to alter the script dramatically. I would aim to create a genuinely accommodating space for a future project: No auditions, no set performance, and no outside audience. Through workshopping and exploring together, we would create and perform for each other at our own pace accommodating all participants. Together as a cast, we would decide if we wanted to perform to an external audience and how. Ideally, the only strict guidelines I would follow is the eight-point manifesto I created during this experiment.

I designed my manifesto for my usage, but it will hopefully help fellow creators identify and guide their productions towards an ideal that could benefit all shows. As Actor A stated, Theatre of Neurodiversity is inherently human theatre, and I hope fellow theatrical artists use my manifesto to build their theories. The Theatre of Neurodiversity is novel, and experimentation by fellow neurodivergent theatrical artists is needed to mature this new theatrical form. No other theatrical form prioritizes an equitable rehearsal space for neurodivergent and neurotypical individuals. By utilizing the manifesto I have provided in this paper, future productions can create a more welcoming and accommodating rehearsal space that welcomes all people. I hope that more theatrical artists, neurodivergent and neurotypical alike, may engage with the Theatre of Neurodiversity and join the

Sisyphean struggle for disability liberation. While we may never achieve that liberation in our lifetimes, Our efforts in unison can help create a more humane, equitable theater for future generations to enjoy.

APPENDIX A

Community Guidelines 2022

Brought to you by the cast of *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*

– *Respect everyone's personal boundaries.* This includes advocating for your own needs to the rest of the community. We should all feel open to exploring acting choices while still keeping a safe dialogue about boundaries going. Remember that people's needs and boundaries can change at any time.

– *One mic, one voice.* Allow others to fully flush out their thoughts before offering other ideas.

– *Keep the community open and welcoming.* As other members of the production are added to our team, it is important to note that new people will have new boundaries and needs that are equally as important to consider. "Be respectful, flexible, and no 'othering'"

– *"Alone versus lonely".* Communicate your space and do not be offended if someone asks for a different kind of space. This is not a personal reflection on you, but on what they need as an individual. *Arms crossed on the chest means "I am decompressing, please give me space".*

– *Maintain professionality.* It is important to understand that there is a time for comedy and a time for sensitivity. We cannot know how much a comment can affect a person. If you would not say something to someone's face, do not say it at all. This also means shutting down anyone else who is doing so.

– *Be deliberate and careful with what you say.* Think before you speak, and be intentional with what you say to avoid offending others.

– *Refrain from offering unsolicited advice.* Wait for consent from the person before offering them advice. If you choose to accept advice, respect the ideas given. Do not dismiss them.

– *Honor people's time.* No phones on set. No side talking during working times. Help others notice when we all need to be more respectful of each other's time.

– *Everyone is a human being. Everyone is trying their best.* Allow empathy towards the members of this community, including yourself.

APPENDIX B

Notes from the Director

The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Nighttime was hailed as a revolutionary way to represent autistic people. This was why a good family friend recommended it to me, and the recommendation came to me at a time when my own identity regarding my autism was in crisis. I was diagnosed with Asperger's Syndrome, now known as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), at a very young age. All throughout my K-12 education I was the autistic kid. I received "Applied Behavioral Analysis" to help teach me tips and ways to properly socially interact with fellow people while taking medication. But by the time I had reached college, I no longer required accommodations. I had learned how to mimic neurotypical socializing so effectively that most people could no longer tell I was neurodivergent. Thus began my identity crisis: was I still autistic? Could I still claim to be neurodivergent? As a Sophomore in College I had begun my exploration into neurodivergence as a community, not simply as a medicalized term. I read *The Curious Incident*, and started seeking out art that represented those who were neurodivergent. I was searching for my community, the autistic community. It was through theory, especially the social model of disability, that I found healing, community, and understanding. I came to realize that I am autistic, not because I receive treatment or act "autistic", but because I **am**. My identity comes from my community and not a doctor. I am autistic, and I am proud. *The Curious Incident* was what inspired me to explore this facet of myself, something that I will always treasure about the show. Yet *The Curious Incident* is a very flawed play; the original production was not accessible to those with autism, with many harmful stereotypes and ableist violence present throughout the play. I could not help but desire as an autistic director to direct this production, to see if I could reclaim this work, make it my own. It was only when I learned of neurodivergent theatre that I saw a possible path forward. Neurodiegent theatre is focused on the rehearsal process, not the eventual performance. It prioritizes accessibility, equity, and validation for those who are neurodivergent. It dismantles the authoritarian elitist directorial methods that are standard in Western theatre for ones based on equity and consent. The show you will see tonight will be the very first production of *The Curious Incident* directed by an autistic director, with an autistic lead, following the tenets of neurodivergent theatre. As an expert in liberatory theory, bell hooks has summarized my directorial experience in her book *Teaching to Transgress* far better than I ever could: "Because you are thirsty you are not too proud to extract the dirt and be nourished by the water." I hope that this production will be water of a purer nature, and that it may satisfy your thirst as it has mine.

- Joel Moore

The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time

A play by Simon Stephens
Based on the novel by Mark Haddon

Directed by Joel Moore
March 4, 5, & 6, 2022

CAST (in alphabetical order)

Christopher	Maddie Jones
Reverend Peters/Station Guard/Ensemble	Serena Jones
Lady in Street/Information/Ensemble	Hailey Kafer
Mrs Shears/Mrs Gascoyne/Ensemble	Emma LaPolt
Roger (Mr Shears)/Duty Sergeant/Ensemble	Maximos Lianos
Policeman 1/London Policeman/Ensemble	Ricky May
Judy	Claudia Pilch-Caton
Ed	Ethan Reichwald
Mrs Alexander/PoshWoman/Ensemble	Molly Robbins
Siobhan	Madison Tirado

Setting

Swindon, England and London, England

There will be one 15-minute intermission.

CONTENT WARNING: Strobe lights, mature content, domestic violence and ableism

THE CURIOUS INCIDENT OF THE DOG IN THE NIGHT-TIME was first presented by the National Theatre, London at the Cottesloe Theatre on August 2nd 2012 and transferred to the Gielgud Theatre, West End, London on March 12th 2013. The Play opened in the USA at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre on October 5th 2014.

This Play is presented by kind permission of Warner Bros. Entertainment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boal, Augusto. Theatre of the Oppressed. Theatre Communications Group, 1985.

Brantley, Ben. “Plotting the Grid of Sensory Overload.” *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 6 Oct. 2014, www.nytimes.com/2014/10/06/theater/the-curious-incident-of-the-dog-in-the-night-time-opens-on-broadway.html.

Chemers, Michael M. “The Mortification of Harvey Leach; Humor and Horror in 19th Century Theatre of Disability.” Theatre and the Macabre, edited by Meredith Conti and Kevin J. Wetmore, University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 2022, pp. 13–28.

Dirth, Thomas P., and Nyla R. Branscombe. “Disability Models Affect Disability Policy Support through Awareness of Structural Discrimination: Models of Disability.” Journal of Social Issues, vol. 73, no. 2, 2017, pp. 413–42, https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12224.

Haddon, Mark, and Stephen, Simon. The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time: The 2018 School Version with Cuts. Dramatist Play Service inc, 2018.

hooks, bell. Teaching to Transgress : Education as the Practice of Freedom. Routledge, 1994.

Kuppers, Petra. Theatre & Disability. Red Globe Press, 2017.

Lukes, Alexandra. "THE ASYLUM OF NONSENSE: ANTONIN ARTAUD'S TRANSLATION OF LEWIS CARROLL." *Romanic Review*, vol. 104, no. 1, 2013, pp. 105-126. *ProQuest*, https://www-proquest-com.oca.ucsc.edu/scholarly-journals/asylum-nonsense-antonin-artauds-translation-lewis/docview/1518507768/se-2?accountid=14523.

Magni, Sarah. Towards a Theatre of Neurodiversity: Virtual Theatre and Disability During a Global Pandemic. 2020. yorkspace.library.yorku.ca, https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/xmlui/handle/10315/38370.

Mike Oliver (2013) The social model of disability: thirty years on, Disability & Society, 28:7, 1024-1026, DOI: 10.1080/09687599.2013.818773.

Personal interview. 24 April 2022.

Program for Mark Hadden and Simon Stephens's The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time at the UCSC Second Stage Theater, California. 2022.

Sandahl, Carrie, and Philip Auslander, editors. *Bodies in Commotion: Disability & Performance*. University of Michigan Press, 2005, https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.92455.