

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To every actor, director, teacher, choreographer, stage manager, and maker that I have had the privilege of sharing a rehearsal room with, thank you from the very bottom of my heart. Whether we worked together for a short time or for years, you have made this research possible and I am forever grateful.

Thanks to all of my mentors, friends, teachers, and colleagues. There are far too many people deserving thanks to name them all, but everything would have been far more daunting without the kindness and generosity of Annette Thornton, Henry Bial, Samantha Riedel, and Jason Davids Scott. Thanks also to the Association of Theatre Movement Educators and my wonderful colleagues at The University of Maryland Baltimore County.

To all of my collaborators at Theatrical Intimacy Education, thank you for believing in this work and for your investment in helping it grow.

Laura Rikard, thank you for being the best co-founder, co-teacher, and co-researcher anyone could ever ask for. I can't wait to see what we do next. Maisie and Ellie, thank you for letting me borrow your mom. She's amazing and so are you.

Thanks to Robin Abrahams for her keen edits. Without you this book would have made much less sense.

And to the team at Routledge, Lucia Accorsi and Stacey Walker — thank you for your support and the deadlines that made this thing real.

Thank you to my family. I know my specialty is weird, but you were proud of me anyway, even when you needed to explain what your daughter/sister/granddaughter did for a living to your friends. Thank you for opening the door to the education that set me on the path to pursue this dream.

And finally, to my Karl. Thank you for your love and support. Thank you for cheering me on and reminding me that this was possible. Thank you for keeping our many, many animals happy and fed while I was rehearsing, traveling, and writing. Thank you for doing our laundry. Thank you for being my teammate. I love you. You're my favorite. You know the rest.

Introduction

Boundaries are complicated.

Theatrical Intimacy Education¹ has buttons that say “Ask me about my Boundaries,” and people take handfuls at workshops. Because most people spend a fair amount of mental energy negotiating boundaries, their own and everyone else's, on matters ranging from parking spaces to pronouns.

And that's just everyday life. Now imagine the rehearsal room. There are all the normal social boundaries that need to be negotiated among a group of people from different backgrounds, of different ages and genders and personal histories, who are sharing space and working together. On top of that, there are the professional roles that each person has taken on —performer, director, stage manager, dresser—each with its own bounded set of tasks and sphere of authority. And on top of that, there is that essential, critical boundary between the *truth* of the stage story the team is creating and the *reality* of the people in the room.

Why do so many boundaries get crossed between actors staging Intimacy? Because actors kiss. Actually kiss. The contact is real. They physically put their bodies on other people's bodies and share contact that has no obvious separation from reality. Theatre artists haven't had an established technique to rely on that tells us that this is a construction, and choreography, and a craft. Because the only direction the director can give is that it needs to be more passionate and sensual. And it starts to seem like it actually is passionate and sensual. And not just blocking and not just characters. And someone's hand is up an actor's shirt and it's unclear if it is their scene partner or a character. And is it truth or reality guiding the hand on their ribcage?

Given the overlapping, intersecting, idiosyncratic, and evolving boundaries in any theatrical endeavor, it is no wonder that staging intimacy is especially charged for both actors and directors. And yet, there has been no codified system or vocabulary developed either to make the process less fraught, or to give intimacy choreography the same status as other forms of movement storytelling. This book is an attempt to fill that gap. This is a comprehensive technique, a system of tools, best practices, and vocabulary, to help you stage intimacy, nudity, and sexual violence.

THE OLD APPROACHES

Directors wouldn't ever tell two actors to "just punch each other," so how did "just kiss each other" become a part of our vernacular in the rehearsal room? It's a complicated question, but the simple answer is that historically, it has worked. For ages and eons, actors kissed when someone told them to.

So, while there hasn't been a complete system for staging intimacy, there have been approaches and techniques to make the inevitably awkward at least somewhat easier. The path to ethical, efficient, and effective theatrical intimacy is littered with good intentions. Many of the approaches people take have been created out of a genuine desire to be careful and considerate—sometimes, unfortunately, to the point of making a lot of things a lot more complicated, and maybe even worse.

Let's look at some of the most common approaches for staging intimacy, why directors and choreographers have tried them, and why they don't work.

Old Approach: "Just Kiss Each Other!"

When a director wants the actors to kiss, tell them to just kiss each other. If the director is staging intercourse, tell them what position to get into so they aren't just guessing and the sightlines work. Keep it simple!

- Why we try it

This seems like the most obvious, quickest, least awkward approach for many directors. And if the actors weren't okay with it, they would speak up. Right?

- Why it doesn't work

Maybe they won't speak up. The obvious issue here is the power dynamics in the rehearsal room. More on this later, but in short, actors are reticent to say no. It's built into their training to say yes.

The other problem is that this approach, which isn't your best bet, relies on the actors and director having the same image of the intimacy. If someone tells two actors to make out on the couch, and they do something that's awkward, or not what the director wanted, what can be done about it? Ask them to make out on the couch ... better? If the playwright has written a moment of oral sex, and the actors have *absolutely no idea* what oral sex looks like (or they are mortified that you might learn what they *think* it looks like) (or they only know about how oral sex looks in pornography) then the production is out of luck and stuck relying on one of the other Old Approaches.

Also, it's super awkward for the actors to have their director (or professor) suggesting sex positions to them.

Old Approach: The Actors Talk It Through

Ask the actors what they think the characters would do with each other and then have them try it.

- Why we try it

They are playing the roles, so the actors have the best insight here. Also, actors won't suggest anything they aren't okay with.

- Why it doesn't work

Actors will indeed suggest things they're uncomfortable with if they believe it's what the director wants.

This approach also narrows the emotional distance between actor and character. If one scene partner says they think their character wants to grope the other character, the other scene partner might be left wondering if their scene partner just wants to feel them up. That can open the door to some messy feelings down the road.

Also, the actor's ideas might not work. They might not have any real world experience, or a different experience than their character, and they might suggest an inappropriate choice. Then you are left having to explain to actors why what they want to try is an inappropriate, or boring, or super weird intimate choice. An approach that avoids awkward conversations would be best.

Old Approach: The Actors Talk It Through (Over There)

Send the actors to another room to block the intimacy on their own, maybe with an assistant stage manager to keep time and supervise.

- Why we try it

This is an attempt to allow the actors some freedom, but allows them the benefit of privacy while they experiment. It also removes the director from awkward conversations.

- Why it doesn't work

Actors are absolutely terrified of displeasing directors. They know that they need to say "yes, and", to be bold, to take risks, to make big choices. That works great in a monologue or even when staging a scene, but when actors are put in the pressure cooker of coming up with something on their own (with no skill set to fall back on other than that they should "take risks") they often stage things that make one, both, or all of the actors involved uncomfortable.

Beyond that, this isn't a great working environment for actors (not to mention the hapless assistant stage manager). If a director or choreographer isn't involved

in the process, it's impossible to know how the actors came up with it (was it a consensual, comfortable process?) or how they feel about it (other than the slightly panicked/overly confident "fine" they will give you when you ask how it went).

And as with the earlier approaches, it will also be impossible to tweak it further because you aren't all working from the same set of vocabulary. A director might have to fall back on "more seductive" or "less tentative" to get what they're looking for.

Old Approach: Show, Don't Tell

Get up and show the actors what you want them to do. Work with an assistant, a cast member, or by yourself, if you're flexible enough, to demonstrate how you want things to look.

- Why we try it

If you don't have the vocabulary, this is the fastest way to show actors exactly what it is you're looking for. You check with the assistant or the actors to make sure they don't mind, and you step in to demonstrate. In dance and stage combat, this is standard practice, it's efficient, and it works.

- Why it doesn't work (for intimacy)

Even though this is a common practice in other areas of theatre, intimate scenes require a little more space between the director and the actors. There's an entire chapter about boundaries later in the book, and (spoilers) this approach crosses almost all of them.

Additionally, you might demonstrate things that the actors aren't physically able to do. And now they can picture you doing them.

Old Approach: Let the Choreographer Do It

Send in the pros.

- Why we try it

There's already a dance or fight choreographer on your team, or on your faculty, or in the cast, or within shouting distance. They are good at teaching people how to move together to tell a story and they choreograph tricky stuff all of the time. Let specialists do specialist things.

- Why it doesn't work

Dance and fight choreographers have training that does not automatically translate to an intimacy setting. Both dance and fight choreography rely extensively on demonstration from the instructor—which can be absolutely fine when demonstrating a lift or a partnered fall, but crosses a boundary for intimacy. Fight choreographers are used to saying "punch" when they mean "fake punch," so it's easy

to understand why they say things like "let's do the rape scene" when they mean, "let's work on the scene where we tell the story of an assault."

Fight choreographers often rely on an actor to imagine specific injuries and real danger to tell the story of the hits and misses. Asking an actor to imagine the realities of sexual violence, or even consensual intimacy, is a psychological exercise that can be emotionally damaging and triggering.

Old Approach: The Sharing Circle

Take the time to understand everyone's relationship to intimacy and the material in the scene so you can approach the material carefully.

- Why we try it

You're considerate, thoughtful, and concerned that the material might be triggering (or just uncomfortable) for the actors. You want them to understand that you recognize that this is difficult and it's important to you that you give them space to voice their concerns. This will also help the actors personalize the intimate moments.

- Why it doesn't work

While imagining that an action or event or prop for a character is something from the actor's lived experience might be a good idea, actors personalizing the intimate or violent events of the play for themselves can create unsafe situations. Making the events of a play personal for the actor means that the world of the play and reality are now in overlapping bubbles. That overlap can encourage confusion, showmance, tech week breakdowns, real world break ups, and all around messy choreography.

This sets you up for a bad situation if actors reveal trauma that you (and the rest of the ensemble) aren't equipped to handle. Even the most emotionally intelligent, mental health first-aid certified director isn't a therapist, and rehearsal isn't therapy. An actor reliving their personal trauma on stage every night isn't going to make your play better and it has the potential to damage the actor's emotional well-being.

Old Approach: Chemistry Lessons

Have the actors do a series of exercises and improvisations to help them feel the energy between them. Guide them to observe how it feels to be touched by their partner. Tell them to imagine their partner's body and think about how it moves. Get them to fall a little bit in love.

- Why we try it

If the actors were actually into each other, this scene would be so much better. It would probably block itself and you wouldn't have to worry about anyone's boundaries getting crossed. They wouldn't be so awkward and the play would be better.

- Why it doesn't work

Relying on actor emotions is an unreliable and unstable way of working. Passion fades. Choreography is forever. They might not like each other in six weeks. Or they might like each other more than is helpful or useful. Relying on "chemistry" is the express train to Showmanceville.

This approach also creates an environment where reality and the truth of the play are equated. If you are asking them to develop real feelings towards each other, they will have a much harder time shaking off the scene when it's over. And if the intimacy in the play is meant to be traumatic or violent, this approach signals to the actors that you want them feeling and living that trauma and betrayal every night.

GETTING BETTER AT STAGING SEX

All of the previous approaches to staging intimacy fell short in at least one of two major areas: getting full and informed consent from the actors, and/or creating consistent ways to communicate the artistic demands of the scene.

There are three problems with current practices around staging intimacy:

1. The dynamics of the rehearsal room make consent tricky and leaves the door open to abuses of power.
2. Even in the absence of abuse or wrongdoing, the nature of theatrical intimacy makes actors psychologically, physically, and emotionally vulnerable, and good intentions on the part of their directors and scene partners are not sufficient to protect them. People who work with volatile substances—like explosives, or human neurotransmitters and hormones—need more than mutual respect to keep things from blowing up. They need ultra-clear communication and a protocol.
3. Intimate moments onstage are part of the story and deserve the same attention to detail and careful crafting as any other moment of theatrical storytelling. We need better tools to tell those stories.

Unfortunately, identifying shortcomings (while an honored theatrical tradition) no more creates a system than sharing horror stories (also an honored theatrical tradition) creates a solution.

This book is a path towards a comprehensive solution for staging intimacy, nudity, and sexual violence designed in response to the needs of directors, actors, stage managers, choreographers, and audience members.

- We need to get consent from *everyone* involved in the process every step of the way.
- We need to establish and normalize clear boundaries for *everyone*.

- We need to treat theatrical intimacy as choreography and choreograph it in a way that is directable, efficient, and doesn't fall apart in front of an *audience*.
- We need to stop putting the burden of staging the scenes on the shoulders of *actors*.
- We need to give our *stage managers* something to write down better than "just kiss each other."

Staging intimacy, nudity, and sexual violence is tricky because boundaries—physical, professional, emotional—can so easily get crossed. But we can do better.

WHAT THE OLD APPROACHES IGNORED

For decades, "just kiss each other" seemed to work. Actors kissed! It seemed fine!

But the old approaches ignored the power *in* the rehearsal room, and the power *of* the rehearsal room. They were based on the assumption that good intentions were all that were necessary to create a good experience for the cast (and ultimately the audience). This assumption is incorrect. Let's examine why.

The Power in the Room: the Director

No matter how egalitarian, consensus-based, and all-around awesome and approachable you may be, you are still the director, the authority in the room. When you are the one in charge, the cast has been conditioned into certain attitudes through years of training to see you and your requests in a certain way.

(Please note: Not all projects are the same, and age, race, gender, disability, experience, education, union status, who's new in town and who has an established network, who has a trust fund and who supports themselves, also influence the power dynamics in the room. The particulars of this section, however, deal with actors' conditioning and some basic principles of psychology.)

As the director you may not feel powerful—you probably feel stressed, underpaid, underslept, overjoyed, frustrated, elated, all in different measures. But those feelings don't undermine your power. Neither does a good intimacy practice. This system is not about empowering actors at the expense of directors, but rather actors and directors alike gaining a vocabulary to meet the demands of the art they are creating together.

Actors are trained to say yes. Acting school is an exercise in saying yes to everything. They have been trained from day one that the first rule is "yes, and," and there is a standard that actors are expected to meet and that they are, in all ways, "easy to work with." The message they internalize is that they can't ruffle any feathers, ask any hard questions, or say no. They believe saying no, or even

questioning a direction, might make them “hard to work with.” The “Easy to Work With Myth” is pervasive. By sending the message that an actor is a person that says “yes,” and takes risks, it comes through loud and clear that a person looking to protect themselves and says no isn’t cut out to be an actor.

When an actor doesn’t know how a director will feel about them establishing clear boundaries, with their reputation potentially on the line, they will say yes, knowing that “yes, and” is the safest choice. Actors are taught that their reputations are as valuable, or more valuable, than their boundaries.

Actors are professionally vulnerable. Actors are taught, either through formal training or observation of the industry, that they are replaceable. Directors can fire actors on the spot. They can keep them from getting future work. Actors learn they are at the bottom early on in their training. They say yes for the sake of being “easy to work with” in an attempt to keep their jobs and be hired again. Performers internalize the message that saying yes is staying employed. A performer fearing that a “hard to work with” label might make them say “okay” to being touched in a way that makes them uncomfortable. They might agree to nudity that wasn’t in their contract. They might go home in tears, frustrated that the skewed power dynamic of a performer and director/producer left them feeling powerless.

The Power of the Room: Human Psychology

Even if the rehearsal room were a completely flat hierarchy—an improv group with a new leader chosen randomly at each meeting, say—the people in it would *still* have a hard time saying “no,” simply because of the power of group dynamics. Directors should be aware of three psychological phenomena:

People conform. Humans are mutually dependent and learn by imitation, and one of the side effects of that is a very strong tendency to conform. People will deny simple logic and the evidence of their own senses in order to fit in with a group—getting them to ignore their own comfort levels is easy. No one wants to be the one to redirect the flow or change the mood of a room. Being the first one to say “no” is the hardest.

At its extreme, conformity can lead to what management experts call the “Abilene Paradox,” when a group agrees on a course of action that few, if any of them, actually want to undertake because one person introduced the idea, another supports it to be polite, and then everyone thinks everyone *else* thinks it’s a great idea.

People need protocol. Respect and courtesy are important to everyone, but the behavior language used to express them differs from culture to culture. Do you take off your hat to pray or put it on? Is it more polite to accept or decline food that is offered to you? When are gifts appropriate? Without a shared behavioral language, it is difficult to interpret other people’s behavior or feel confident that your own will be interpreted correctly.

This is why having explicit protocol or team culture is important when dealing with a diverse team and/or complicated interpersonal relationships—both of which conditions apply in just about any rehearsal room. We have these protocols around many areas of theatre, but historically not when staging intimacy, where it’s arguably the most needed.

Heightened states affect cognition. People’s brains work differently when they are in a state of high arousal—stressed, adrenalized, *on*, like actors once rehearsal starts to get real. The unconscious mind looks for a good primitive reason for that heightened state and may decide it’s due to an attractive scene partner, not stage fright. Boundary-setting and other higher-order social skills may tend to decline, unless those skills are practiced in a heightened state.

HOW THIS BOOK CAN HELP: THREE BIG IDEAS

The goal is that in every rehearsal room, someone should have access to, and actually use, a system for staging intimacy, nudity, and sexual violence. The plan for making that happen is to have that person be you. Not every organization or production can, or necessarily needs to, hire an intimacy choreographer. If they can, great, but the goal is to continue to make the people already in the room be better at being in the room. The target audience for this book is directors, choreographers, and theatre teachers. These are the people who are most powerful and most present in the rehearsal room.

Actors, stage managers, and students: the best practices in this book are a starting point for you to have a conversation with the people in power in your rehearsal rooms about how things can be better. Every technique that I outline in this book is a tool that you can take into a scene study, into rehearsal, into your career with you.

This book is particularly important for college and high school teachers because student actors are particularly vulnerable—their directors assign not only roles but grades and recommendation letters. By training emerging artists in ethical, efficient, and decidedly desexualized practices, we can work to eliminate a culture of ineffective, traumatizing staged intimacy.

Three main guide this book. If you get overwhelmed, come back here.

1. Create a Culture of Consent

Directors like to think that they don’t pressure actors to do things that they don’t want to do. They may point to safeguards in their rehearsal rooms, union protections, their own affable personalities and approachability. You can be the most approachable, seemingly least threatening director in the world, but at the end of the day, you hold the power in the situation. You can’t give it away by being approachable.

And you shouldn’t. Because of the power of the room, you need to be the power *in* the room. If you don’t break the tendency toward conformity, who will? If you

don't provide techniques to reinforce the boundary between the actor and the role, who will? It's up to you to learn how to use your power. Bring best practices in the room. Model good behavior.

For example, if the ensemble decides that everyone gives everyone else back-rubs, offer a practice for the actors to get consent from each other, but don't participate. If you are tempted to join in, imagine the creepiest director you have ever worked with jumping into that massage train. No, you aren't them, but if you do it, it normalizes directors crossing professional boundaries. Don't do anything your creepiest colleague shouldn't. Because if you do, your creepiest colleague might think it's okay. Look out for the actors by modeling good behavior, even if you think you can get away with less. Have better boundaries than you think you need.

No ethical director wants to take advantage of the actor-director power dynamic. Consent requires an enthusiastic, uncoerced "yes" from all parties involved, so an "I guess so, sure," out of obligation hardly qualifies. When a conscientious director becomes aware of this power dynamic, they try to close that gap by empowering the actor to establish boundaries, making an effort to check in, or calling in a pro. That director works hard to make sure the actor is comfortable with whatever tools they have at their disposal.

To actually get consent in the rehearsal room, there has to be space, real space, for the actor to say "no." It's not enough to tell actors that they can say "no." If your whole training life has conditioned you to say yes, saying "no" breaks the rules. Even asking for a moment to decide can feel like being difficult. Even when you ask them what they want, actors feel the pressure to be easy.

It's not enough to tell actors that they can say "no." **We need to normalize "no,"** and we do that by establishing an expectation, with words and with our actions, that everyone will have boundaries and those boundaries will be respected. I tell actors all the time that there is no boundary that will get in the way of my ability to tell a story. And I mean it.

This system ensures that we are starting off on the right foot by building consent into every step of the process. We have a consent-based boundary establishment, consent-based choreography, and consent-focused methods. We normalize asking questions and setting boundaries so that when we get a yes, they mean it.

2. Desexualize the Process

Staging sex doesn't need to be sexy—it shouldn't be, any more than staging violence should be scary. Keep any illusion of actual sexiness out of the process with clear boundaries, clear choreography, and desexualized language.

Desexualized language describes the physical pieces of the movement and skips over the cultural or social context the movement is usually given. For example, in a handshake, there is contact between the palms, medium pressure with the fingertips on the back of your partner's hand, synchronized motion up and down, and a release. Working this way for a handshake might seem silly, but it gives the director

room to craft and shape the handshake. Slow it down, speed it up, increase pressure, be out of sync.

All of those tiny cues tell us about character and circumstance without the director needing to say, "be tentative," "be passionate," "be aggressive," or "make it awkward." That same breakdown makes intimacy directable and keeps directors from relying on vague psychological cues, like "be more passionate" or "struggle more". When you use desexualized language to describe intimacy, you avoid describing sex acts to actors, but you gain an ability to direct the movement as specifically as you might like.

Describe everything in desexualized language. Don't call the scene with intimacy in it "the sex scene." Call it Act II scene ii, or the "coffee shop scene."

When we desexualize the language, we never *gripe* our scene partners. That would be highly unprofessional and rude. We instead *find muscle- and bone-level contact with the areas of our partner's bodies that they have given us permission to work with today*. We don't *hump* our partners. We *open and close the distance between our pelvises*. We don't *struggle to get away*, we *apply bone level contact, short sharp breath, open distance, and avoid eye contact while they try and close distance and seek eye contact*. Equally important to choreographing with desexualized language is to keep a desexualized rehearsal space. Avoid making sexual comments in rehearsal and encourage everyone to use the desexualized language of the choreography, rather than realistic sexual language. Euphemisms like "getting it on" or "horny" can create discomfort in the room. Don't worry if you slip up, it's about creating a culture, not being 100% perfect.

Every intimate scene can be broken down, desexualized, and directed with this system. When movement is described in concrete, desexualized terms, it can be easily written down, leaving the actors with a recipe that they can follow into tech week and beyond.

3. Choreograph It

Choreography is your insurance policy against all sorts of weirdness.

If you want a passionate kiss, the first day you say "just passionately kiss each other" the actors might do exactly what you want them to do. They might feel great about it and do it consistently for the duration of the run and it never gets weird and they never change it. Perfection. That's almost never how it goes. Or at least it's not the whole story.

What if they do exactly what you want them to do the first time and then never again? What if they get the giggles every time they go in for it after that? How do you get the passionate magic back? It's never as good again and you are left googling synonyms for passionate.

What if they do it weird the first time? You say passionate kiss, and you get an awkward face smashing, writhing mess that you can't do anything about. What can you say to them? Kiss better? Kiss less weirdly? If you can't shape it, there is no guarantee that the intimacy will tell the story you are trying to tell.

What if you say kiss passionately, it goes perfectly all the way through opening night? It all seems fine, but by closing, one of the actors is in tears because their partner keeps crossing the line, adding moves, getting handsy, night after night, and your stage manager has no idea how to get them back on track?

Without choreography, boundaries getting crossed left and right, things changing depending on actor whims and moods is the norm. And when theatrical intimacy is loosely set, it's not only a boundary nightmare, it's undirectable. That incredible kiss they just found? It's gone if you don't know how to go back and get it and then set it.

Intimacy needs to be choreographed. And if you treat intimacy as choreography, you can tell exactly the story you want to tell without needing to rely on the ingenuity and sexual experience of your actors.

The process for choreographing it can range widely, from a collaborative, exploratory approach to the director having a crystal clear concept or idea going in. And just like how spins become pirouettes when choreographing a dance, choreographing intimacy needs its own vocabulary. It's important that we assign movements vocabulary because without language, it becomes very difficult to record the choreography.

Passion fades. Choreography is forever. I want to help directors and choreographers realize on stage what they can see in their heads, so if you are directing *Romeo and Juliet*, and you knew what you want it to look like, you are able to put the scene together yourself in a way that made everyone feel great about it.

Long story short: If you want it to be repeatable, choreograph it. If you want it to tell a consistent story, choreograph it. If you want to help your stage manager run the show, choreograph it. If you want happy actors, choreograph it.

WHO I AM AND WHAT THIS BOOK IS

First and foremost, I am a woman who wore Good Underwear to rehearsal every day for six weeks because my director never told me when Underwear Rehearsal would be. There was no standard protocol for communicating this sort of thing to actors at the time. I didn't feel traumatized or anxious or exploited or anything like that. I loved working with the director, and I was having a marvelous time, except for how much time I spent doing laundry. It got me thinking there had to be a better way.

In my training, no one taught me how to be in intimacy on stage. Theatrical intimacy has been left completely out of the curriculum. That led to an awful lot of worry, confusion, and general boundary fuzziness. If the stage direction says kiss, should I go ahead and kiss my scene partner? Are they going to kiss me? That's good, right? If I ask about the kiss, am I overeager, or does that mean I'm so naive that I don't know that you just kiss each other? I wanted to save other theatre artists the awkwardness and confusion I experienced.

I have made or witnessed many of the mistakes I am going to ask you not to make. It's not because I didn't care about the safety or boundaries of actors I was working with. It is because, like many directors and choreographers, I didn't have a

comprehensive system for staging intimacy, nudity, and sexual violence when I got started and things slipped through the cracks. I could not have written this without every actor and director with whom I have shared a rehearsal room. I learned from all of their examples, good and bad. I saw what mistakes looked like from people with good intentions and what abuse looked like from people with bad ones.

I developed this system to be fast, easy, and accessible. Rehearsal time is a precious commodity and the speedy-if-unreliable "just kiss each other!" held the time to beat. This system—tested extensively in professional and academic rehearsal studios, on set, and in classrooms across the country—can be learned quickly and doesn't take a lot of in-rehearsal time.

This book is my method for staging intimacy. Not all of it is for everyone, and that's fine. Borrow in whole or in part the bits that make sense to you. Think of it as a cookbook. As with a cookbook, you can make things as simple, or as complicated and customized as you like. Only you are responsible for what you do with it. Please take the time to understand the "why" of a section before you bring it into your rehearsal room, but then bring it into the rehearsal room and make it yours. This is a toolkit designed to supplement and work with your own.

This system was developed for live theatre and it is designed to be the most-cautious, considerate, and thoughtful version of a system for staging theatrical intimacy. A system was designed to work for students in academia, some of the most vulnerable people in the industry, works beautifully for experienced professionals.

The Ingredients will give you all of the tools you need to create beautiful choreography. This book is not a choreography lesson, but a translation manual with a whole bunch of commonly used phrases. The Recipes and Ingredients you will find in this book are designed to make intimacy easier to choreograph. They give you specific language that describes movements, not sex acts. That specificity means that every move is infinitely tweakable.

If you get overwhelmed: Get consent, desexualize it, and choreograph it. Even a little bit better is better. You got this. Let's jump in.

¹ For more about Theatrical Intimacy Education, see Appendix.