



written by
JEREMY KAREKEN & DAVID MURRELL
and GORDON FARRELL

based on the book by JOHN D'AGATA and JIM FINGAL

directed by
MEHELLE MOE

Timeline
Theatre Company

YOUR GUIDE TO TIMELINE PRODUCTIONS

BACKSTORY



Dear Friends,

As a kid I was told: "Don't let the facts get in the way of a good story."

That life lesson came from my Irish grandmother (an expert in the art of comedic embellishment).

Or maybe it was someone else.

Doesn't matter who. That detail is irrelevant.

The important point—by Grandma or whoever—is that any skilled storyteller should paint narrative pictures that are vivid and provocative, without obligation to minutia that dilutes a greater emotional truth. Or a punch line.

Throughout history, creative license has been employed by filmmakers, novelists, lyricists, and (recently drawing scrutiny) stand-up comedians.

On stage, playwrights have for centuries blurred the line between fact and fiction, in the interest of dramatic action, anchored by the key distinction that the work is not journalism.

Similar arguments have been made by essayists, as was the case with "What Happens There," a piece by John D'Agata that ignited a hailstorm of pushback from intern Jim Fingal, who'd been assigned the task of fact-checking the provocative essay.

A debate erupted, with D'Agata—in response to Fingal's dissection of numerous elaborations or fudged circumstances—asserting his right to creative license. Their back-and-forth spawned a book called *The Lifespan of a Fact*, followed by this poignant script that (truth be told) takes additional liberties, as most plays must do.

D'Agata's piece examines the emotional soul—and toll—of living in Las Vegas, illuminating the story of a teenager who took his own life. The essay is haunting and probing, evocative and resonant. It was not, however, crafted to be a piece of journalistic reporting.

Despite that stipulation, as Fingal and others may argue, facts still matter.

And it's a slippery slope between a small, harmless lie and calculated, harmful deception.

Particularly during an age when sources of news have become, to put it politely, more varied in adherence to journalistic standards, what are the responsibilities of all storytellers to truth? And who is the arbiter of how truth is defined?

Here at TimeLine, we embrace this issue constantly, taking liberties on stage in the interest of drama. However, our goal is always to provide resources toward a more accurate picture offstage. Whether that's through this *Backstory* magazine, our lobby exhibits, or other media, we share historical context to complement the "truths" you experience on stage. Such is the case with this production, and I encourage you to delve into the following pages to explore the dispute between D'Agata and Fingal, and the origin of this play.

After launching our season with the acclaimed *The Lehman Trilogy* at the Broadway Playhouse, we're delighted to welcome you back to our longtime home on Wellington Avenue.

And on a personal note, I'm honored to return to our stage in this Chicago premiere, under the direction of fellow Company Member Mechelle Moe, working alongside Alex Rodriguez making his TimeLine debut, and joining fellow co-founder Juliet Hart, with whom I had the privilege of appearing in our first production in this space 24 years ago. As our sights are set on TimeLine's future home in Uptown, I'm grateful to be alongside her one more time to bookend a collection of memories made in this magical space that we've called home since 1999. And we can't wait to share all that's yet to come.

Best,

THE RESPONSE

CRITICAL REACTION TO THE BOOK: THE LIFESPAN OF A FACT

The Lifespan of a Fact.

John D'Agata,
author.

Jim Fingal,
fact-checker.

"A fascinating and dramatic power struggle over the intriguing question of what nonfiction should, or can, be." —Lydia Davis

Tellingly, the book *The Lifespan of a Fact* has glowing blurbs from fellow essayists and authors on its cover, praising John D'Agata's expansion of the genre or the battle between "imagination and pedestrian reality." But the reviews of the book's 2012 publication in a variety of periodicals are distinctly more critical, calling D'Agata's essay everything from being pretentious to manipulative and unethical. The reviewer for NPR found the book an entertaining boxing match in which you are likely to side with the least obnoxious of the authors at that moment. Here are some excerpts of the book's mixed response:

"A fascinating and dramatic power struggle over the intriguing question of what nonfiction should, or can, be."
—Lydia Davis, *Author*

"This book review would be so much easier to write were we to play by John D'Agata's rules. So let's try it. (1) This is not a book review; it's an essay. (2) I'm not a critic; I'm an artist. (3) Nothing I say can be used against me by the subjects of this essay, nor may anyone hold me to account re: facts, truth or any contract I have supposedly entered into with you, the reader.

There are to be no objections. There are to be no letters of complaint. For you are about to have—are you ready?—a 'genuine experience with art.'

This is so liberating!"

—Jennifer B. McDonald's review "In the Details,"
The New York Times, February 21, 2012

...

"A singularly important meditation on fact and fiction, the imagination and life, fidelity and freedom."

—Maggie Nelson, *Author*

...

"The epistolary jousting works. It points up the near-impossibility of imposing moral responsibility on a genre as ill-defined as nonfiction. After pages—years—of John and Jim's 'intellectual anarchy,' dogged quarreling, fruitless brokering and pains-taking revisions, we're worn out ... They do such a good job of dismantling the myth of 'fact' and 'truth' that it's hard to care about what really happened during the editing of *The Lifespan of a Fact*."

—Alice Gregory, "Lifespan Of A Fact: Truth And Consequences," NPR, March 3, 2012

...

"... D'Agata doesn't believe he's playing by those rules. He's an essayist, not a nonfiction writer, and works in the tradition of greats who, he asserts, also fudged facts for effect. 'Mary McCarthy, Orwell, Thoreau, Cicero,' he said, ticking off the examples on his fingers ... perhaps I'd be more enthusiastic about D'Agata's right to artistic license if the essay that he defends to his last breath weren't filled with the kind of portentous magazine writing that can sound insightful and elegant (if occasionally overheated) but that seems utterly hollow when you're faced with the layers upon layers of falsehoods that went into creating a specific effect."

—Dan Kois, "Facts are Stupid," Slate, February 15, 2012

Jim Fingal (left) and John D'Agata, in the book jacket photo for *The Lifespan of a Fact*. (Margaret Stratton)





Las Vegas has a history of finding a cultural desire and sensationalizing it, and thus Sin City was created.

Las Vegas was established as an American city on May 15, 1905, and the completion of the San Pedro, Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad, linking Southern California with Salt Lake City, soon established it as a railroad town.

From seemingly small beginnings, how did Las Vegas become Sin City?

A combination of social and economic developments created the environment for Las Vegas to thrive.

By the time Las Vegas was founded, Nevada had already begun to relax its divorce laws. There were several economic incentives for loosening these laws—attorney fees, hotel fees, hospitality services, and more put money back into the city. Then in 1931, Nevada lowered the residency threshold from three months to six weeks, which meant that divorce-seekers only had to be in Nevada for six weeks before their divorce was legally recognized. Divorce ranches popped up throughout Nevada,

allowing those waiting out their six weeks to do so in leisure.

As the economy around divorce picked up, Las Vegas also leaned into the entertainment industry. Construction on the nearby Hoover Dam began in 1930, bringing men from all over the country to earn wages working on this massive construction project. Casinos and showgirl venues opened up on Fremont Street, Las Vegas' sole paved road, to attract the project's workers. When the dam was completed in 1936, cheap hydroelectricity powered the flashing signs of Fremont's "Glitter Gulch."

Another large development came in 1941 when the first combined hotel-casino, El Rancho Vegas, opened on a stretch of Highway 91 that early casino owner Guy McAfee later nicknamed "the Strip." The El Rancho Vegas resort was notable because it helped make gambling "something you could do on a vacation," says David G. Schwartz, a gaming historian formerly at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. "And that was very successful."

The star quality of Las Vegas set it apart from other cities in Nevada at the time. Celebrities flocked to Las Vegas to both get a divorce and get a piece of its burgeoning economy. In 1939, Ria Langham came to Sin City to divorce Clark Gable. Langham

went on to say that her stay in Vegas had been "the finest and shortest vacation I ever had in my life."

In the 1940s, America saw the rise and fall of Benjamin "Bugsy" Siegel in Vegas. Siegel was a mobster who opened a hotel-casino called the Flamingo and was presumably killed for the catastrophic financial failure of that enterprise. Ironically, Siegel's murder put the Flamingo in headlines and it was ultimately able to stay open.

As time went on, Las Vegas leaned into large gestures and heightened experiences, going so far as to use nuclear testing as a way to draw tourists to casinos. The city was located about 65 miles away from the Nevada Test Site. On the nights before early morning atomic detonations, resorts would host parties that lasted until the visible nuclear explosion at dawn. Celebrations might involve special "atomic cocktails" or "Miss Atomic Energy" pageants.

Las Vegas has a history of finding a cultural desire and sensationalizing it, and thus Sin City was created.

(Above) Panoramic view of the Las Vegas Strip and city skyline at night. (marchello74, Adobe Stock)

(Below from left) Front entrance of the Flamingo Hotel and Casino, circa 1946; downtown Las Vegas with a mushroom cloud in the background, circa 1950s. (Wikimedia Commons)



THE TIMELINE: THE CREATION OF THE LIFESPAN OF A FACT

Saturday, July 13, 2002 16-year-old Levi Walton Presley jumps to his death after scaling two fences on the 109th floor of the Stratosphere Tower at about 6 p.m. He lands on the driveway to the hotel by Las Vegas Boulevard.

2003 Noted author John D'Agata is commissioned by *Harper's* magazine to write an essay about the suicide of Levi Presley. Once it's written, *Harper's* decides that D'Agata's essay takes too many liberties with the facts and rejects it.

2003 or 2005 (sources disagree) D'Agata takes the essay to *The Believer*, a magazine dedicated to pushing literary forms. The editor asks for a fact checker to work on the essay and intern Jim Fingal volunteers. He will be D'Agata's fact checker for the next five (or seven) years.



January 1, 2010
D'Agata's essay, "What Happens There," is published in *The Believer* with

some changes that contrast with the essay that appears in the book *The Lifespan of a Fact*. Read *The Believer* version via QR code at left.



Cover of *The Believer*, Issue 68: January 2010.



“In many ways, dramaturgs stand in liminal spaces—between the facts and the text of the play, between the audience and the production.”

WRITTEN BY BRYAR BARBORKA AND MAREN ROBINSON, CO-DRAMATURGS

While working on this production of *The Lifespan of a Fact*, we have been struck by how similar the play’s landscape of fact, truth, art, and fiction is to what many dramaturgs have to navigate in theatre productions, particularly here at TimeLine Theatre.

Those of you who are regulars at TimeLine have come to value our *Backstory* articles and lobby displays that often tease out the history behind the play. These materials are meant to invite you into the process—to highlight and further your understanding of not only the play, but also what was important to the production team in the room.

In some ways, we like to think of the dramaturg as a sort of Hansel and Gretel of the creative process. We leave bread crumbs from thought A to thought B, so that the team, and in turn the audience, can always find their way back to the larger artistic question that is being asked. Those dramatic questions often deal with getting at the artistic truth of a play.

A dramaturg occupies many different roles in relation to a play, but one of the most complicated is that we are often deemed the fact checkers. Sometimes people assume that we exist to stifle a creative process by maintaining a sense of unwavering factual accuracy.

Dramaturgs do bring in facts and history, but only as it supports the artistic project of a play and the

conversations around the play. In many ways, we stand in liminal spaces—between the facts and the text of the play, between the audience and the production. This is why dramaturgs resort to so many metaphors to describe our work. Perhaps a bridge across these spaces is a better metaphor.

In some ways, our task as dramaturgs is easier than the task of a fact checker. There is a suspension of disbelief that comes with watching a play that is not inherent when one is reading an essay. It’s a given that a play is a piece of fiction. Actors may represent real people, but we know they are actors. Audiences and actors agree to share a space together—we pretend that we don’t see each other, but we know we have an artistic agreement.

Theatre artists also are bound to produce a published play as written; we can’t make editorial choices. Fact checkers, on the other hand, are bound to factual truth. At one point in the play, Jim says, “I don’t have a code book that tells me what matters and what doesn’t.” They must navigate their work with an all-or-nothing approach.

At another point in the play, John says, “I’m not interested in accuracy; I’m interested in the truth.” As dramaturgs we get to offer up facts, but still serve the truth of the play.

If you see John and Jim as two ends of a spectrum, the role of the dramaturg often falls somewhere in the middle. We get both fact and truth.

(Above) Cover of *The Lifespan of a Fact* script.

(Below) A sample of some of the research and resources provided by the dramaturgs to the cast and production team at rehearsal.



LAS VEGAS: SUICIDE CAPITAL OF AMERICA THE STATISTICS

“You’re in a place that nobody cares. It’s not famous for being warm and fuzzy. It’s a place you can be anonymous and die.”

– David P. Phillips, a sociologist at the University of California at San Diego and co-author of a 1997 study that found Las Vegas had the highest level of suicide in the nation for residents and visitors.

In 2008, NPR ran a segment calling Las Vegas the “Suicide Capital of America.” The statistics are stunning. *Business Insider* reported in 2011 that the suicide rate in Las Vegas was more than three times that of the average U.S. population.

The CDC reported that since 1929, when Nevada started keeping vital statistics, suicide rates have generally been twice the national average, with more than 400 dying annually and 25 people attempting suicide for every completed suicide.

A 2008 article in *Science Direct* stated that controlling for factors like age, gender, and marital status, the odds of suicide were 50% greater for residents of Las Vegas compared to other locations. The same study showed that leaving Las Vegas resulted in a 20% reduction in suicide risk. Traveling to Las Vegas resulted in a doubling of suicide risk. So both residents and visitors experience an increased risk of dying by suicide in Las Vegas.

Why might these risks be higher in Las Vegas? The authors offered several theories, which are not mutually exclusive and may be working together: ecology, selection, and contagion.

Ecology is the theory that there is something about Las Vegas—the buildings, the landscapes—that is suicidogenic. Selection suggests that people who are drawn to Las Vegas are already more likely to be suicidal, plus some evidence that there are people drawn to Las Vegas to die by suicide. The authors felt that the least-developed theory was the contagion theory—the idea that news of suicides or the reputation of Las Vegas for suicides could influence more people to imitate these suicides.

The study was not fully conclusive. However, Las Vegas’ reputation remains.

May 25, 2010 D’Agata publishes *About a Mountain*, a book-length, essay-like narrative about his time in Las Vegas. It contains portions of “What Happens There” incorporated into the book.

2012 The book *The Lifespan of a Fact*, which contains the essay “What Happens There” presented alongside the extensive email conversations between D’Agata and Fingal regarding fact checking the essay, is published by W. W. Norton & Company.

October 18, 2018 The play *The Lifespan of a Fact*, written by Jeremy Kareken & David Murrell and Gordon Farrell, and based on the book written by D’Agata and Fingal, premieres in New York City at Studio 54 on Broadway. The play features Bobby Cannavale as D’Agata, with Daniel Radcliffe as Fingal, and Cherry Jones as editor Emily Penrose.



Daniel Radcliffe (from left), Cherry Jones, and Bobby Cannavale in the Broadway production of *The Lifespan of a Fact*. (Peter Cunningham)

2019 The playwrights receive the John Gassner Award for New Plays from New York’s Outer Critics Circle.

If you or a loved one are struggling, please reach out to the National Suicide & Crisis Lifeline—**call or text 988**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.



During the rehearsal process for TimeLine's Chicago premiere of *The Lifespan of a Fact*, co-dramaturgs Bryar Barborka (BB) and Maren Robinson (MR) were able to speak with two of the playwrights, Jeremy Kareken (JK) and David Murrell (DM), to talk about their work to adapt the book into a play for Broadway and beyond.

This is an edited version of their conversation; to read the entire interview, visit timelinetheatre.com/lifespan-lobby.

(MR) We appreciate you both taking time to share your story with our audience. Could you start by telling us how you came to hear about this book and decide it should be a play?

(JK) David called me and said, "Have you seen this review in *The New York Times* for this book? It's really a negative review, and sounds like an interesting project for us to work on."

The review was so angry about the ideas of fact and truth as separate concepts, and so angry about all sorts of things in a way that was funny. So we bought the book, and we also thought it was funny. We thought it was kind of a joke that nobody else seemed to be getting.

(DM) We love the book. It is funny. It has some deliberately comedic moments in it, and we enjoy those.

Jeremy is talking about two separate categories of humor. One is that the book was purposely funny in parts, and brilliant. And the other was that it elicited a lot of very strong negative emotion from several elite reviewers,



Playwrights Jeremy Kareken (left) and David Murrell.

who did not like what John D'Agata was saying. They did not like it at all.

So we thought there must be something here. There must be some trove of emotions that the book is tapping into, that we didn't necessarily understand. But we saw something was happening. This might make a good play.

(JK) While we understood why it was a potentially dangerous way of thinking, we didn't quite understand the level of fury, because the book seemed to us to be in such good humor—watching two people deliberate—but some reviewers didn't get it.

(DM) Also, this book was a dialogue, so Jeremy and I lazily thought, "Hey, they did our work for us. It's already a play, because it's two guys talking to each other." We were very naïve. If we go back to our earliest pass at the script, it's embarrassing because you see that I pasted in long passages of the book as dialogue. It's just ridiculous. It absolutely didn't work, like someone waking up, thinking they could do the Platonic dialogues as a musical or something. So that was a comeuppance that was humbling.

(MR) This kind of cuts to the nature of playwriting in terms of truth and fact. Our genre has some assumptions that people are going to watch it as a fiction, as opposed to John and Jim's book. I'm curious how you navigated the truth and fact of the story as playwrights?

(JK) We viewed the actual, true circumstances as a starting point, and that's it. And we would improv based on that. One of the things I love about theatre is, everybody sees the wires, everybody sees

the wings, the lights, you know. It's a fiction. They're not trying to fool you. I love that.

(DM) I agree with Jeremy. My own answer, and I'm not being glib: We didn't navigate anything. We made up whatever we felt like making up. We felt completely, creatively free, and did whatever we wanted. And that was with John D'Agata's blessing. He said, "Do whatever." So I never gave thought to anything that happened. I just did whatever I wanted to make happen. So the truth was a launching point.

I mean, we killed his mother. John D'Agata's mom is alive, she's fine, but it made sense for the play for her to be dead. So we killed her. The charming story is that she went to the Broadway production, and we talked to her afterward and said, "Sorry we killed you." And she said, "Oh, that's fine. I'm just glad to have been of use."

(BB) I'm interested, as you talk about making your own thing when writing the script, what are your own opinions of truth versus fact?

(JK) While I was working on each of the characters, I invested as fully as possible with that character's perspective. That's something you have to do. So as I would do subsequent drafts, I would say, now I'm John. Now I'm Jim. Debaters call that steel manning [the opposite of straw manning], and I think it's a privilege of being a playwright to do that, to take everybody's perspective as seriously as possible.

(DM) I went into it being fine with creative nonfiction, like John is, and I came out of it being fine with it still. So I have no problem whatsoever with what John does. But I still wrote Jim as well as I could.

(JK) Most circumstances, I'm perfectly fine with it, too, and there are certain circumstances where I think it's the better choice.

(DM) I mean, I have very different opinions when it comes to journalism. Then I'm just as rigid and strict as anybody else should be. Fact and truth mean different things in John's world versus journalism. Because in John's world, he does not care. He's disinterested in whether there is a match between fact and truth. If the truth happens to be factual as well, that's great. Hooray! But it doesn't really matter that the truth be consistent with fact, because what matters is the truth.

Whereas in journalism that's not the case. In journalism, if you say that seven people were shot in Brooklyn last night, you hope you're presenting it as a fact, and you also, as a journalist, hope that it's true. Because there could be three other gunshot victims that you're not aware of. So the truth could be that 10 people were shot in Brooklyn last night, but the only fact you're able to say is that seven people were shot in Brooklyn last night. So in that case, fact and truth don't necessarily align, even though as a professional, as a journalist, you would like them to. So you're aiming to merge the two circles.

Whereas John really has no particular interest in merging the two circles. If they happen to merge, great. But if they don't, that's fine.

Alex Benito Rodriguez (from top), PJ Powers, Juliet Hart, and director Mechelle Moe during *The Lifespan of a Fact* rehearsals. (Jenny Lynn Christoffersen)



"We thought there must be some trove of emotions that the book is tapping into ... something was happening. This might make a good play."

(MR) You each have a Chicago connection—you both went to the University of Chicago. Is there something about your formation as theater artists that is tied to your time here?

(JK) This play would not exist without us going to the University of Chicago. I owe my roots in Chicago as a writer, as a performer. That's where I learned to do any of this stuff, so I would not be who I am without the city of Chicago or the University of Chicago.

(DM) My answer is more personal, which is that I came out of a lower middle class background and somehow made it to Chicago, and that was a huge turning point in my life. I learned things and saw things that were completely different from anything I had ever experienced. It taught me that there's more to the world than I knew.

(BB) Staying with your histories—you two have collaborated a bunch in the past. I'm wondering, how was this process different?

(DM) It was the fruit of earlier years working out the kinks. When we were younger, there were more fights, more anger, more, "How is this gonna work? Who's doing this and that? But wait!" Basically, we did that for years. By the time this came along, we had mellowed.

(JK) We've learned more objective approaches to creative projects than just, "This is what I want, because I like it." Now we say, "I think what we're looking for here is more of a conflict rooted in action." We have a better language to communicate our disagreements. It was also different in that we weren't in the same room as often. We were sending it back and forth via computer.

(DM) Yeah, it was more of a tennis match. Also, our other projects didn't involve other people. Norman [Twain, a producer] was over our shoulder throughout, and then Gordon Farrell was hired a few years into it. So it was also more of a social project than our previous work, and I think that acted to its benefit.

(JK) I do, too. We've come up with some crazy and uncommercial ideas in the past. We wrote a screenplay together about haunted breast implants. That is one of the most ridiculous things in the world! So every time we wanted to turn to one of our crazy ideas—and we had a few for this play—Norman would say, "Listen, this is going to be a Broadway play, and that means

this." He was able to say no, that idea is not a good way to go. We knew we wanted to do a Broadway play.

(BB) We're now a few years out from that Broadway premiere. Have your views of the play changed at all?

(JK) I can't say my opinions have particularly changed. They've deepened.

(DM) Yeah. This goes back to the distinction between fact and truth in terms of essays, and fact and truth in terms of journalism. If the play were about fact and truth in terms of journalism, I think after the last four or five years, I probably would have different views about it.

But D'Agata's book about truth and fact in essays is eternal. It's not going to change. It's going to be the same 20 years from now. It's going to be the same 500 years from now. It was the same 500 years ago. These questions are not going anywhere.

BACKSTORY: THE CREDITS

*Dramaturgy & Research by
Bryar Barborka and Maren Robinson*

*Written by Bryar Barborka and
Maren Robinson with contributions by
PJ Powers and Lara Goetsch*

*Editing and Graphic Design
by Lara Goetsch*

*The Lifespan of a Fact promotional
image design by Michal Janicki*

*Backstory is published to
accompany each production*

Our Mission: TimeLine Theatre presents stories inspired by history that connect with today's social and political issues.

Our collaborative organization produces provocative theatre and educational programs that engage, entertain and enlighten.

BACKSTAGE

SPOTLIGHT ON OUR FUTURE NEW HOME



CREATING A NEW CULTURAL ASSET FOR CHICAGO, IN UPTOWN. LAYING THE FOUNDATION FOR TIMELINE'S NEXT ERA.

TimeLine has made extraordinary progress toward establishing the first home of our own—to be located at 5035 N. Broadway Avenue (near the corner of Broadway and Argyle) in Chicago's Uptown neighborhood. With more than \$35 million raised so far in both private and public funds, the next stages of this thrilling project are just around the corner.

EXPLORE THE STORY OF OUR NEW HOME VIA THE WEBPAGE BELOW!

To learn how you can support TimeLine's future, please contact Chelsea Phillips, Director of Major Gifts, at chelsea@timelinetheatre.com or 773.281.8463 x116.

TIMELINETHEATRE.COM/ITS-TIME

○ **STILL TO COME**
IN TIMELINE'S 2023-24 SEASON!



TimeLine's Chicago premiere production of *THE LEHMAN TRILOGY*, by Stefano Massini, adapted by Ben Power, co-directed by Nick Bowling and Vanessa Stalling, at Broadway in Chicago's Broadway Playhouse through November 26, 2023. Featuring (from left) Anish Jethmalani, Joey Slotnick, and Mitchell J. Fain. Photo by Liz Lauren.

CHICAGO PREMIERE
 BY ANNA DEAVERE SMITH
 DIRECTED BY MIKAEL BURKE

Hailed by *The New York Times* as "a searing and urgent work," this innovative first-person documentary piece, which utilizes verbatim dialogue pulled from more than 250 real accounts, shines a light on the stories of those caught in America's school-to-prison pipeline.



NOTES FROM THE FIELD

JANUARY 31 - MARCH 24, 2024
 TimeLine Theatre, 615 W. Wellington

WORLD PREMIERE
 BY DOLORES DÍAZ
 DIRECTED BY SANDRA MARQUEZ

This startling look at conflicts of climate change, race, and gender in the days leading up to an infamous dust storm in 1930s Texas was developed through TimeLine's Playwrights Collective, which also nurtured recent hits *Campaigns, Inc.* and the Jeff Award-winning *Relentless*.



BLACK SUNDAY

MAY 8 - JUNE 29, 2024
 TimeLine Theatre, 615 W. Wellington

○ **EVERY TIMELINE SUBSCRIPTION IS A FLEXPASS!**

2-Admission FlexPasses are now on sale, starting as low as \$63. Enjoy ultimate flexibility as you see the rest of our 27th Season of riveting stories that explore today through the lens of the past. With a FlexPass, you'll save up to 20% off regular prices, get priority access to our in-demand shows, pick the dates you want, use admissions as you choose, enjoy free exchanges, and more!

TIMELINETHEATRE.COM/SUBSCRIBE 773.281.TIME