ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis:	THE INTERPLAY PERFORMANCE PRACTICE: PLAY AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN LATE CAPITALISM
	Daniel Isaac Dilliplane, Master of Arts, 2016
Thesis Directed By:	Associate Professor, Dr. Laurie Frederik, Theatre and Performance Studies

Practitioners of the performance form "InterPlay" utilize dance, storytelling and song to build community and generate social change. I ask how this community of practitioners conceptualizes "social change" and argue that the InterPlay social movement is organized around the application of play to performances of self in everyday life. I explore how the InterPlay non-profit corporation, Body Wisdom Inc., employs this technique to address racial justice in its organizational practices. I also examine how practitioners understand their use of this performance play in places of work, concluding that—even in these endeavors—they see social change as a process immanent to both individual people and the systems they create, not as the intervention of an autonomous external power. Ultimately, I argue that, within late capitalism, play should no longer be conceptualized as an activity separate from everyday sociality but as an immanent process of change constitutive of a socioaesthetic domain.

THE INTERPLAY PERFORMANCE PRACTICE:
PLAY AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN LATE CAPITALISM

by

Daniel Isaac Dilliplane

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2016

Advisory Committee:
Dr. Laurie Frederik, Theatre and Performance Studies, Chair
Dr. James Harding, Theatre and Performance Studies
Dr. Jan Padios, American Studies

Preface

HAND TO HAND CONTACT
The full directions
Bring one of your palms to your partner's palm.
Give them a push to see if they are there.
Give them a bigger push.
Go ahead—push them across the room.
Now grab your partner's wrist and pull away—counterbalance.
Make that bigger.
Come back to standing.
Put your palm with your partner's palm.
Change the shape of that connection.
Change again, and again.
Now we are going to change faster than the speed of the mind.
(quickly) Change, change, change, change, change.
Bring your palms back together.
Now let that connection move—follow the connection between your two
hands wherever it wants to go.
Let it take you off your spot.
If you haven't already, include your evil twin—that part that wants to trick
your partner.
Bring your palms back together.
Put a little space between your palm and your partner's palm.
And a little more.
Take a couple of steps away from your partner.
Now drop the connection.
Find it again.
Drop it.
And find it.
And bring your hands back together.
Here are several things that you can do hand to hand.
I'm going to put on some music and we will spend some time playing around
with this hand to hand connection.

Why do it?
Hand-to-hand contact is one of the basic forms. It can lead to more involved
contact, but it can be extremely satisfying on its own. It allows people to
'converse' in a different way, exchanging a different level of information
without being too confronting. It can also be quite intimate, but we rarely if
ever suggest that up front. […] We never set up the expectation that a
particular form will create a 'deep' experience, or imply by our instruction
that that is the intent. It will happen on its own, and if it doesn't, so what?

The Secrets of InterPlay manual (2014:32)

These instructions for how and why to lead an InterPlay hand-to-hand contact dance come from *The Secrets of InterPlay* manual. This manual serves to help people who want to become a more permanent member of the InterPlay community to become more familiar the philosophy, practice, and application of InterPlay. I've included these instructions at the outset not only to provide an example of one of the twenty-six basic InterPlay forms, or games, but also to illustrate the InterPlay attitude and approach to identifying the significance of these activities in their lives.

A majority of InterPlay forms follow a similar organizational structure. They start by asking participants to focus on something simple and easy, usually either a particular part of the body or a familiar activity with an implied relation to the body (like walking or breathing). Once this focus has been established, the leader—or facilitator—invites participants to experiment with different ways of experiencing that body part or activity, building a set of performance tools with which to play. This set of tools is intended not to constrain, but to open up possibilities. This intention becomes apparent in the next component of the structure of the forms: a period of open improvisation with these experiential tools, and with whatever else participants bring to the experience. Forms typically conclude with what InterPlayers call a "noticing circle" in which the whole group comes back together and shares with each other thoughts, feelings, realizations, etc. that they had while engaged with the physical activity.

While all InterPlay forms are not uniform in this regard, this process of defamiliarizing the everyday and improvisational performance play followed by reflective discussion is characteristic of theatre for social change more generally,

reflecting a very Boalian approach. For this reason, this structure serves as a useful metaphor for my own approach to writing about InterPlay. While the three major sections of this text are already divided into an exploration of how individual change is experienced, how the InterPlay organization Body Wisdom Inc. is transforming, and how the InterPlay community conceives its capacity to change the larger social world in which it takes part, I think that it is also useful to read these sections through the lens of this structure of their activities. The first section attempts to delineate the *tools* and basic structure of the InterPlay practice and our inquiry. The second explores how the InterPlay community, as embodied by Body Wisdom Inc., *improvises* with these tools in the creation of their community, while the third section engages in a *reflective discussion* of how these tools and improvisation with them relate to the larger world, focusing in particular on the efforts of InterPlayers to transform workplace culture.

In true InterPlay fashion, I'd ask that you hold this structure lightly as you read, not taking it too seriously, but allowing it to help you to find your place should you start to feel lost. Just as the description of "why do this" from the hand-to-hand contact dance notes that the activity can be satisfying for participants in many different ways, I hope that this text similarly provides you, the reader, with multiple avenues for understanding its significance. While the potential for transformation in InterPlay is largely reliant on participants' understanding of the activity as relevant to their lives, InterPlay leaders try to allow that understanding to unfold of its own accord rather than to force it. Although the tools and possibilities are there, I can't

ensure that your reading of this text will "create a 'deep experience'." I hope that it

will happen of its own accord, but, as they say in InterPlay: "if it doesn't, so what?"

Dedication

For Janet Garner

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Introduction

"Make your life less like work and more like play."

InterPlay Marketing Materials

On October 24th, 2015, the international performance practice and social movement called "InterPlay" celebrated its twenty-fifth year of using dance, song, and storytelling to build community and generate social change. Practitioners of InterPlay utilize ludic exercises in what they call playshops and untensives—their versions of workshops and intensives—in order to facilitate "ease, connection, human sustainability and play" (Body Wisdom website). Co-founders Cynthia Winton-Henry and Phil Porter began developing these exercises, or InterPlay forms, and the "embodied philosophy" of InterPlay during the late 1980s in the context of their improvisational performance troupe Wing It!. Now InterPlay is practiced in over fifty cities worldwide and is used in a variety of contexts, from social work and therapy to spiritual practice and corporate team building. Despite this diversity of applications, its practitioners, who refer to themselves as InterPlayers, agree that creative play functions as an engine for personal and social transformation.

Many InterPlay groups tend to consist predominantly of white, middle-class women and couples over the age of fifty. However, my deepest engagement with the philosophy and practice of InterPlay was quite different in that regard. The July 2015 InterPlay Art and Social Change Untensive in Oakland, California was marketed to "Millennials"—a vague category invoking a generation born roughly between the early 1980s and the early 2000s commonly understood as sharing an interest in social

justice—and included participants with a variety of backgrounds from across the United States, as well as Canada, Mexico, Belgium, Denmark, and Pakistan. Arriving in Oakland's KONO district (Koreatown/Northgate), these participants gathered at "InterPlayce," a building on the southwest corner of 23rd and Telegraph that is home to the InterPlay dance studio and the offices of the InterPlay non-profit corporation, Body Wisdom, Inc., to spend the final two weeks of July playing together and discussing how the practice of InterPlay might support efforts at social transformation in their home communities. This particular training was significant to my research not only because of the demographics of its participants but because of its explicit focus on InterPlay as an aesthetic endeavor engaged to bring about social change.

My research examines InterPlay as one example in a proliferation of approaches to theatre for social change, and investigates the "what and how" of this "social change." As theatre for social change has become widespread in recent decades, many groups that identify themselves under this moniker rely on vague and uncritical notions of what this "social change" is and how they are achieving it through their work. I ask: What is the change that practitioners of InterPlay purport to result from their practice? How do these InterPlayers conceptualize this process of transformation in their practices and philosophy? What are the ways that this change can be understood as both a product of and an influence on the social systems in which the practice and organization of InterPlay are embedded? These questions are particularly significant in 2016 because of the ongoing social impact of movements like Occupy Wall Street and Black Lives Matter and the role that performance practices like InterPlay or Theatre of the Oppressed can play in these efforts.

The term "theatre for social change" is often used as a catchall phrase to describe any theatre, performance, or paratheatrical practice that makes claims to engagement with political or social issues. Because of this application of theatrical practices to the social and political realms, theatre for social change holds close ties with social movements and activism. In *Theatre for Change*, Robert Landy and David Montgomery describe this applied theatre as "a theatre for change that exists to question and challenge the given order," (2012:130) but stress that it is utilized for both conservative and progressive ends and both to deconstruct and reinforce systems of power. As they describe it, this tradition includes practices like Theatre of the Oppressed and Playback Theatre, as well as theatre companies like Michael Rohd's Sojourn Theatre of the 2000s and others that seek to transform traditional audiences into active players in the dramatic action. In accord with this formulation, I understand theatre for social change as theatre, performance, and paratheatrical activities that reconfigure the audience/performer relationship in ways that carve out a more active role for participants. While Augusto Boal's well-known concept of the spect-actor—spectator/actor—is perhaps the most well known example of this effort, my focus on InterPlay seeks to demonstrate the diversity of approaches to this reconfiguration.

Understanding InterPlay through this comparison with Theatre of the Oppressed situates it alongside other examples of theatre and art for social change, but also raises questions about what makes its approach to social transformation unique. The coordinator of the younger generation of InterPlayers, Agnotti Cowie, describes InterPlay as "a space for us to bring our own stories into a community"

3

(interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-26-15). She continues, "It feels more loving than Theatre of the Oppressed." As this comparison suggests, some practitioners of InterPlay also have training in Theatre of the Oppressed, Playback Theatre, and other forms of applied theatre or theatre for social change.[1] In addition, a new working group combining Theatre of the Oppressed jokers—or facilitators—and InterPlay leaders is emerging in order to explore the possibilities for blending the two techniques. Because of my own background in Boal's techniques, understanding how InterPlayers approach their work has the potential to reveal significant differences both in values and conceptualizations of "change."

Throughout this thesis, I will more deeply investigate how members of the InterPlay community conceptualize the individual, organizational, and social transformation that is the goal of this practice. I argue that, rather than positing change as the result of a social intervention, the InterPlay community comprehends change as an immanent quality of both individuals and systems. Put another way, it is my contention that practitioners of InterPlay understand social change not as the impressment of their values onto the larger world but as a process of unlocking latent capacities within themselves and their communities.

Through this examination of InterPlay, I argue that, in the "cultural logic of late capitalism," play is no longer, as Huizinga put it, "'different' from 'ordinary life,'" (1955, 28) but a constitutive component of social systems that serves as an immanent process by which change occurs. While scholars posit play as a significant source of social and cultural innovation, they often do so by discursively constructing

---

[1] For example: Christopher Ellinger, Katie Hymans, Rehana Tejpar, Agnotti Cowie, Natalie Abdou, etc.

it as an autonomous realm separate from that of everyday life. By seeing play as

separate and somehow "outside of" everyday sociality, these scholars perpetuate a

notion of change as deriving from an external source rather than being an immanent

quality of a system. I argue that, in a late capitalist framework, this theorization is no

longer possible. Frederic Jameson describes the breakdown of theoretical categories

of human experience in his *Postmodernism: Or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*

(1991):

> That means that the expression *late capitalism* carries the other, cultural half
> of my title within it as well; not only is it something like a literal translation of
> the other expression, *postmodernism*, its temporal index seems already to
> direct attention to changes in the quotidian and on the cultural level as such.
> To say that my two terms, the *cultural* and the *economic*, thereby collapse
> back into one another and say the same thing, in an eclipse of the distinction
> between base and superstructure that has itself often struck people as
> significantly characteristic of postmodernism in the first place, is also to
> suggest that the base, in the third stage of capitalism, generates its
> superstructures with a new kind of dynamic. (xxi)

Jameson's description of late capitalism as a framework in which categories of

culture and economy and distinctions between base and superstructure break down

accords with the InterPlay approach to individual, organizational, and social

transformation. Given this breakdown in categories, I argue that play should no

longer be conceptualized as an activity separate from everyday sociality that produces

change through an exertion of its autonomy onto the social realm, but as an immanent

process of change constitutive of a socioaesthetic domain.

This work aims to constitute a detailed introduction of the practice of

InterPlay into academic discourses, particularly those concerned with theatre for

social change. Including InterPlay in these discussions is particularly important

because of the degree to which Augusto Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed has come to

5

synecdochically represent all approaches to theatre for social change.

Existing scholarship on InterPlay is quite limited. An article in the *Journal of Dance Education* by Sarah Carlson explores InterPlay as "a tool for cultivating expression in technique class" (2013, 61). An M.A. thesis in Education at Vermont College of Union Institute and University by Gretchen Jayanti Wegner compares and contrasts possibilities for utilizing InterPlay and Theatre of the Oppressed exercises to facilitate embodied critical inquiry in classroom settings. In addition to these writings, there are a few M.A. and M.FA. theses and dissertations in dance/movement therapy, education, and in religious and theological studies that have included InterPlay as some part of their study, focusing primarily on issues of embodiment, knowledge production, and spiritual community formation.[2] None of these writings, however, address InterPlay as a social practice[3] and social movement. The vast majority of published writings on the InterPlay practice and philosophy are the work of its founders, Phil Porter and Cynthia Winton-Henry.[4] While these writings are valuable sources for understanding the goals of the founders and their vision for the organization, I hope that my work here will offer a unique critical perspective on the

---

[2] See M.A. theses "Play as a Means of Care" by Dirkje Frieda Legerstee, and "Improvising the Sacred" by Katherine Marie Kunz; M.F.A. theses "Dance/Movement Therapy and the InterPlay Technique with Adolescent Students" by Emily Katzenbach, and "'Hold Me Tight': Creating a Sustainable Ensemble" by Naomi Petrea Bennett; and dissertations "Primal Patterns: Ritual Dynamics, Ritual Resonance, Polyrhythmic Strategies and the Formation of Christian Disciples" by Marcia McFee, "Praying our Prayers: Toward More Embodied, Participatory Worship" by Beth Yoder, "Artistic Play: Seeking the God of the Unexpected" by Courtney Goto, "'Minding' Knowledge: Leaving the Body Behind" by Mary Elizabeth Hendrix.
[3] Following the work of Shannon Jackson, I understand social practice through its "allegiances" with "activist art, social work, protest performance, performance ethnography, community art, relational aesthetics, conversation pieces, action research, and other term that signal a social turn in art practice as well as the representational dimension of social and political formations" (Jackson 2008, 136). Social practice art seeks to enact social change through performance. See also: Bishop 2004 and Bourriaud 2002.
[4] See Porter 2005, Porter and Winton-Henry 1997, Porter and Winton-Henry 1995, Winton-Henry and Porter 1993, Winton-Henry and Porter 2004, Winton-Henry 2009.

InterPlay practice and movement that situates it within discourses on play, performance labor, and theatre for social change.

Methodology

My research on InterPlay has consisted primarily of ethnographic methods, including participant observation with the Washington D.C. chapter and at the InterPlay Art and Social Change Untensive in Oakland, California. I have also conducted formal and informal interviews with co-founders Cynthia Winton-Henry and Phil Porter as well as a variety of InterPlay leaders, participants, and board members. Participant observation has been crucial to this study because, although some regional groups utilize InterPlay in public performance, the practice is primarily exercised in semi-private play communities meeting in churches and dance studios. Furthermore, practitioners of InterPlay stress that forms and tools of the practice are best understood as a kind of embodied knowledge that is communicated most clearly "body-to-body." Participating in playshops, untensives, and in the InterPlay Life Practice Program has enabled me to establish rapport and thus conduct numerous informal, yet in-depth interviews with InterPlay participants. This participation has also allowed me to build connections to the larger network of InterPlay leaders, and obtain unpublished documents and organizational newsletters. I supplemented these ethnographic methods with archival research conducted at the headquarters of Body Wisdom Inc. in Oakland, California. Body Wisdom Inc. is the non-profit arts organization that coordinates the dissemination of InterPlay performance practices and supports the international network of leaders. Archival materials that I collected while attending the InterPlay Art and Social Change Untensive in July of 2015

included copies of various training manuals, documentation of how the practice

within a variety of communities and environments, and recent annual financial

reports.

I would like to stress that this inquiry is not an effort to evaluate the social or

political efficacy of the InterPlay movement, but only to elucidate the ways in which

individual participants and practitioners understand the effects of the practice. Baz

Kershaw, in his book *The Politics of Performance*, notes the potential pitfalls of

attempting to demonstrate political efficacy and argues instead for the value of

examining what conditions make performance "most likely to produce an efficacious

result" (1992, 3). Although our inquiries differ in that Kershaw focuses on the

capacity of radical theatre to generate political dialogue while I am interested the role

of embodied practices as both rehearsals and enactments of social transformation, we

share a focus on the conditions and approaches that might lead to transformation.

Through an analysis of the spoken and written discourse of InterPlayers and a

contextualization of that discourse within the organizational structures and embodied

practices of the InterPlay community, I endeavor to elucidate the InterPlay

conceptualization of change in ways that are valuable not only to scholars of theatre

and performance but also to InterPlayers. InterPlay co-founder Winton-Henry

expressed her desire that my research address theoretical questions that InterPlayers

might have regarding the practice. She added, "I think that it is really interesting to

ask the question: What is an emerging community praxis that takes the body and the

performing arts as its base, as a culture?" (Skype interview with author, 1-20-2016). I

hope that this thesis provides insight on this and other questions relevant to the

InterPlay community.

Section Breakdown

In the first section of this thesis, I provide a foundation on which to understand the philosophy and practices of InterPlay. I construct a genealogy of the theoretical and embodied knowleges on which InterPlay is based and provide a detailed description of the InterPlay forms and "embodied philosophy" by explaining how an individual becomes part of the InterPlay community.

In the second section, I undertake to describe how InterPlayers understand the notion of individual transformation that stands as the core of their practice. I argue that the InterPlay social movement is organized around the application of a playful attitude to everyday life situations, demonstrating how InterPlayers understand any supposed boundary between play and everyday life to be extremely porous. After examining how individual InterPlayers experience change in their performances of self through play, I show how this improvisational performance play aims to experiment not only with self-performance but with social relations and structures— even those of the InterPlay movement itself.

In the third section, I argue that the InterPlay non-profit, Body Wisdom Inc., strives to facilitate a sense of Turner-esque *communitas*[5] that enables communities of difference to "heal" interpersonal "traumas." Specifically, I examine efforts to realize racial justice within the InterPlay movement. I close this section with a description of

---

[5] In *The Ritual Process*, Victor Turner describes communitas as "an unmediated relationship between historical, idiosyncratic, concrete individuals" (1969, 131). He elaborates on this in *From Ritual to Theatre*, arguing that "in industrial societies, it is within leisure, and sometimes aided by the projections of art that this way of experiencing one's fellows can be portrayed, grasped, and sometimes realized" (1982, 46).

the funding model of Body Wisdom Inc. in order to demonstrate that, in order to maintain the relative autonomy necessary to undertake these efforts at racial justice, the organization has commodified the communitas that their practice seeks to create.

In the final section, I describe the emerging relationship between InterPlay and workplace environments, characterize this relationship through the use of scholars writing on affective labor and playbor.[6] I demonstrate, through an analysis of their approach to workplace trainings, that InterPlayers conceptualize change as something immanent to communities of which they are a part, rather than as a social intervention.

---

[6] After receiving an early draft of this thesis, InterPlay co-founder Cynthia Winton-Henry developed her own word for the blending of work and play—plork—which she used in the March 21, 2016 InterPlay electronic newsletter.

What is InterPlay?

"The joke and challenge of InterPlay is that it is impossible to describe. Worse yet, its [*sic*] scary. Of course this is also why InterPlay is so profound. Having everything to do with the body brings it right here, right now, in your face. It can change you… and fast. If it wasn't so fun we might not do it… Change and transformation is not for everybody. It is for those who are willing. Bodies know to put on the breaks unless they have a lot of community support, affirmation, underlying strength and a sense of urgency."

The Secrets of InterPlay manual (2014, 65)

In the course of my research, I have repeatedly struggled with the question: what is InterPlay? *The Secrets of InterPlay* manual identifies this question as a source of difficulty even for experienced InterPlayers. Although it maintains that the best way to discover InterPlay is by participating in a playshop or attending a performance, it does recommend some strategies for answering: model InterPlay in your actions and attitude, respond with a question, and relate InterPlay to an experience with which the person is already familiar. In the Preface, while providing a glimpse of how InterPlayers conceive the relationship between embodied play and social change through an analysis of the structure of their games, I strove to model InterPlay through the act of writing. In the Introduction, I asked my questions and briefly compared InterPlay with Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed.

In this section, I undertake two more attempts at answering this question. First, in true academic fashion, I trace some of the history of InterPlay and construct a genealogy of its influences and inspirations. This genealogy is particularly helpful in contrasting InterPlay with Theatre of the Oppressed and situating it more fully within discourses of theatre for social change. Secondly, while a poor substitute for attending an InterPlay event in person, I will recount my own experience of encountering

InterPlay for the first time and describe a typical path to becoming a member of the

InterPlay movement, exploring how a gradual introduction to the InterPlay forms and

"embodied philosophy" contribute to an experience of personal transformation. To

begin, I'll borrow another tactic recommended in the manual: deliver a strong one-

liner.

InterPlay Inspirations

InterPlay names a set of performance-based, experiential forms developed by

Cynthia Winton-Henry and Phil Porter in Oakland, California, as well as the

international community of practitioners of those forms. There is nevertheless

substantial diversity in Interplay applications. Performance groups like Wing It!, The

Next Gen Ensemble and The Big Yes use InterPlay both as performance training and

as a structure for improvisational performance. Spiritual leaders in a variety of faith

communities employ InterPlay in the development of ritual practices specifically

tailored to their communities as well as in traditional healing. A number of educators,

including those working with younger students, those working in dance and

performance, and others, have incorporated InterPlay into their pedagogical practices.

In their book *The Wisdom of the Body* (1995), Porter and Winton-Henry describe

InterPlay in a variety of ways:

> At one moment InterPlay is the framework for an improvisational
> performance in a theater. At another its basic concepts are used by a
> corporation or organization to help its members work together more
> effectively. Health and helping professionals—nurses, therapists, doctors,
> social workers—use it in their work to teach and learn about well-being and
> integration. Others enjoy it as play—as relief from a long day's work. (13)

Because of the incredible variety of uses to which InterPlay is put and the different social settings in which it can be found, it is somewhat inaccurate to constrain it within the discourse of theatre for social change. Nevertheless, across these many applications, InterPlayers consistently see playful, improvisational performance as a source of personal and social transformation.

InterPlay developed out of the context of the feminist movements and gay cultures of the San Francisco Bay-area, from the practices of Authentic Movement, modern dance, and liberation theology, as well as through the lives of the founders and other InterPlay community members. Porter and Winton-Henry began collaborating as co-directors, along with Judith Rock, of the Body & Soul Dance Company, "a modern dance company with a special interest in theological themes" (Porter and Winton-Henry 1995, 11). Many of the tools and ideas that would later form the foundation of the InterPlay practice were developed as improvisational choreographic techniques. In 1988, Rock moved, Winton-Henry took on a new ministerial position, and Porter began to focus on new creative endeavors. These shifts brought Body & Soul Dance to an end.

Rather than allow their collaboration to come to an end, Porter and Winton-Henry affirmed the capacity of their improvisational techniques to aid them in "becoming articulate bodies," (Porter and Winton-Henry 1995, 13) a way of describing how InterPlay enables individuals to develop and refine self-performances. Winton-Henry describes the period after the end of Body & Soul as a transitional one in which she experienced the "divine realization" that she should "one: change the world, and two: have fun!" (interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-21-15).

She worked for three years as a preacher in Silicon Valley, embracing a church community in which her spiritual leadership both as a dancer and a feminist was beginning to be appreciated. Although both spirituality and dance have been and continue to be important parts of her life, Winton-Henry has said "I'm a church person, but I could see that the artist part is just a little stronger than the pastor part," (Body Wisdom 2014, 75) demonstrating the significance of this collaboration to her own process.

Porter similarly connects his creative practices with his path to becoming the person that he wanted to be. He draws parallels between his process of becoming an artist and dancer and his experience of coming into his sexuality. He says:

> The path of figuring out that I was an artist was similar to the path of figuring out that I was gay. It was one of those things where I didn't quite fit in the categories. I wasn't really a painter or drawer sort of artist, but I did every craft thing that was around, from the time that I was young through whenever. And so I experimented with all sorts of stuff… (Bowman 2012, 5)

Porter links his sexuality to his artistry by describing their discovery through playful experimentation. In doing so, he suggests a link between embodied play and individual change. *The Secrets of InterPlay* manual acknowledges that: "Transformation (change), good and bad, is a constant" (21). One of the goals of InterPlay is to channel this process of continual change and to make choices that allow one to change in ways that lead to more ease, joy, and playfulness. For both Winton-Henry and Porter, one of these choices was to build the InterPlay system.

As Porter and Winton-Henry started working with others in their improvisational performance troupe Wing It!, they recognized the capacity of this improvisation to enable people to rehearse and perform the person that they wanted to

be. Seeing applications for their techniques beyond the worlds of dance and theology, Winton-Henry and Porter decided to expand their work into new settings. Porter describes this expansion, saying:

> We decided we wanted to focus on improvisation as the deal. Body and Soul was already doing a lot of kind of intersection between dance and theatre. There was a lot of story, very character-based. And Cynthia and I decided we wanted to include voice. And we also eventually made a decision to kind of move our stuff gently out of just the church settings. We still have a strong kind of spirit, faith thing going on. A lot of the people in our circles are church people, but we wanted to kind of open that up. (Bowman 2012, 39)

As others have experienced this capacity for personal transformation through the InterPlay practice, the movement has grown substantially. Washington DC leader Kate Amoss stresses the importance of the work done by North Carolina InterPlayers Tom Henderson and Ginny Going in expanding and growing the InterPlay social movement. She describes them as having "spearheaded InterPlay on the East Coast" and as being the ones who "made it practicable for others" (conversation with the author, Washington, DC, 12-12-15). A substantial InterPlay organization has developed in Australia under the leadership of Trish Watts and Rod Pattenden. InterPlay now has more than a thousand graduates from their Life Practice Program— the primary training program for the movement—and over three hundred and fifty certified InterPlay Leaders practicing in thirty-four of the US states and in nine countries across the globe, including India, Australia, Singapore, and Germany (Body Wisdom website).

In addition to the inspirational sources that enter InterPlay through the backgrounds of founders Porter and Winton-Henry (the embodied knowledges of modern dance, media and textile design, and contemporaneous feminist and gay

liberation movements, as well as Christian liberation theological theory), InterPlay has roots in some psychotherapeutic techniques that endeavor to bridge the mind/body divide inherited from Western philosophy. Two examples of these techniques that have been particularly influential are Mary Starks Whitehouse's approach to dance/movement therapy "Authentic Movement" and Eugene Gendlin's technique called "focusing."

In the section on "Formational Books" included in *The Secrets of InterPlay* manual, Winton-Henry thanks Authentic Movement teacher Neeta Hayward for introducing her to the concept of Witnessing. In Authentic Movement, the witness, often the therapist, observes the movement of a patient as an alternative to the analysis of speech. Many InterPlay forms borrow this practice of witnessing, asking participants in partnered activities to alternate between experiences of moving and observing. Both InterPlay and Authentic Movement take physical movement as an expressive form different from spoken language, allowing for a different mode of access to the internal life of the individual. While Winton-Henry makes this effort to acknowledge this debt and express her gratitude, she also makes it very clear that the way that she implements this concept into the practices of InterPlay differs from the way that it is employed within Authentic Movement. She describes these differences as the absence of a purity of focus on internal motivation, the allowance of musical accompaniment to the movement, and the understanding of the practice as a playful rather than therapeutic one. These differences highlight the ways in which InterPlay seeks to engage in this personal exploration in a playful manner rather than to impose the seriousness of a therapeutic approach.

Another important distinction between InterPlay and the technique of Authentic Movement is their relationship to the notion of the "authentic," a contested notion in both academic and artistic spheres. Practitioners of Authentic Movement seek to maintain a kind of purity of individual expression through movement, postulating a kind of unmediated access to the individual through movement. While many InterPlay participants often use the word "authentic" to describe a quality of vulnerability and openness that they witness in the performances of other participants, co-founder Phil Porter has said that he has "given up on the idea of authenticity" because "the InterPlay system really is about expanding the range of our expression… you can't do something that your body can't do. If it's coming out of your body, it must be real, or authentic… How do we determine authenticity?" (interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-30-15).

The work of psychotherapist Eugene Gendlin also served as an inspiration in the development of the InterPlay practices. His book *Focusing* (1978) describes a technique for recognizing a pre-verbal "felt sense" in the body, a physical and emotional response to a situation or experience. The ubiquitous InterPlay phrase "Unlock the wisdom of your body" is borrowed from the title of the first section of Gendlin's *Focusing*. There are clear connections between Gendlin's work and the InterPlay concept of body data/body knowledge/body wisdom, one of the eight "body wisdom tools" that I will address later. The significance of both *Focusing* and Authentic Movement to InterPlay suggests the centrality of physicality and of the notion of body as self to this practice and its "embodied philosophy." Winton-Henry describes the concept of physicality within the InterPlay philosophy as including

17

"everything: energy, sensations, body wisdom, really all of perceptible reality"

(interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-21-15). Given this expansive and

inclusive sense of physicality, all human experience is physical and bodily; even

thinking and feeling are considered embodied behavioral patterns. As I will describe

in more detail later, an awareness of these patterns is for InterPlayers the foundation

of self-knowledge on which a process of personal change can be undertaken.

InterPlay's focus on embodied knowledge and social practices as a locus of

social change link it with applied theatre, theatre for social change, psychodrama, and

social practice art. Gretchen Jayanti Wegner has written about the connections

between Theatre of the Oppressed and InterPlay in her Master's Thesis entitled

"'Sneaky Deep' Inquiry: Integrating Body Wisdom, Bodyspirit, and Critical Action in

the Classroom." Many practitioners of InterPlay also have training in Theatre of the

Oppressed, Playback Theatre, and other forms of applied theatre or theatre for social

change.[7] In addition, a new working group combining Theatre of the Oppressed

jokers and InterPlay leaders is emerging in order to explore the possibilities for

blending the two techniques.

InterPlay shares important aspects of its approach to social change with Boal's

Theatre of the Oppressed, but, as the genealogy described above suggests, there are

significant differences in their theoretical foundations. Both InterPlay and Theatre of

the Oppressed utilize a variety of techniques including both public performance as

well as paratheatrical practice. Also, as I describe in the Preface, the structure of

InterPlay games reflects a Boalian approach to change through embodied

defamiliarization. Nevertheless, Theatre of the Oppressed developed from theatre as

---

[7] Christopher Ellinger, Katie Hymans, Rehana Tejpar, Agnotti Cowie, Natalie Abdou, and others.

an academic institution and in direct opposition to Aristotelian aesthetics. It is grounded in a Marxist theoretical framework, building on the theatrical practices of Bertolt Brecht and the educational philosophy of Paulo Freire. InterPlay, on the other hand, grows out of a specific application of modern dance in the Christian church. It is rooted in theories of liberation theology and builds upon the work of movements like second-wave feminism and gay liberation that embrace the politics of identity. The ways in which InterPlay's genealogy is distinct from that of Theatre of the Oppressed gives rise to a unique understanding of and approach to social change, both of which are reflected in the practices and "embodied philosophy" of InterPlayers that I will describe further in the following section.

Twenty-six Basic Forms and Eight Body Wisdom Tools

My initial experience with InterPlay, I have later come to learn, is quite typical:

I enter through the rear door of the building, Seekers Church in the Takoma Park neighborhood of Washington DC, to discover that the space has been converted into a church from what used to be a large house. The wooden chairs in the worship room have been stacked and pushed to the edges. About ten people are milling around, chatting near the edges of the room, avoiding the large, open space in the center. The leader, Billy, enters the center and invites us to join him. We stand in a circle in the center of the room as Billy introduces himself and tells us a little bit about InterPlay. We introduce ourselves: each of us says their name accompanying it with a gesture, and the rest of the group repeats each name and movement. Billy's

wife, Kate, moves to the stereo system at the edge of the room and turns on some

soothing, orchestral music.

Billy encourages us to move one of our hands in a smooth, flowing manner. Our

hands trace smooth, round arcs into the air. Each of us remains focused on our own

movement, taking in the movement of others only through our peripheral vision.

Then Billy asks us to change the movement of our hands to something sharp and

jerky. My hand and the hands of the others in the circle begin to move in swift,

straight lines through the air, punctuated by brief moments of stillness. Finally, Billy

asks us to make shapes with our hands. A variety of shapes are formed: some wide,

stretched hands, others curled or pointing. Then he asks us to make another shape,

and another. Soon, all the hands are shifting from shape to shape in fractions of a

second, freezing just long enough to establish one shape before forming a new one.

As Kate puts on a new song, Billy explains that we can choose to move our hands

using any of these three movement tools, switching back and forth at will. A new

song plays, another classical, orchestral piece, but one with a bit more changes in

tempo and with a greater variety of emotional qualities. After five minutes of

improvised hand movements, I have completed my first InterPlay Hand Dance.

My initial experience with InterPlay is quite typical. Generally speaking,

individuals become aware of the InterPlay practice in one of two ways: they attend a

performance by one of the InterPlay performance troupes or they are invited to a

playshop by an active InterPlayer. A couple of friends from the group of Theatre of the Oppressed facilitators—jokers—that I worked in Chicago were familiar with InterPlay and encouraged me to visit the DC chapter when I moved in the summer of 2015. Nearly all of the people with whom I am currently undertaking the InterPlay Life Practice Program were referred by a current member of the organization. Washington DC Leaders Kate and Billy Amoss first encountered InterPlay when they attended a performance of the North Carolina InterPlay performance troupe Off The Deep End. Others are introduced when a member of a community of which they are already a part, such as a school or workplace, share InterPlay in these settings. Because InterPlay is spread "body-to-body," InterPlay communities vary widely in terms of age, gender, race, ability, etc. depending on regional demographics and leadership. A small minority of InterPlay communities are organized around identity categories, but even these tend to be connected to larger more inclusive InterPlay communities.

What all these communities share are the twenty-six "basic forms," and the principles of the InterPlay philosophy, the eight "body wisdom tools." As previously described, the InterPlay forms are the playful and performative exercises that, according to practitioners, promote "improvisation, community, and change." The InterPlay chapter in Washington DC, like many other regional communities, has monthly "Open Gathering" meetings designed to welcome new-comers and to introduce them to these forms. These meetings vary in attendance anywhere from a half-dozen to about twenty participants. Participants engage what InterPlayers call the "five performative ways of the body: movement, voice, word, stillness, and contact,"

(Body Wisdom website) through activities that include, among others, hand dances, one-breath songs, contact dances, and storytelling circles. Activities like these are the foundation of the InterPlay embodied practice.

Individuals typically attend many of these Open Gatherings as well as other playshops offered on a more irregular basis and then are invited to longer weekend untensives. These longer untensives usually combine the embodied experiences of the forms with some discussion of the eight InterPlay body wisdom tools. These tools form what InterPlayers call the "embodied philosophy" of the practice because they attempt to put into words experiences and principles connected with the performance of the forms. In an interview, Phil Porter described the relationship of the forms to the tools by saying: "In general, we would base our ideas on physical experience… the practices came first and the wisdom came out of the practices" (interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-30-15). In this way, the practice has been systematized—although Porter would argue that "to systematize it is imprecise" (conversation with the author, Oakland, California, 7-20-15)—into the core principles of the InterPlay movement, the eight body wisdom tools: easy focus, body data/knowledge/wisdom, internal authority, physicality of grace, exformation, body wisdom practice, incrementality, and affirmation.

While participants are introduced to these principles at the Open Gatherings and at various playshops and untensives, the InterPlay versions of workshops and intensives, they come to more deeply engage with them and to apply them to their daily lives through the InterPlay Life Practice Program. This program, which takes place one-weekend a month for nine months, introduces a group of beginning

InterPlayers to the InterPlay Body Wisdom Tools and encourages them to incorporate these practices into their everyday lives. The program teaches the tools through a process of creative embodied play and reflective discussion of that play.

These tools are developed from the shared experiences of the forms and are designed to offer insight and guidance in efforts at personal transformation. Easy focus is a perceptual attitude focused on "big picture" features rather than minute details. InterPlay DC leader Kate Amoss described the distinction between easy and hard focus, calling hard focus "the way that we're taught again and again in schools… because it's not the natural way of being, you know, that kind of critical mind, but it's highly useful in our complex industrial society" (interview with the author, Washington DC, 10-16-14). The physicality of grace is a kind of bodily experience that is the inverse of stress. InterPlayers often talk of the practice as being committed to a sense of ease, which is another way of expressing this notion of a physicality of grace. The principle of body data/knowledge/wisdom holds that each individual should pay attention to positive—like the physicality of grace—and negative feelings in the body (data), discover patterns in the relationship of these feelings to experiences (knowledge), and to develop behavioral practices that create increased opportunities for those experiences linked to positive feelings (wisdom). These behavioral practices should be developed incrementally, because the InterPlay notion of incrementality holds that small, slow steps facilitate bodily changes.

The practice also stresses the importance of distinguishing an internal authority from the many external authorities that seek to influence individuals' behaviors. InterPlay encourages members to determine what messages and values are

imposed from outside and what things are known through lived experience. Exformation is the InterPlay inverse of information. InterPlayers describe taking a great deal of information into their bodies and needing to engage in activities to exform, to move that information out of their bodies. The principle of affirmation encourages individuals to notice what feels good to them and to seek more of it. The idea of body wisdom practices is to develop new behavioral practices in order to facilitate personal transformation. This tool takes as fundamental the notion that, in order to change one's life, one must change one's practice. InterPlayers aim to change aspects of their lives through experiential learning, practicing new behaviors in order to alter the overall structure of one's life.

These eight body wisdom tools summarize the InterPlay embodied philosophy, which rejects any mind/body dualism and seeks to build community through the sharing of personal knowledge and experience rather than through the imposition of structures and ideas developed outside of the community. Amoss describes them as "the way you go about being in the world" (interview with the author, Washington, DC, 10-16-14). The Life Practice Program familiarizes InterPlayers with these tools and asks them to find ways to incorporate them into their everyday lives. Upon completion of the program, participants are inducted into the InterPlay community through a semi-structured improvised graduation ceremony, sometimes preceded by an improvised group performance by the graduates.

While this description of how individuals become a part of the InterPlay community provides a valuable grounding in the principles of individual and social transformation that form the core of the InterPlay practice and philosophy, an

understanding of the InterPlay conceptualization of change as immanent requires a

deeper engagement with these processes, an engagement that I undertake in the

following section.

Individual Transformation as Social Change

"InterPlay is a system of improvisational storytelling, movement, and voice. And that can bring about social movement… What I think about social movement is that humans have these needs of connecting, with our stories, with moving body-to-body, and with our voices… and this is basic human ritual needs… community, communal, tribal things… and often people find that in different ways… maybe it's a religious thing because that's often times where those things happen, where people move together, sing together, and tell stories and hear stories… and so InterPlay accesses these needs without the dos and don'ts, without the judgment… accessing just whoever is in the room and their human voices and stories and movements. That's how I think [InterPlay] is a social movement… because it's accessing those things that have been sort of ignored with 21st century technology… in previous generations, we've gone into our separate houses, and put up walls. This is bringing us back together and teaching us again how to do that cross-culturally because often times we gather in cultures around like religion… or a specific country. But [InterPlay] is cross-cultural. We can dance together. We can sing together and we can tell stories together."

Agnotti Cowie (interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-26-15)

Given the diversity of applications of the InterPlay practice and its emphasis on performance play, how do we understand the definition of InterPlay as "a global social movement dedicated to ease, connection, human sustainability and play" provided on the organization's website? The above quotation from InterPlay Millennial Liaison Agnotti Cowie is one articulation of InterPlay as a form of social movement. She describes InterPlay as concerned with connecting individuals. This means both offering individuals that already interact with one another an opportunity to 'strengthen and deepen' their connection through sharing experiences of improvisational expression as well as facilitating a sense of connection between people that might not otherwise interact with one another. Cowie describes the capacity of InterPlay to reduce a sense of separateness that she feels is common in the contemporary world and to help individuals connect with one another across cultural

differences. The focus of the InterPlay practice is not to reconcile or homogenize differences, but to facilitate a community that acknowledges and preserves these differences. How do we reconcile this understanding of InterPlay as a social phenomenon with the focus on self-exploration and individual change described in the previous section?

In this section, I argue that InterPlayers conceptualize social change as the accumulation of many instances of self-directed personal transformation. Because InterPlayers understand change as an immanent process for individuals, they understand social change as the application of the playful attitudes and perceptual tools utilized in their play to everyday life situations. I begin by clarifying the nature of InterPlay as a social movement, reconciling this notion with InterPlay organizing practices of autonomy and identity. I continue by describing ways that InterPlay facilitates experimentation with self-performance and seeks to apply these performances outside of spaces for play. I conclude with a discussion of the significance of improvisation to the development of and transformation of social structures.

Play and Social Movement

While its website identifies InterPlay as a social movement, it should not be understood as a social movement in the traditional sense of a hierarchically-organized group advocating for policy change or shifts in resource allocation but rather as an example of what scholars call the "new social movement." Social movement theorist Steven Buechler describes new social movement theory as an abandonment of classical Marxism for a focus on "other logics of action (based in politics, ideology,

and culture) and other sources of identity (such as ethnicity, gender, and sexuality) as the sources of collective action" (2000, 46) and characterizes new social movements through their "politicization of everyday life" (47). He identifies the development of these kinds of social movements, which take a social constructionist approach, in the 1980s—the same time as the emergence of InterPlay. Understanding the InterPlay movement within this rubric will prove integral to understanding their approach to "social change" as immanent.

More specifically, because InterPlayers tailor their use of the practice to what they perceive as the needs of their particular communities and both individual InterPlay leaders and regional chapters operate on a largely independent basis, the InterPlay notion of social movement also accords with what scholars call "autonomous social movements." George Katsiaficas in *The Subversion of Politics: European Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life* (1997) describes these kinds of movements as an effort to achieve "the subversion of politics—the complete uprooting of authoritarianism in our everyday lives" (235) and identifies two significant dimensions to the notion of autonomy these movements take as a social organizing principle: 1) the development of movement constituencies based on self-determined identity formations, and 2) independent decision-making within the collective. Because the InterPlay "embodied philosophy" champions what InterPlayers call "internal authority" and this principle is reflected in their collective structures, I understand InterPlay as operating on these principles of autonomy in social organizing, an understanding crucial to my argument that InterPlayers conceptualize change as an immanent quality of both individual people and social

28

systems.[8]

Although InterPlayers may not be organized around clearly defined leaders or particular social or political issues like environmentalism or prison reform, they do share an understanding of playful, improvisational performance as a potential source for personal and social transformation. InterPlayers value play for what they understand as its transformational capacity as well as for its intrinsic qualities. Furthermore, they share a desire to make their lives "less like work and more like play" by incorporating aspects of their "ethic of play" into their approach to everyday life. InterPlayers identify many characteristics of this ethic of play, but some include: not taking everything seriously, focusing on affirmation rather than critique, embracing multiple solutions/meanings, respecting the integrity and desires of other bodies, and valuing structure as limitation in which infinite possibilities exist (Body Wisdom 2014, 19-20). Leaders attempt to define this ethic within the community with whom they are working by asking participants to generate lists of their associations with work and play. This activity "encourages participants to look at questions of work and play and how we might shift our pictures of how we go about our daily lives" (Body Wisdom 2012, 6). Given this understanding of the InterPlay ethic of play and their transformational philosophy encapsulated in the eight body wisdom tools, I argue that InterPlay is a social movement organized around the application of a playful attitude to everyday life situations.

Centering our inquiry on this articulation provides a basis for understanding the relationship InterPlayers see between the playfulness that is so crucial to their practice and the process of transformation that is the "change" in their version of

_____

[8] See also Lotringer and Marazzi 2007, and Cuninghame 2010.

theatre for social change. However, what does it mean to organize around applying an ethic of play to everyday life experiences? While InterPlayers seek to define the characteristics of an ethic of play within the communities that they work, I would like to engage with play as it is understood with the academic community in order to delineate a scholarly interpretation of this application of play to the everyday. In the following section, I would like to investigate this relationship more deeply by placing this characterization of InterPlay in conversation with the work of play scholars, in particular with those theorists interested in the boundary between play and the everyday that InterPlayers seek to blur.

InterPlay as Play: the Performance of Self

For scholars concerned with the socio-cultural aspects of play, Johan Huizinga's work *Homo Ludens* (1955) serves as a foundational text. Huizinga's work is simultaneously lauded and critiqued for its inclusion of a wide range of activities and the broadly applicable definition of play that it develops from an analysis of these activities, but love him or hate him scholars cannot ignore his very thorough analysis of play. Huizinga defines play as "a voluntary activity or occupation executed within certain fixed limits of time and place, according to rules freely accepted but absolutely binding, having its aim in itself and accompanied by a feeling of tension, joy, and the consciousness that it is 'different' from 'ordinary life'" (28). While scholars of play debate each of these characteristics, this definition presents the standard against which they have sought to position themselves.

The InterPlay practice largely accords with this notion of play, stressing its voluntariness, celebrating the feeling of ease and joy it creates, and organizing

30

playshops and untensives that take place within clearly delimited time and space.

However, there are also significant ways in which the practice of InterPlay challenges

this theoretical understanding of play. For Huizinga, play is defined in part by the

players' consciousness that the activity is distinct from everyday experiences. While

this separation between play and the everyday is certainly characteristic of playshops

and other InterPlay gatherings, this relationship between these two realms is

complicated by the effort of InterPlayers to bring playfulness into the everyday.

An experience I had on the first morning of the July 2015 InterPlay Art and

Social Change Untensive in Oakland, California serves as a valuable illustration of

this effort to transform the everyday through play. One of the first activities of the

program was a hand-to-hand contact dance led by co-founder Cynthia Winton-Henry.

Within minutes of meeting her, I was palm-to-palm with Natalie, a fellow participant,

improvising movements through and between our hands with some prompting from

Winton-Henry on the far side of the room. Surrounded by other pairs engaged in the

same exercise, we took turns leading and following one another's movement,

sometimes becoming intent on the minute experiences of slow, smooth motions and

other times exploring more adventurous movements that carried us about the room.

Eventually, Winton-Henry invited us, as we continued to move through this

improvisational connection between our palms, to move such that we were no longer

sure who was leading and who following.

After this embodied play, we formed a circle for group discussion of the

experience. This collective verbal sharing is a key aspect of the InterPlay practice,

which they refer to as "noticing." Natalie shared with the group her amazement that

she felt that the two of us were able to move with neither of us leading or following. Another participant, Kelsey, standing nearby in the circle described how the exercise made her think about how she feels more comfortable responding to her partner than leading within her intimate relationships, identifying a pattern in her everyday behavior. Others around the circle echoed these thoughts and feelings about the roles that they play in their relationships with others. InterPlay practitioners believe that cycling between experiential play and reflective discussion encourage participants to become aware of their personal behavioral patterns and allow them to either embrace these patterns or rehearse alternatives.

The InterPlay forms and practices are designed to help participants "unlock the wisdom of [their] body," that is, to discover and rehearse performances of self through play, and the InterPlay philosophy and its eight body wisdom tools serve as a method for implementing these performances into their everyday lives. While many participants are not as quick as Kelsey was to make (or to share) the connections that they draw between the experience of the forms and their personal lives, these kinds of comments are incredibly common in the InterPlay community and form what InterPlayers take to be the foundation on which play contributes to change. This philosophy, however, stresses that any personal change is strictly optional and urges InterPlayers to implement behavioral changes only to achieve a greater sense of personal satisfaction rather than to please others. This voluntary aspect to change and the implementation of playfulness in the everyday reveals the InterPlay conceptualization of change as immanent to individuals. Each individual plays in

order to discover and implement changes in self-performance that are freely chosen rather than imposed from outside.

In order to more fully explore this relation between play and the everyday, I would like to examine InterPlay in light of theories of play that examine the boundary between experiences of play and everyday life. In *Adult Play* (1991), Kerr and Apter identify play as a human experience that takes place within a protective frame and relies upon a paratelic metamotivation in participants.[9] Paratelic metamotivation is the name for the characteristic of play that it is not goal-oriented, not teleological. Generally speaking, players engage for the sake of playing rather than for external rewards. The concept of a protective frame for play originates with the work of Bateson and Goffman in the 1970s,[10] and refers to a cognitive framework for understanding situations and events.

> I have suggested that the character of an encounter is based in part upon rulings as to properties of the situation that should be considered irrelevant, out of frame, or not happening. To adhere to these rules is to play fair… here it can be seen that an engaging activity acts as a boundary around the participants, sealing them off from many potential worlds of meaning and action. (Goffman 1961, 25)

Bateson understands this framing of an activity as resulting from a metacommunicative act establishing generally understood boundaries and rules of engagement. For both scholars, this frame serves to establish the meaning of events taking place within the frame and defines their relationship to those elements outside the frame.

---

[9] In recent years, adult play has seen a revival. Many organizations seek to promote (and capitalize on) the potential psychological health benefits of play. See, for example: Hicks 2016, Keller 2015, Yenigun 2014.
[10] See Bateson 1972, and Goffman 1974.

While leaders of playshops clearly establish the performative, improvisational forms as an act of play, there are no set rules about what everyday experiences are permitted to enter the play frame. While most InterPlay events are open to a general public, a protective frame is established insofar as they take place in semi-private spaces like dance studios and churches. The InterPlay forms themselves are designed to be structures into which participants are invited to pour whatever content they choose, especially aspects of their daily life. The inverse relationship, however—the impact of those elements from inside the play frame on everyday life—is more clearly defined within the InterPlay practice. As addressed in the previous section, there are general guidelines or tips about how to incorporate things discovered through play into one's everyday life. In general, however, the boundary between the play frame and the experiences of everyday life is extremely porous in InterPlay.

One example of how this individual exploration is experienced is in an increased comfort with physical contact. Fellow graduate of the InterPlay Art and Social Change Untensive Stephan Marchant of Belgium described thinking about the InterPlay practices and body wisdom tools on a daily basis, even six months after the completion of our program. When I asked him if there was something specific that he took away from our two weeks in Oakland, he responded that he had learned "to really see what brings me joy and to take that as guidance in making decisions" (Skype interview with the author, 2-24-2016). When I asked as a follow-up if this change had resulted in any particular differences in how he was interacting with other people, he described an increased comfort with and desire for a non-sexual physical closeness. He said that he felt more comfortable with casual touch in interactions with

friends, family, and co-workers. Furthermore, he described using one of the InterPlay forms in a work meeting that was received so well that another colleague used the same activity in a different meeting the following day.

Another example of how InterPlayers experience change on an individual level is through becoming more outgoing or extroverted. One of my fellow participants in the Washington DC Life Practice Program, Laura, is participating in the program for the fifth time. She describes wanting to participate again and again because of the community that is built between participants in the program, the pleasure that she gets from performing through the forms, and for the valuable reminder of the body wisdom tools and how to use them in her daily life. When I asked her if she felt that she was different because of her experiences with InterPlay, she described the change in her as "being more comfortable being the person that I want to be" (conversation with the author, Washington, DC, 1-9-16). During a lunch conversation later that day, she described the change to me and a few of the other participants as an increase in freedom in which her "being free is an invitation to others to be free" and as learning "how to be myself in community."

InterPlay DC Leader Billy Amoss describes the annual InterPlay Men's Retreats held in rural Maryland as an opportunity to explore shifting performances of masculinity. At the 10th Annual Men's Retreat in Germantown, Maryland in February of 2015, Amoss expressed his desire to be present at the retreat as an opportunity to "break open what it means to be a man in our culture" (conversation with the author, Germantown, Maryland, 2-15-2015). He specifically described the changing nature of

gender roles and his appreciation that InterPlay could provide him with a space for exploring how to navigate these changing social norms.

All of these examples of how InterPlay is experienced as transformative on an individual level reflect the strong connection that InterPlayers experience between their performances in the semi-private playshops and untensives and their performances of self in everyday life. Furthermore, they also demonstrate the extent to which these changes in self-performance are linked to social transformation insofar as changes on an individual level result in changes to social relations and modes of interaction with others. I have shown that InterPlayers employ their body wisdom tools to playfully apply evolving performances of self within the play frame to everyday life situations, and in the following pages I will clarify the way in which these individual changes contribute to change on a social level.

Play for Change: Anti-structure and Improvisation

Because the "new social movement" takes a social constructionist approach and because InterPlay, specifically, seeks to transform the everyday through play, my focus in these discussions of InterPlay as a form of play is focused on scholars interested in the socio-cultural aspects of play. In this academic tradition, play has been described variously as a "model of adaptive variability" (Sutton-Smith 1997, 229), a "laboratory of the possible" (Hendricks 2006, 1), and as "world-building activities" (Goffman 1961, 27). These characterizations accord closely with InterPlay DC leader Kate Amoss's articulation of the relationship between InterPlay and culture: "InterPlay is about culture creation… I do feel as if there aren't a lot of places where culture is being created" (interview with the author, Washington, DC, 10-16-

14). I believe that the combination of an understanding of play as the source of socio-cultural construction and the application of this capacity to personal and social transformation is the foundation of the InterPlay social movement.

As I have so far argued, the experience of change for individual InterPlayers is grounded in a shared approach to applying a sense of playfulness to everyday life activities and as a personalized effort to pursue self-performances that support that playful attitude. But, how does this increased ease and playfulness for an individual relate to a transformation of our *social* world? Historically, scholars have approached notions of self/structure and freedom/system in a variety of ways. In her book *Social Works* (2011), Shannon Jackson describes these tensions in the context of the recent trend in social practice art, saying:

> Such contemporary work wrestles explicitly and implicitly with a longer twentieth century of critical debate and experiments in governance. Often recounted as an abstract tussle between capitalism and socialism, sometimes made more abstract as a tussle between Individualism and Collectivism or between Freud and Marx, this longer history recounts stories of philosophers and policy wonks, idealists and pragmatists, leaders and *lumpen* as they debated and systematized the micro and macro interdependencies of selves and others. (21)

Jackson's argument—which I find compelling—is that previous iterations of these debates and experiments are rooted in notions of autonomous personhood and autonomous art while this recent trend attempts to display the heteronomous nature of these categories. This argument has strong resonances with the philosophy and practice of InterPlay because of its rejection of binary thinking and its understanding of experience as an embodied, preverbal phenomenon (see Porter and Winton-Henry 1995, 34-35).

In order to more clearly understand notions of self and structure in InterPlay,

it is important to recall the improvisational character of their performance play.

Scholars Rebecca Caines and Ajay Heble, in the introduction to their edited volume

The Improvisation Studies Reader (2015), provide multiple characterizations of

improvisation, including: "a social activity that cannot readily be scripted, predicted,

or compelled into orthodoxy" and "a key feature of interpersonal communication and

social practice" (2). Although improvisation is a substantial part of our everyday life

experiences and behaviors, its unpredictable quality has made it difficult to study

within traditional frameworks. This unpredictability, however, does not preclude the

generally agreed upon notion that improvisation is often based on a system that limits

and guides choices.

InterPlay is no different from other improvisational forms in this regard.

Founders Winton-Henry and Porter cite Stephen Nachmanovitch's book *Free Play:*

The Power of Improvisation in Life and the Arts (1990) as a "formational book" in

their understanding of play and improvisation. Nachmanovitch describes the

relationship between freedom and rules in improvisation, saying:

> It is sometimes thought that in improvisation we can do just anything. But
> lack of a conscious plan does not mean that our work is random or arbitrary.
> Improvisation always has rules, even if they are not *a priori* rules… An
> improviser does not operate from a formless vacuum, but from three billion
> years of organic evolution; all that we were is encoded somewhere in us. (26-
> 27)

This conceptualization of improvisation accords with other expressions of the

relationship between structure and freedom in the practice of InterPlay. Co-founder

Cynthia Winton-Henry has described InterPlay as "highly structured" and *The Secrets*

of InterPlay manual describes the 80/20 guideline, saying "although we don't expect

everyone to do the warm-up or any of the forms exactly the same everywhere, our

hope is that at least 80% of the content would be present… one of our hopes is to create a common language among InterPlayers anywhere in the world" (31). When I first began attending the Open Gatherings of the InterPlay DC chapter, I did not realize the degree to which many of the exercises were structured. After a few sessions, however, I noticed that some of the language for leading exercises was almost identical across a variety of facilitators. InterPlay leader Kate Amoss then told me about the scripts for leading exercises that are included in the manual. While the process for leading InterPlay is scripted—with some allowances for local idiosyncrasies—the exercises themselves are designed to have just enough structure to allow participants to explore and to incorporate their own attitudes and content.

This scripted character of the InterPlay forms is significant because the InterPlay "embodied philosophy" is not just a set of theoretical concepts but embodied ways of experiencing the world as discovered and developed through participation in those forms. The forms are, thus, a rehearsal for experiencing the world in a playful way.[11] While understanding this play as a kind of training could potentially create tension between the autotelic character of play and the effort at play for personal and social transformation, the InterPlay 'ethic of play' rejects the binary between play for play's sake and play as development, maintaining the value of both "what is useless/nonproductive as well as product/outcome" (Body Wisdom 2014, 19). While the InterPlay forms are a kind of rehearsal of skills, the practice is not only

---

[11] This capacity to apply the perceptual experience of the play frame to the larger world is very much like Richard Schechner's notion of the performance subjunctive, described in *Between Theatre and Anthropology*, which characterizes the capacity of the 'as if' of the subjunctive experienced through performance to "paradoxically expand, containing the indicative frame" (1985, 92). While Schechner sees this expansion of the subjunctive frame as a temporary experience of willing suspension of disbelief, the InterPlay practice seeks to bring this mode of experience into the everyday on a more permanent basis.

about individual development, but also about creating a community with shared ways of perceiving and engaging with the world.

This effort to rehearse a way of experiencing the world differently is rooted in the structural function of play. Huizinga argues that play "creates order, *is* order" (10). Victor Turner and Brian Sutton-Smith describe the capacity of play to reinforce social and political structures, of which perception and its associated ontologies are one example. Conversely, they also theorize the anti-structural capacity of play, that is, its ability to deconstruct existing norms:

> The normative structure represents the working equilibrium, the 'anti structure' represents the latent system of potential alternatives from which novelty will arise when contingencies in the normative system require it. We might more correctly call this second system the *protostructural* system because it is the precursor of innovative normative forms. It is the source of new culture (Sutton-Smith 1972).

In dialogue with Sutton-Smith about this notion, Victor Turner argues that this kind of anti-structure is a potential source of all kinds of alternative models for living, some that run counter to the dominant cultural paradigm and others that serve it as instruments of control (1982, 33). These arguments concerning the role of play in the ordering and construction of the social world acknowledge the deep power that play holds and thereby the significance of InterPlayers use of it in personal and social transformation.

This power of play to structure (or de-structure) our perceptual and experiential habits is often ignored or denied. InterPlay DC leader Kate Amoss commented on play and culture in an interview that I conducted with her last year. She said, "Playing in our culture is like wasting your time… it's like you're are not doing anything important. It's like all fluff… you know we want to keep the status

quo and the way to keep the status quo is by telling someone 'that's stupid and childish'" (interview with the author, Washington, DC, 10-16-15). Amoss's words link the denigration of play as childish to the maintenance of established norms and systems of power.

InterPlay leaders often tell newcomers to the practice—and remind experienced InterPlayers—that "there is no wrong way to do InterPlay." In an effort to maintain a sense of playfulness, InterPlay leaders hold even the structure of the forms lightly and allow participants a level of playfulness with the structures themselves. When I saw the InterPlay performance troupe Wing It! perform during my visit to Oakland for the 2015 Art and Social Change program, one of the members, during a side-by-side DT3 (a form in which two or more performers simultaneously tell stories, each one alternating between *d*ancing and *t*alking three times—hence D-T-3) took off his belt in order to use it in the telling of his story. He said, "I'm breaking one of the InterPlay rules: I'm using a prop." InterPlay leader Agnotti Cowie similarly described differing experiences of rules and rule-breaking based on cultural differences:

> "It is interesting to see cross-culturally how people react to rules, because I've taught InterPlay in India, and Germany, and here [the United States]. It was really funny being in India, because there's a lot of… like, chaos. And so there would be like… they weren't really following rules. Where in Germany, when I would say something… they would notice afterwards… like with the one-hand dance, I didn't say that they couldn't switch hands, but they were like 'Can I switch hands?!' in their heads, because it just felt like a rule… It was interesting to see what cultures are paying more attention to rules in general and what cultures in general are not paying attention to rules." (interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-26-15)

While these different experiences of rules may reveal significant differences in cultural approaches to experience, the recognition of these differences for individual

41

InterPlayers gives them insight into their particular approach to rules and rule-breaking.

This playfulness with which InterPlayers approach even their own rules and structures is a crucial part of the way that InterPlayers maintain a sense of "internal authority" within structures. In an interview I conducted with co-founder Phil Porter, he stressed the importance of the individual and honoring one's own experience and autonomy, saying: "Sometimes the system can kind of overtake the individual experience, so we keep reminding people that they are more important than the system" (interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-30-15). This willingness of InterPlayers to not only play *through* their improvisational structures but to play *with* these structures enables them to experiment with the structures and rules of everyday life situations as well.

In this section, I have sought to characterize the experience of individual transformation through play as conceptualized by the InterPlay community, I argued that InterPlay is a social movement organized around the application of play to everyday life, and more specifically that individuals explore alternative performances of self through play. This individual exploration is self-directed, reflecting the notion of change in InterPlay as something immanent to individuals. I concluded by arguing that, just as improvisational play and the method contained in the InterPlay body wisdom tools are designed to allow for personal change and alteration of the structures through which the self has been defined, they also encourage experimentation with the social relations and organizational forms utilized throughout

everyday life. In the next section, I will examine the InterPlay non-profit

organization Body Wisdom Inc. in order to demonstrate how this social change

manifests in the InterPlay community, looking specifically at how the organization

addresses racial justice in its practices.

Redressing Trauma: Social Justice in Body Wisdom Inc.

> "The purpose of Body Wisdom, Inc., is to support and promote the development of the worldwide InterPlay movement. InterPlay is an active creative way to unlock the wisdom of the body. The InterPlay system, developed by co-founders Cynthia Winton-Henry and Phil Porter, consists of a set of ideas and practices that promote community, ease, peace-making, multiculturalism, creativity, and individual and organizational transformation. InterPlay is shared through teaching, writing, classes, workshops, seminars and performance. It is rooted in the power of movement, storytelling, singing, and silence."

> Body Wisdom Inc. By-Laws, Section 1.02

Body Wisdom Inc. is the non-profit corporation organized to spread the philosophy and practices of InterPlay. InterPlay DC leader Kate Amoss once described the management of Body Wisdom Inc. and the InterPlay social movement by way of an analogy with the form "Walk, Stop, Run." She led this form during the celebration of InterPlay's 25th anniversary in Washington DC in October of 2015, a form that she lightheartedly refers to as "the tribal dance of Western Civilization." In this form, participants begin by simply walking through space, before being invited to change directions, to walk backwards, to walk in a strange manner, to jog or run, and finally to stop. Then participants improvise, usually to music, playing with these movement possibilities and with each other. Often, people run, skip, or chase one another. Sometimes, they mimic the movements of others. Groups form, dissolve, and reform rapidly. I've witnessed more experienced InterPlayers crawling, making shapes with their bodies, and experimenting with weight sharing.

Amoss describes Body Wisdom Inc. and the InterPlay social movement as akin to this "Walk/Stop/Run," with different individuals occupying the center at times and then moving to the periphery and new groups of people forming or dissolving

constantly in an organic fashion. This capacity to discover significance in the details of how people play is a crucial part of the InterPlay approach to social change. Amoss's metaphor accords closely with Winton-Henry's description of the InterPlay community as an "open circle with a strong center." This metaphorical description is not, however, just about seeing the organizational structure of the InterPlay community as existing in a constant state of becoming, but also of acknowledging the playful attitude that InterPlayers bring to that structure. Amoss is also a member of the Body Wisdom Inc. Board of Directors and so her description of the structure in this way also reflects this playful attitude brought to organizational governance.

In this section, I argue that the InterPlay conceptualization of change as immanent is reflected in their effort to redress historical "traumas." I explore how the InterPlay social movement, through the workings of the non-profit organization Body Wisdom Inc., seeks to build and reshape community in ways that preserve difference, specifically examining how this approach to social change manifests in the organization's push for racial justice. In the final part of this section, I examine the funding practices of Body Wisdom Inc. in order to, following the model set by Jackson in her *Social Works*, understand InterPlay as an aesthetic practice sustained though its interdependence with social and economic institutional structures. I argue that its funding model enables it to maintain a level of autonomy for its practitioners.

Organizational Trauma

Body Wisdom Inc. is the non-profit corporate entity that maintains and administers the InterPlay performance practice and drives the development of the InterPlay social movement. It also operates as an intermediary between the InterPlay

community and larger economic and legal frameworks. Body Wisdom Inc. is responsible for ensuring that InterPlay remains both economically viable and socially relevant; in essence, the board of directors is tasked with growing InterPlay both in terms of practitioners and financial security. This board regulates the InterPlay leadership training process, granting access to the cultural capital that accompanies certification as an InterPlay leader, and collects fees from InterPlay leaders based on their InterPlay-related income in order to carry out its functions. While the organization is in many ways defined by the social and economic norms imposed by existing economic and social institutions, the board of directors and employees of Body Wisdom Inc. carry out their functions in ways that embody the playfulness of the InterPlay philosophy.

The description of the organization as a large-scale version of the InterPlay form "Walk/Stop/Run" by Amoss resonates with Body Wisdom Inc. Board Member Agnotti Cowie's comment that the board of directors wants to be a "body-wise board." Cowie's comment invokes the principle of body data/knowledge/wisdom from the eight body wisdom tools of the InterPlay "embodied philosophy" and suggests that these principles are central to the way the organization operates on a collective level. The board meets in-person each summer for three days prior to the annual InterPlay Leaders Gathering. These meetings, according to Cowie, consist of a combination of embodied play and discussion of the plans for the future of InterPlay. She describes the board members playing together as part of a process for discovering the path for InterPlay between this meeting and the following year's gathering.

In recent years, the Body Wisdom Board of Directors has focused the use of funds collected throughout the year on two main initiatives: 1) to build support for the Life Practice and Leadership Training programs by hiring a national coordinator to help facilitate communication regarding the ways that these programs are being implemented, and 2) to support training and outreach for people of color and younger leaders. This latter effort is spearheaded by InterPlay Leaders of Color Liaison Coke Tani and InterPlay Millennial Liaison Agnotti Cowie, who utilize funds to provide scholarships for young people and people of color looking to enter the Life Practice or Leadership Training programs as well as to initiate events designed to meet the needs of these communities. These initiatives represent deliberate efforts to grow and shape the future of the InterPlay movement in ways that challenge the racial and generational segregation that are characteristic of dominant cultures in the contemporary United States.

Although the playful attitude characteristic of InterPlay might seem incompatible with efforts to address these kinds of challenges, the InterPlay philosophy, in addition to seeing play as a foundation of human connection and as the engine of social change, posits play as a force for healing. InterPlayers understand these not as three separate capacities but as interconnected elements of a process. *The Secrets of InterPlay* manual stresses that InterPlay is "creativity based rather than healing/wound based," but simultaneously acknowledges the healing power of creative play saying, "healing may happen quicker when we are not focusing on it" (16). For InterPlayers, play has the capacity to unlock and heal wounds and traumas, even when it is not oriented toward that end.

To understand how InterPlay approaches social transformation at the organizational and interpersonal level requires an acknowledgement that there are reasons that particular individuals and groups are not already a part of a shared community. Some InterPlayers use the language of "trauma" to describe these reasons or the kinds of blocks or resistances people have to making connections with one another. At the end of the first week of the InterPlay Art and Social Change 2015 Summer Untensive, Winton-Henry, while elucidating her theory of "sensitives," described trauma as "an inability to self-regulate, so that you have to remove yourself from the system." She argued that sensitives, people with a strong emotional intelligence and a high capacity for empathy, are social innovators "figuring out how to respond to situations and to trauma." InterPlay leader Beth Sarver describes experiencing an "organizational trauma, where the organization was having a lot of toxic stress and there was a lot of professional stress between people, a lot of toxic energy, gossiping, loss of productivity, just diminished quality of care and service to the client, the student" (Skype interview with the author, 1-12-16). In their Race Dance playshop, Winton-Henry and Grassroots Spiritual Practitioner Soyinka Rahim characterize the legacy of American slavery and racism as an "historical trauma." For InterPlayers, there is an embodied experience of interpersonal, organizational, and historical traumas that calls out for healing through embodied play and human connection. This understanding of trauma as interpersonal, organizational, and socio-historical construct trauma as an almost ubiquitous relational phenomenon.

Witnessing a playshop without this understanding of traumas, one might think that InterPlay sought healing where there was no wound. Victor Turner's four-phase

model of social drama describes a process of "breach, crisis, redress, and *either* reintegration *or* recognition of schism" (Turner 1982, 69).[12] Using this terminology, one might characterize the efforts of InterPlayers as seeking redress where there had been no breach. However, acknowledging the many schisms—or "traumas"—that serve as part of the underlying fabric of many societies, like patriarchy and racial hierarchy, reveals an understanding of InterPlay as a redressive effort in response to these historical traumas. This approach to social change might prove particularly valuable in the context of trainings on social privilege because of the ways in which privilege tends to be invisible to those wielding it. For those unaware of their privilege—the result of an ongoing social schism—such trainings might prove a less confrontational approach to creating an awareness of this privilege and to redressing it.

In following with the InterPlay philosophy, Body Wisdom Inc. undergoes change as an ongoing redefinition of their organizational structures through constant acknowledgement of the differences embodied in their community. The healing of historical and interpersonal traumas is part of this effort at redefinition. As individuals who (re)experience these traumas on a daily basis choose to become a part of the InterPlay community, that community works to integrate the "body wisdom" of that individual into the "collective body wisdom" of the movement. Rather than rhetorically situating themselves outside of histories of division and injustice,

---

[12] This model of social drama is useful for understanding the role of InterPlay in social transformation, so long as the reintegrative component is not understood as what Adorno would call "reconciliation under duress," (151) but as an acknowledgment of differences and an on-going commitment to seeking understanding.

InterPlayers acknowledge these traumas and seek to redress them through the
formation of communities of difference.

Racial Justice in the InterPlay Social Movement

As I mentioned above, one of the major initiatives for social transformation
within the InterPlay movement itself has been the effort to support growth into
communities of color and to facilitate InterPlay leadership training for people of
color. In many ways, this effort represents the core of the InterPlay approach to social
change. *The Secrets of InterPlay* manual opens:

> InterPlay is multicultural, intergenerational, gender-empowering, and
> interfaith. We play with our own unique ethnicity, spirituality, geography,
> learning styles, sexuality, economics, gifts, and challenges. We dance with
> those who are different—side by side, one at a time, walking, stopping, and
> running, we sing, dance, babble, shout, and tell our stories to applauding
> witnesses. **This is how we are changing the world.** (1)

This quotation invokes a notion of a community of difference as the actualization of a
process of social transformation. Understanding the InterPlay "Leaders of Color
Initiative" as an effort to realize this kind of community in diversity through play
provides us with a clear and direct example of how the InterPlay movement
conceptualizes social change within their own organizing efforts. But what does this
community of difference look like and do people of color feel comfortable in it?

Victor Turner describes a similar sense of community in his discussion of
anti-structural play, which he calls "communitas" (See Turner 1982, 1974, 1969). The
anti-structural aspect of play challenges notions of social identity and hierarchy—like
race—and can, according to Turner, produce a sense of community across, rather than
through, social systems and structures. His description of communitas as "the

experiential basis of the Christian notion of 'actual grace'" (1982, 45) is in many

ways parallel to the InterPlay concept the physicality of grace. Turner argues that this

notion of communitas has an inclusive quality without forcing group homogeneity:

> For me communitas preserves individual distinctiveness—it is neither
> regression to infancy, nor is it emotional, nor is it 'merging' in fantasy. In
> people's social structural relationships they are by various abstract processes
> generalized and segmented into roles, statuses, classes, cultural sexes,
> conventional age-divisions, ethnic affiliations, etc. In different types of social
> situations they have been conditioned to play specific social roles. (1982, 45-
> 46)

The similarity between Turner's notion and InterPlay rhetoric suggests that the social

transformation for which the InterPlay movement is striving could be understood as

communitas through play.

However, although the larger InterPlay organization represents a diverse range

of ethnic, racial, and national backgrounds, local and regional InterPlay communities

often do not reflect this diversity. I've met InterPlay leaders working with specific

marginalized groups, including homeless populations, transgender and gender non-

conforming people, and disabled groups. Many of the local InterPlay groups not

organized around specific lines of difference and identity structures represent a

greater relative uniformity. According to the 2013 InterPlay Annual Report produced

by Body Wisdom Inc., based on a small survey of 29 InterPlay events conducted in

13 states during that year, 45% of attendees were between 56 and 75 years old, 79%

were women, and 70% self-identified as European American while 16% self-

identified as African-American. While these data were based on a sample size too

small to provide a statistically significant picture of the demographics of the InterPlay

community, they do suggest that some populations are more strongly represented in

the organization than in the larger locales and regions in which these communities are embedded. These factors can sometimes result in instances in which individuals feel unable to participate in their local InterPlay communities. One member of the Art and Social Change Untensive, who had been involved with the InterPlay chapter in her home state for many years, discussed challenges that she experienced in that community because of her struggle with mental illness. As in other social environments, individuals who find something of value in the InterPlay practice and philosophy but are unable to find the community support that they need often pursue separate spaces and communities in which they are more able to address their specific needs.

The Annual InterPlay Leaders Gathering each summer is an important site of multicultural and multiethnic play in which otherwise distinct InterPlay communities come together and interact with one another. Because InterPlay is an embodied activity, InterPlay communities tend to be organized around geographic localities to facilitate in-person interactions—with the new InterPlay Millennial group that uses online video software for virtual meetings constituting a notable exception. Because of the kinds of groups organized around particular differences described in the previous paragraph and the realities of relative geographic racial uniformity in a United States that continues to experience deep racial segregation, these annual gatherings of InterPlay leaders represent significant opportunities in the organization's effort to continually foster the kind of community of difference to which they are committed.

This effort to foster racial justice and ethnic diversity within the InterPlay

organization has somewhat inevitably encountered challenges in its implementation.

During an interview with Grassroots Spiritual Practitioner Soyinka Rahim, I asked

her what difficulties she has faced as a woman of color doing this work. Speaking

about a workshop that she had been invited to lead by the Atlanta InterPlay chapter in

October of 2014, she described attempting to lead an opening chant and becoming

frustrated when the largely white group of local participants seemed unwilling to join

in the exercise. She said that she became more insistent with them and that later they

described her efforts to insist on their participation "too forceful, demanding, violent"

and "not incremental" (interview with the author, Oakland, California, 7-30-2015).

Rahim said that this experience, among others, has caused her to often ask herself,

"what am I doing here with all these white people?" Despite these challenges, she

maintains that InterPlay is "slow, but willing to change." Her attitude toward these

challenges is an invaluable reminder that the realization of racial justice is a process,

one that will require an ongoing willingness to acknowledge what she describes as

our "knowing and not knowing, understanding and misunderstanding" of each other.

At the 25th anniversary celebration, InterPlay Leaders of Color Liaison Coke

Tani praised the larger InterPlay community for being "welcoming and affirming of

bodies of color," but also expressed the need for this community to do more to

"incorporate the wisdom of InterPlayers of color into the group body wisdom" (Skype

presentation, 10-24-2015). Tani's comment implies that presence and representation

are not sufficient for people of color to truly be part of the InterPlay community.

While listening and witnessing are important components of the InterPlay practice,

they are not simple, but developed capacities. In his "Listening to the Lambs,"

George Lipsitz introduces the concept of improvised listening, describing listening as

"an active social practice" (12). He argues that rhythm and blues musician Johnny

Otis's book *Listen to the Lambs*, written in response to the Watts rebellion, stressed

the need of "white society… to learn about itself from the perspective of ghetto

residents. But to do so, whites had to learn to listen" (11). Tani's comment similarly

asks white InterPlayers to exercise their capacity for improvisational listening in their

interactions with InterPlayers of color.

The Oakland InterPlay community has spearheaded a number of efforts to

rehearse practices of improvised listening across racial barriers. In the midst of

gentrifying Oakland, these InterPlayers understand their need to address issues of race

in the InterPlay community. Winton-Henry and Rahim have collaborated on a touring

playshop called 'Race Dances,' and Winton-Henry has also teamed up with InterPlay

leader and racial justice educator Katie Hymans to organize an InterPlay research

group called 'Waking Up White' in order to explore ways of addressing white

privilege through the InterPlay forms. These efforts and others demonstrate the ways

in which the InterPlay social movement applies its playful approach to building

community across lines of difference as well as through the healing of interpersonal

and historical traumas.

I have sought to characterize the InterPlay approach to social change as

focused on building communitas. However, this is not to suggest that InterPlay lacks

the political antagonism more characteristic of Theatre of the Oppressed. The anti-

structural play that enables the formation of this communitas also serves as a

foundation on which to engage in the painful process of confronting and deconstructing social structures like racial hierarchies. The strength of the InterPlay approach lies in its capacity to create a strong base of community on which the redressing of trauma can take place, potentially enabling the formation of a community of difference by transforming social relations rather than homogenizing difference in the creation of a false unity or accepting systems of social sorting and segregation.

Funding Change: Commodification of Communitas

In order to finance the work of InterPlayers addressing the issue of racial justice and to offer scholarships to people of color wanting to participant in InterPlay programs, Body Wisdom Inc. needs to raise a substantial amount of funds each year. During the course of my research on InterPlay, many scholars have asked me whether the InterPlay movement funds its community and social change efforts through the corporate workplace trainings described in the following section. Given an economic context in the United States in which funding from foundations and governments is both scarce and restrictive—insofar as these institutions require that it be used to further specified social and political goals—the idea that socially conscious arts organizations would need to pursue sources of revenue within the corporate business world is widespread. However, Body Wisdom Inc. maintains a level of organizational independence through a funding model that eschews submission to the values of external sources of authority.

A certain degree of autonomy is necessary to sustain the improvisational and autonomous approach to leadership in the InterPlay movement and the playful

manner in which the non-profit corporate body, Body Wisdom Inc. organizes that movement. That flexible attitude toward formalized institutional structures is founded on a certain level of engagement with existing economic infrastructure. In her *Social Works* (2011), Shannon Jackson raises questions about the necessity of funding and its effects on notions of autonomy and heteronomy in social practice art:

> Questions of aesthetic autonomy gain an acute urgency when we consider what it means to sustain not only the life of art but also the lives of artists. In fact, the variation in content, form, and goal in social practice and experimental art subtly interacts with artists' differing sense of where they will find security of employment. In such heteronomous reflection, it becomes harder to argue for the purity of aesthetic autonomy. Who or what, after all, will be an artist's primary source of support and promotion? (16)

The question of how artists sustain themselves and how their strategies for doing so entangle them in a web of interdependencies, impacting their art, raises other serious questions about the potential for autonomy in any aesthetic product. For InterPlayers, the question applies not only to the InterPlay practice and the playshops and untensives in which it is enacted but also to their understanding of their community as a social movement.

As the corporate entity that maintains the InterPlay performance practice and facilitates the development of the InterPlay social movement, Body Wisdom Inc. functions as an intermediary between the InterPlay community and larger economic and legal frameworks. Body Wisdom Inc. seeks to ensure that InterPlay continues to grow both in terms of practitioners and financial security. This board collects funds from InterPlay leaders based on attendance fees for playshops and untensives. The majority of Body Wisdom Inc.'s funding is obtained in this way; for playshops, untensives, and Life Practice programs across the world, Body Wisdom Inc. collects a

portion of the payments made by participants for access to these events and programs, with the remainder going to the InterPlay leaders organizing and leading these events.

While InterPlay playshops and untensives are often events for which participants are asked to pay, in practice there is a great deal of flexibility around these payments. The monthly "Open Gatherings" of the DC chapter are free when you attend for the first time, with a twenty-dollar suggested donation thereafter. InterPlay North Carolina leaders Tom Henderson and Ginny Going often lead weekend untensives for which the price of attendance only covers the costs of putting the event together; participants are then encouraged to make a donation to the leaders for their time. As a graduate student living on a limited income, I have received assistance from both the Oakland and DC chapters regarding payments for their events. They have made efforts to help me by utilizing scholarship funds that they have at their disposal as well as by facilitating housing and meals for events to which I have had to travel. Although revenue from events and trainings account for approximately two-thirds of the total income of Body Wisdom Inc., the practices of payment for these events remains flexible.

Part of the reason for this flexibility in payment structures is because of what co-founder Phil Porter has called the "economics of grace." In *Body and Soul* (1993), Porter describes art as a process of giving and receiving gifts and grace as the experience of this giving and receiving. He states, "The economics of grace—the economics of gift-giving—are substantially different from the economics of the marketplace" (70). One of the important differences between marketplace economics and the economics of grace that he describes is the experience of ownership:

> We often confuse (thanks again to the wonders of advertising) that physical experience of grace that comes from seeing a thing of beauty with the need to own it… We can own objects that are grace/full, but ownership ultimately limits grace/fullness. Grace is part of the gift economy. Grace must be received and then given out, to complete the circularity that leads to its increase. To own it is to stop that process. (73)

InterPlayers strive to prevent a sense of ownership, even over the InterPlay forms themselves, from interfering with their efforts at social and personal transformation. In order to have the scholarship funds and other infrastructure that allow them to have this flexibility, however, these groups need additional funds from which to draw.

During the weekend that I participated in an untensive called "The Secrets of InterPlay" in October of 2014, I was invited to attend an InterPlay-DC fundraising event digitally connected with similar events in many other cities across the United States as well as the primary fundraising site in Oakland. This multi-location event featured presentations and performances from a variety of InterPlay leaders, including Porter and Winton-Henry, and raised over sixty-eight thousand dollars. The majority of these funds were specifically allocated for training and supporting a new generation of InterPlay leaders, the Millennials, as well as InterPlay leaders of color (Body Wisdom website). Although Body Wisdom Inc. is funded primarily through revenues generated by programming, charitable contributions account for approximately one-third of its annual income. In 2012, fundraising efforts garnered over one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, representing almost forty percent of the year's revenue. The numbers for the 2013 fiscal year are almost identical. While this dual revenue source model is common in non-profit organizations, it is worth noting that these funds were raised almost exclusively from individual donors rather than through corporate giving or grant money.

InterPlay's previous major fundraising effort was launched in September of 2009, in celebration of its twentieth year. Body Wisdom Inc. announced a three-year fundraising and outreach effort called "The Million Connections" campaign. The two major goals of this campaign were to introduce InterPlay to a million new people and to raise a million dollars. These efforts were intended to support three central initiatives outlined by the board of directors: "spreading InterPlay regionally, creating outreach opportunities to take InterPlay where it is needed nationally and internationally, and to build a solid foundation for InterPlay into the future" (Body Wisdom website). Contributors were encouraged to commit to giving a set amount at monthly intervals over a five-year period, a practice they liken to tithing. Despite an annual budget of nearly five hundred thousand dollars, Body Wisdom Inc. employs only six part-time staff and spends less than a third of its budget on personnel-related expenses. The bulk of their revenue is used to support regional efforts to grow the InterPlay movement by supporting InterPlay leaders and by hosting events in regions that lack an established InterPlay presence.

Because Body Wisdom Inc. is able to raise the funds necessary to carry out its organizational functions through this combination of fees and donations from individual donors, the organization is able to maintain a level autonomy from the institutional apparatus described by Jackson. This level of financial independence enables a concomitant autonomy, allowing its members to determine their own values and goals—their approach to social change—on an individual basis.

However, in funding their efforts at racial justice in this way, they transform the sense of communitas that they seek through their practices into a product for the

market. The majority of Body Wisdom Inc.'s funds come from payments made by participants for access to InterPlay events and trainings. In addition, the organization markets the InterPlay practice by selling books, CDs, and other merchandise. Body Wisdom Inc. seeks to institutionalize and commodify the InterPlay method. These efforts at commodification represent an attempt to codify and market a means of accessing communitas. While the flexibility in their payment structures reflect the attitude of Porter's "economies of grace," this marketing and sale of communitas though play is symptomatic of the late capitalist marketplace that Porter is seeking to counterbalance, blurring the distinction between the concept of monetary economies with that of gift economies.

Throughout this section I have sought to elucidate how the InterPlay practice and philosophy conceptualizes social transformation. I have examined the concept of trauma and healing in the practice as understood by reference to Victor Turner's notion of social drama, the ways in which the InterPlay non-profit corporation Body Wisdom Inc. has addressed race within the InterPlay social movement, and the impact of the Body Wisdom Inc. funding model on organizational practices. I argued that the InterPlay conceptualization of social change is founded on the building of communities of difference that build a foundation of communitas on which to redress historical traumas.

However, this analysis has been focused exclusively on social transformation within the InterPlay organization. How does this change extend beyond the community of practitioners of InterPlay and into everyday social environments that

do not share these values of playfulness? Many of the InterPlay leaders that I have

spoken with described their desire to become a leader of the practice not only as an

effort to share these practices, but also an inclination toward incorporating InterPlay

into as many parts of their everyday lives as possible. InterPlay leader Beth Sarver

expressed this sentiment saying, "I wanted also to get paid to do InterPlay, 'cause I

loved it so much. I'm like: I need to bring this with me. So I'm just going to integrate

this wherever I can. Everything that I want to do should integrate InterPlay, because

it's good for my body and its good for the people around me" (Skype interview with

the author, 1-12-16). In the final section, I undertake to illuminate the InterPlay

understanding of social change as it functions within the context of the larger society

and social systems in which the organization and its practices are embedded, looking

specifically at its use in places of work.

Workplace Play and Late Capitalism

"Perhaps we cannot help but be worried about money, but we can also be awakened to a richness that we may have more access to than we realize. As artists (as we understand it in its broadest sense) we give and receive gifts, we receive and dispense grace. If our financial needs continue to outstrip our means, we may never find either safety or salvation. And once we find fiscal safety, we may realize that our lives lack other riches. But we can also free ourselves from our obsessions about money, at least partly, by understanding other sources of richness, sources over which we have much more control. Time, energy, attention; hands, bodies, hearts—these are all gifts we have to give, and they are the gifts we may receive. In that can be our safety and our salvation. We may not be able to supplant market economies, but we can place the economics of grace right next to it for balance… There is effort in giving and receiving grace—oftentimes great effort. It is in this sort of effort, though, that the distinction between work and play are blurred. The effort, as well as the result, contains its own satisfaction."

<div align="right">

Phil Porter
"The Economics of Grace: Art, Money, and Salvation" in
Body and Soul (1993, 74-75)

</div>

InterPlay co-founder Phil Porter notes that in particular endeavors the difference between the productive labor of the workplace and the creative effort experienced in artistic play becomes difficult to discern. Both are rooted in a capacity to transform the material world. Similarly, Marx describes labor as "the living, form-giving fire; it is the transitoriness of things, their temporality, as their formation by living time" (361).[13] For Marx, the transformation of the world by the worker is also inevitably a transformation of the worker through her labor. InterPlayers describe feeling a sense of individual change as a result of their play, but they also see their

---

[13] Marx distinguishes living labor from abstract labor. Living labor is the application of that creative power in order to fulfill the needs and desires of the one laboring. This labor does not serve the accumulation of abstract wealth, capital. Abstract labor, on the other hand, conceptualizes labor as it participates in the marketplace. Abstract labor understands the sale of labor as labor-power as constitutive and thus conceives labor as a commodity.

efforts as changing the world. In this final section, I will explore this notion of change in relation to the larger social context in which InterPlay is embedded.

Porter's words also acknowledge a deeply entrenched obsession with money in a culture dominated by capitalist market economies. While he invites his readers to consider values beyond those of the marketplace, Porter nevertheless acknowledges the central role that a concern for financial security plays in so many people's lives. This reality is no less true for Body Wisdom Inc. as a non-profit organization than for the individuals to which Porter is speaking. InterPlayers may be able to offer "economies of grace" as a counterpoint to market economies, but the organization must still operate within the economic and legal frameworks to which it is working to offer an alternative.

In this section, I elucidate the InterPlay concept of change as it applies to the world outside of the InterPlay community. In particular, I investigate the work of InterPlay leaders who utilize the practice within workplace settings, often as a form of corporate team building. As a framework for understanding those efforts, I first undertake a review of post-Marxist and Autonomous Marxist literature on the relationship between work and play in a growing economic sector: communicative technologies. In the second part of this section, I utilize this framework to analyze the efforts of InterPlayers to bring their play into places of work, an effort to extend the transformation described in the previous sections to other communities.

Affect and Playbor in Late Capitalism

In the introduction, I characterized theatre for social change through its commitment to the reconfiguration of the audience/performer relationship. In

63

examples of theatre for social change, traditional audiences are transformed into spectator-participants, both witnessing and contributing to the aesthetic product. In *Fair Play: Art, Performance and Neoliberalism* (2013), theatre and performance scholar Jen Harvie likens this changing role of audiences in experimental and immersive theatre to the economic concept of the "prosumer" (55). She describes this conceptual combination of producer and consumer as "the consumer who also designs and produces what she consumes" (29). Harvie draws this connection in order to highlight the capacity for this reconceptualization of the spectator/consumer not only for its subversive potential, but also for its potential to reinforce efforts to enlist consumers in a new form of unpaid labor. Harvie's comparison serves as a warning to practitioners of theatre for social change to continuously reflect upon whose interests are being served by particular applications of their work.

Many InterPlay leaders practice the forms and teach the body wisdom tools in non-profit, governmental, and corporate trainings. InterPlay leader Beth Sarver has developed a specific training using InterPlay techniques to help professionals understand how to work with individuals who have experienced trauma. In Kansas City, Missouri, she uses "body-to-body" learning to train police officers, firefighters, EMT personnel, and others in the use of these tools. Richard Citrin is an InterPlay leader in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania who uses the tools of InterPlay in "high end corporate stress resilience training" (Cynthia Winton-Henry, email correspondence with the author, 1-11-2016). InterPlay Australia Board Member and Leader Robert Stocks uses InterPlay as a business coach to develop "strong leaders, successful teams, and sustainable business results" (Integrated Coaching Solutions website). The

InterPlay website has a list of thirty-five InterPlay leaders from across the United States who use the practice in organizations and corporations as a way of "reducing stress, and renewing collaboration, creativity, and productivity to your work world" (Body Wisdom website). Understanding this incorporation of InterPlay into the workplace requires examining it as part of a larger trend to transform the experience of work within a rapidly changing labor market.

The use of play as a kind of labor to produce affects and the notion of the prosumer described above are manifestations of a major shift in economic practices commencing near the middle of the twentieth century. Scholars in the Marxist tradition theorize this shift as marking a new phase in the development of capitalism. Referred to as "late capitalism," this phase is characterized by the rise of the transnational corporation, global markets, a post-Fordist production model, and a substantial growth in the development of new information technologies and in white-collar and service-sector employment. There is, in addition to this plethora of changes, one further characteristic of late capitalism to which I would like to give particular attention: the growing significance of immaterial labor.

While orthodox Marxism is a purely materialist tradition, many subsequent scholars have challenged these materialist foundations, some even arguing that there is evidence of this intangible, social reproductive labor in Marx's writings that have been overlooked by other scholars. Maurizio Lazzarato uses the term immaterial labor to describe "the labor that produces the informational and cultural content of the commodity" (1996, 133). He describes two ways in which this concept manifests itself in the contemporary economy: through changing labor processes which

increasingly rely on communication and computer skills and the commodification of activities related to the defining of cultural and artistic tastes and the manipulation of public opinion. Post-Marxists and Autonomous Marxists like Lazzarato have worked to revise the Marxist tradition in response to the rapid growth in service sector jobs in many labor markets—a key feature of late capitalism—to incorporate the notion of immaterial labor.

Arlie Hochschild's *The Managed Heart* (1983) represents a major text in this revision of the Marxist theory of labor. Hochschild examines the work of flight attendants and bill collectors in order to develop a concept of emotional labor. She defines emotional labor as requiring "one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others" (7). For flight attendants, this is a kind of caring labor that produces for passengers a feeling of safety and comfort. Bill collectors, on the other hand, are asked to generate a sense of alarm and urgency. Because what is produced by InterPlayers using their practice in the context of the workplace are tools of social enskillment and feelings of pleasure and ease rather than material goods, the emotional labor described by Hochschild is an important step toward understanding this work.

While the concepts of emotional and immaterial labor are helpful in beginning to understand the application of the InterPlay practice in the workplace, Michael Hardt's notion of affective labor is broad enough to encompass more of the variety of ways in which InterPlay is employed. Hardt builds on Lazzarato's immaterial labor, identifying affective labor as "immaterial, even if it is corporeal and affective, in the sense that its products are intangible: a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction,

excitement, passion—even a sense of connectedness or community" (1999, 96). He identifies this work as central to moments of communication and the building of interpersonal networks.

Hardt's affective labor is particularly useful because the intangible products that he describes as characteristic of this labor are precisely the kind of intangibles that InterPlay practitioners identify as the outcomes of the practice. The InterPlay website defines InterPlay as "a global social movement dedicated to *ease*, *connection*, human sustainability and play" (Body Wisdom website, my emphasis). InterPlay leaders who use the practice in corporate, non-profit, and governmental workplaces are selling these intangibles and the skills for workers continue to produce these affects on their own.

The idea that play could serve capital accumulation in this way flies in the face of many of the theories of play. Roger Caillois, for instance, says in *Man, Play, and Games* (1958) that: "a characteristic of play, in fact, is that it creates no wealth or goods, thus differing from work or art… nothing has been harvested or manufactured, no masterpiece has been created, no capital has accrued. Play is an occasion of pure waste" (5). However, existing theories of play can no more prevent the current blending of play and labor than they could the breakdown between play and everyday life. Irrespective of the classical understanding of play, contemporary scholars have begun to theorize this blurring of the boundary between play and labor as playbor.

Julian Kücklich coined the term "playbour" to describe ways in which companies, especially those in the technology sector, have managed to control and capitalize on activities that straddle the realms of leisure, labor, and domesticity. I

include what he calls his "succinct, one paragraph definition of playbour" here in its

entirety because of the many fruitful ways in which it speaks to the discussions of

play and labor undertaken thus far:

> If we assume that play is distinct from "ordinary life" (Huizinga), and that it
> constitutes an "occasion of pure waste" (Caillois), then playbour is the re-
> entry of ordinary life into play, with a concomitant valorization of play
> activities. Insofar as life (bios) is always productive, and be it only in the
> sense that it produces waste, the extraction of value from play can be seen as a
> form of waste management; and insofar as play can be seen as a waste of time,
> the logic of playbour demands that time be wasted efficiently. In this sense we
> could also call playbour the Taylorization of leisure. Like other forms of
> affective or immaterial labour, playbour is not productive in the sense of
> resulting in a product, but it is the process itself that generates value. The
> means of production are the players themselves, but insofar as they only exist
> within play environments by virtue of their representations, and their
> representations are usually owned by the providers of these environments, the
> players cannot be said to be fully in control of these means. Playbour is
> suffused with an ideology of play, which effectively masks labour as play, and
> disguises the process of self-expropriation as self-expression. However,
> exploitation and empowerment, subjectification and objectification,
> wastefulness and efficiency coexist in the ambiguous "third space" of
> playbour, where these binary oppositions break down, and thus open up new
> possibilities of intersubjectification. (2009, 1)

Kücklich focuses on representation in the final sentences of this definition because he

is concerned primarily with the play of digital avatars and the capacity of online play

to serve capital. However, his definition could easily extend to include the embodied

affective labor described by Hardt and practiced by those InterPlayers who work to

create a sense of ease and well being in the corporate workplace.

My use of the concept of affective labor to describe the work of InterPlay

leaders hired to produce a sense of ease and community in a company's existing

workforce differs from its use by many scholars insofar as they employ it to describe

work that is done by employees for a consuming public while I am addressing its role

as a management technique in which corporations hire InterPlay leaders as affective

laborers to produce particular affects in other workers within the company. This use, in some ways, reflects what Niels Åkerstrøm Andersen refers to as "social creation games" in his book *Power at Play: The Relationships between Play, Work, and Governance* (2009). Andersen identifies a shift in workplace games originating in the 1980s—notably at the same time that the InterPlay practice was being developed by Porter and Winton-Henry—in which workplace play began to function as a concealed managerial power masquerading as individual empowerment. This leads me to ask: When InterPlayers bring a sense of playfulness to work, are they transforming the micro-politics of everyday life by empowering individuals to disrupt forced performances and the social hierarchies behind them or are they enabling people to internalize their own exploitation by subtly reinforcing systems of power? Are these efforts a drive to create a more humane workplace, a means to increased productivity, a wage supplement, a component of an increasingly paternalistic relationship between employer and employee, or something else? Could a dissolution of the boundary between play and work transform the politics of the workplace, similar to the politicization of everyday life that accompanied the breakdown between play and the everyday?

InterPlay(bor): Social Change in the Workplace

During the opening remarks of the InterPlay 25th anniversary celebration, InterPlay co-founder Winton-Henry welcomed those who were "just discovering InterPlay" saying, "You may have noticed that you have entered a different kind of context, one that doesn't feel very corporate or business-like" (Skype presentation, 10-24-15). This understanding that the feelings of playfulness and community

associated with InterPlay are dissimilar from—in fact, opposed to—experiences of

the corporate workplace is common in the rhetoric of InterPlayers. These associations

are so ubiquitous that many of the marketing materials for InterPlay programs and

events employ the tag line: "Make your life less like work and more like play."

Despite this rhetoric, which opposes work to play, notions of work and play can

become blurred for InterPlayers both conceptually, as in the quotation from Porter at

the beginning of this section, and in practice, given the efforts of some InterPlay

leaders within governmental, non-profit, and corporate workplaces.

Many theatre companies have utilized techniques conceived as theatre for

social change as corporate workplace trainings in order to financially support their

performance or community work. Applied theatre scholar Rea Dennis has written

about the use of Playback theatre by Mercedes Benz to improve relations with their

workers and to facilitate better customer service interactions through the development

of a kind of workplace intimacy (2010). Professor of Business William Ferris has

even written about the use of Theatre of the Oppressed as a corporate team-building

technique (2002). Many theatre practitioners consider these kinds of relationships

with corporations to be a necessary part of a successful business model.

While for theatre companies this work is about their own financial viability,

the corporations hiring these groups stand to make significant gains as well.

Microsoft is one of the companies most known for its incorporation of play into the

workplace. In an interview with the *American Journal of Play* (2012), Microsoft

Director of Test Ross Smith describes the benefits of play in the workplace as

increased creativity and productivity, better relations between workers and managers,

and a more pleasant working environment. John Helliwell and Haifang Huang

published a study titled "Well-Being and Trust in the Workplace" in the *Journal of*

Happiness Studies in 2011 showing that a ten-percent increase in employee-reported

levels of trust in the workplace is valued more highly than a thirty-percent increase in

wages (747). Are the psychological gains workers experience from workplace play

recaptured by capital through stagnating wages? Understanding the specific

circumstances under which play is incorporated into the workplace is necessary to

determine the resultant impact on workers and companies and who stands to gain.

I interviewed Winton-Henry about a training that she conducted for

employees at the non-profit health care corporation Kaiser Permanente in 2015. She

described this training:

> One of our board members worked at Kaiser for quite a long time… you
> know, a big part of Kaiser is the technology stuff, as in any big system there's
> all the administration holding it together… He was connected with a
> Millennial that was starting this whole Gen KP and realizing that a lot of
> young talent was feeling completely not met by the next generation up
> because there is such a big difference in training in technology and there was
> so much more speed and capacity in younger people around the how-to's…
> She decided it would be great to have these early folks in LA and the Bay-area
> come do a day retreat at InterPlayce with some elements from InterPlay. I
> wasn't just teaching InterPlay like 'here is how you do InterPlay and let's
> have some fun.' I was trying to teach the body wisdom principles of team and
> interconnection, and how all this stuff works in terms of creating community
> practices that really support people at the deepest level… I've had a couple of
> conversations with people in the organization about other opportunities, but…
> to be invited in at these corporate levels, you have to have a kind of corporate
> platform… Because we're mostly playing within non-profit helping-
> profession sectors, unless we're invited into… both tech and engineering areas
> with different levels of success. The biggest reality that we all realize is that
> InterPlay works most powerfully over time. Sometimes people get interesting
> hits and find it kind of a kick… so far we haven't really got a situation where
> people are taking it on, on a corporate level. (Skype interview with the author,
> 1-20-2016)

There are a few things that I think are worth drawing out of this statement that help to more deeply illustrate the InterPlay conceptualization of social change and the complexities of that conceptualization among InterPlayers.

First, Winton-Henry explains how she came to give this training by demonstrating a connection between the InterPlay community and the Kaiser employees. She frames this endeavor as an invitation from a fellow InterPlayer to share the InterPlay practices and tools with another community of which he was a part, an administrative team working for Kaiser Permanente. This example differs from the ways in which InterPlay leaders Rich Citrin and Robert Stocks, mentioned earlier, use InterPlay in business because it is not the result of a directed marketing effort to sell trainings. For Winton-Henry, it is significant that InterPlay is already in some way a part of this organization—through its inclusion of an InterPlayer—and that through this connection the organization identifies a particular need that it believes InterPlay can fill. This existing connection justifies an understanding of the training as an attempt to draw out something immanent to Kaiser rather than serving as the intervention of an external power.

Second, Winton-Henry describes the specific need at Kaiser that her InterPlay training was intended to address as the disparity in technological proficiency between younger and older workers. Because this proficiency manifests as an embodied knowledge, a creative capability, she sees a direct correlation between the InterPlay body wisdom tools and the challenges of a workplace in which rapidly changing technologies—both commodified products and the means of production—require far greater worker flexibility. Winton-Henry identifies the need to develop values and

practices that value workers as they face the challenges of technological change in the workplace. By connecting these changing conditions to the need for ongoing community practices, she identifies the rapid technological change as an immanent and continuous process that requires a corresponding change in the practices of the workers.

Third, Winton-Henry frames her approach to the training with a focus on the individual workers as a collective. She describes the training as an effort to create "community practices that really support people." Again, this is quite different from what InterPlay leader Rich Citrin offers, tools for managing work-related stress, or from the work of InterPlayer Robert Stocks, which focuses on developing "successful" leaders and corporate teams. Winton-Henry conceives this particular endeavor with Kaiser as an opportunity to empower these employees both in their work and their lives beyond that work. This approach focuses on a concept of community rooted in physical presence—eschewing any dehumanizing values of production systemically imposed on this community—and understands social change as individual transformation through the development of shared practices.

Finally, perhaps in part because Winton-Henry's rhetoric does not reflect corporate values, this training did not lead to an ongoing relationship between InterPlay and Kaiser or this particular group of employees. Winton-Henry implies that success for her in this endeavor would have been for the company to adopt InterPlay techniques as a permanent part of their community practices. This notion of success points to a shared understanding among InterPlayers that their practice obtains significance through ongoing engagement. For Winton-Henry, trainings like

this one with Kaiser introduce InterPlay to a defined group and offer that group the

opportunity to pursue the practice and include it as part of their community practices.

While this training may have functioned as a temporary release of stress, without an

ongoing transformation of community practices within the group based on the

InterPlay techniques, this endeavor did not serve its purpose, as far as she was

concerned.

These observations help to illuminate my argument that InterPlayers

conceptualize social change not as an intervention but as an immanent capacity. Both

Winton-Henry's framing of her effort with Kaiser through her relationship to an

employee as well as the tendency of InterPlay leaders to incorporate the practice into

all parts of their lives suggest that InterPlayers understand change as immanent to

individuals and communities. Seeing change in this way helps to make sense of

Winton-Henry's initial response to my inquiry regarding uses of InterPlay in

workplace settings:

> Most of our community is NOT in business. Though, Tom Henderson was a
> chemist and admin person so he and Ginny did some of this kind of work.
> Many of our leaders are incorporating tools In THEIR workplaces but don't
> work as consultants to org.
> There are people who are being invited to take InterPlay to the retreats of their
> professional communities. Most of these folks are helping professionals.
> (email correspondence with the author, 1-9-2016)

Understanding that most InterPlay leaders incorporating the practice into workplaces

are doing so in their own places of work rather than as consultants for other

organizations and corporations reinforces the notion that InterPlayers are not engaged

in a notion of social change as intervention.

Winton-Henry's clarification, however, does not fully account for the work of all InterPlay leaders. As mentioned in the above paragraphs, the efforts of some InterPlayers to utilize the practices of InterPlay in the workplace do not fall into the model described. She describes these efforts as anomalies rather than the norm of InterPlay approaches, saying, "We are seeing these as incidents rather than professional actions for the most part" (email correspondence with the author, 1-11-2016). That these InterPlayers are welcome to use the practices and "embodied philosophy" in this way demonstrates the level of autonomy permitted to individuals within the InterPlay community. InterPlay organizes on principles characteristic of what scholars have termed autonomous social movements. While some InterPlay leaders utilize the practice in their work as consultants doing workplace trainings rather than solely within their own communities, this phenomenon is not characteristic of the InterPlay movement as a whole, but it does reflect the individual autonomy valued within the InterPlay community.

This understanding of the InterPlay approach to social change also illuminates the process through which it is spreading. During the InterPlay Art and Social Change Untensive in July of 2015, Winton-Henry told the participants: "If you want to incorporate InterPlay into your work with your community, we invite that… Please don't become mission-driven and passionate in a colonial way." This description accorded closely with her other descriptions of the spreading of the practice as a "desire-based process" and as "attraction, not promotion" (conversation with the author, Oakland, California, 7-30-2015). Winton-Henry encouraged participants to share InterPlay within their communities, but warned them against imposing the

75

practice, especially on communities of which they are not a part. This approach helps

to explain why, while the larger trend in playful practices utilized in workplaces that I

described earlier is experienced primarily by a class of privileged workers in

particular industries like technology and management, the use of InterPlay in places

of work seems focused primarily in professions like education, social work, and

therapy. Although particular personality types that are perhaps more likely to be

drawn to practices like InterPlay tend also to be associated with these professions,

that InterPlayers seek to spread the practice primarily within their own communities

is also a significant factor in the predominance of these professions in the InterPlay

movement.

Despite this difference between the kinds of professions in which InterPlay

tends to be used and those professions primarily identified in scholarship on playbor,

the question of what role this play serves in these organizations remains. Niels

Åkerstrøm Andersen identifies social creation games as a trend in contemporary

workplace play and argues that these games represent an effort of power

communication to conceal itself. He examines how social games have contributed to

changes in the way that power is organized and exercised in the workplace. He

describes two primary modes in which play-at-work has been utilized and

subsequently theorized: as an effort to support a sense of well-being and community

and as a means to facilitate creativity and innovation. In his analysis of workplace

games since the 1980s, Andersen describes the rise of social creation games that

experiment with power. In these games, "boundaries become fluid in that they can

always continue to be the object of play and they continue at the same time to be both

binding and non-binding" (2009, 162-163). Although he acknowledges that these games are politically significant insofar as they draw attention to and play with power relations, he takes the view that these games are a ploy to disguise the exercise of power, arguing that "organizational games are about power that does not wish to be power, or does not wish to look like power. Today, play represents a technology for self-management in organizations, where power runs up against its own wall" (10).

While the introduction of practices like InterPlay into the workplace might serve as an opportunity to enhance internal communication, increase productivity, and improve worker attitudes, play is difficult to channel and contain. Hardt assures us that "saying that capital has incorporated and exalted affective labor and that affective labor is one of the highest value-producing forms of labor from the point of view of capital does not mean that, thus contaminated, it is no longer of use to anticapitalist projects" (1999, 90). An evaluation of the capacity for InterPlay(bor) to serve as structural or anti-structural within workplace culture is beyond the scope of my inquiry; however, I speculate that it plays each of these roles depending upon the particular circumstances.

While InterPlay leaders are able to operate autonomously and to utilize the practice and "embodied philosophy" to pursue a notion of social change relevant to the particular communities of which they are a part, it remains unclear whether this kind of transformation is possible, given the InterPlay approach to change, in workplace culture. In a section of *The Wisdom of the Body* (1995) that addresses corporate life and leading and following in the InterPlay forms, Winton-Henry and Porter note the ways that constraint limits our capacity for transformation:

In the workplace, for example, we may be group members by *necessity*; we need our jobs for financial security. Our dependence on our salaries will effect [*sic*] our sense of freedom in relation to our jobs, and therefore our willingness to follow. Following may come less from a sense of choice than a sense of obligation… Unfortunately, the contracts that we make at work are rarely community ones. (113-114)

Because workplace culture requires a submission to an external authority rather than the development of community practices that allow for individual choice, it is in direct conflict with the notion of change as immanent that, I argue, is central to the InterPlay project.

Regardless of whether or not InterPlay as a form of workplace play serves the interests of capital accumulation, engaging with this particular question demands an acknowledgement of the power of play. Thomas Henricks notes the tendency of play scholars from many disciplines to laud play as democratic and egalitarian. He sees the potential contribution of sociologists to play theory, on the other hand, as an attentiveness to "patterns of entanglement and hierarchy" (8). How scholars understand the role of play is substantially impacted by their disciplinary training, but perhaps there can be some agreement with regard to its power. One of the central projects of Hendricks's *Play Reconsidered* (2006) is to draw connections between the creativity inherent in Marx's concept of labor and the creativity involved in the socio-cultural ordering of the world that is rooted in Huizinga's notion of play (37). Celebrating both play and labor as transformative, Hendricks positions play as the engine of social and cultural production in the same way that labor is the engine of economic production. Because of the autonomy the InterPlay movement grants to its practitioners this power of play for social transformation results not in a linear developmental progression but in a movement with a variety of interests and values.

In this section, I have sought to illuminate the InterPlay notion of social change by examining how InterPlayers conceptualize the use of their practice within workplace settings. In an attempt to understand the role of InterPlay in the workplace, I applied Autonomous Marxist and post-Marxist theories of affective, immaterial labor to the efforts of InterPlayers to facilitate ease and a sense of connection between coworkers. I argued that these efforts have the potential to be a kind of playbor, play-labor, that functions as a management technique to disguise the use of power, but also that they have the potential to draw attention to and challenge the social hierarchies that govern the corporate workplace. In the conclusion, I undertake to clarify my argument regarding the conceptualization of change as immanent within the InterPlay community in light of the material presented here and in the previous sections. Furthermore, I endeavor to demonstrate what this conceptualization of change can offer in terms of understanding the relationship between the aesthetic and the social and the significance of performance within the new social movement.

Conclusion

"I think there are different ways to approach transformation. Sometimes people don't even have the language for it. I mean, I don't think InterPlay is very complicated. I mean: I have so many theories about this. Personally, I believe that when people start behaving at this level of spontaneity, even within—I think that InterPlay is actually highly structured—but even so, the threat to… cultural behaviors and the meaning of that… how people might feel that they could be kicked out of the group or could be seen in ways that they don't want to be seen. The roots of this in Western individualistic culture, you know, how actually how we have high individualism as choice but low individualism in terms of expression… many people seem quite timid about truly being themselves and feeling comfortable in expressing themselves… so that's all the way down in white, dominant culture. You get on task. You get evaluated. You get your job done."

Cynthia Winton-Henry (Skype interview with the author, 1-20-2016)

Despite the significance of conceptualizations of change to determining how one engages with the world outside oneself, verbalizing this conceptualization, as the above quotation suggests, can prove rather difficult. InterPlay co-founder Cynthia Winton-Henry describes transformation as connecting improvisational play, through her invocation of spontaneity and structure, to cultural behaviors and the potential for exclusion that accompanies performances outside of established social norms. As I described in the second section on individual transformation, InterPlayers apply improvisational play to performances of self in everyday life, seeking a greater sense of personal satisfaction with their lives. In the third section on racial justice, I argued that the InterPlay movement seeks to build communities of difference, allowing people to exercise this improvisatory play in social environments that minimize the risk of exclusion for operating outside of established norms. Winton-Henry links this potential for exclusion to Western individualism, whiteness, and the forced performances of the workplace. In the fourth section on workplace play, I argued that

the InterPlay community understands its contributions to social change as immanent to—rather than as interventions into—social institutions.

By way of concluding, I will further situate myself with regard to this inquiry by elaborating on how my personal background impacts my understanding, investigate how the InterPlay approach to social change relates to existing conceptualizations of the aesthetic and the social, and argue that InterPlayers' understanding of change as immanent results in part from their effort to disrupt binary thinking and challenge existing categorizations of human experience.

Subject Position and Knowledge Production

Coming to understand the InterPlay conceptualization of change has not been a simple, linear process for me. When I started attending the monthly Open Gatherings of InterPlay DC in the summer of 2014, engaging in these improvisational performance forms with other adults felt a bit uncomfortable and awkward. Even as a theatre person, I found that I often needed to quiet the voice in my head telling me that I looked ridiculous and that I was wasting my time. During the noticing sessions after these activities, I was commonly frustrated by the tendency for the conversation to focus on the surface level of the experience but felt unsure how to push these observations deeper, especially given my dual role as participant and researcher. The 10th annual InterPlay Men's Retreat held in Germantown, Maryland in February 2015 and the InterPlay Art and Social Change Untensive held in Oakland, California later that July significantly opened up for me the possibilities for this practice. Witnessing a group of twenty middle-aged men of various racial backgrounds and sexual orientations explore shifting notions of masculinity through performance and

reflection and an international collection of young adults experiment with identity and community-formation through performative play helped me better understand what the InterPlay practice and "embodied philosophy" could mean to those who practice it.

I recognize that my own approach to social change, as a cis-gender, white male from a small Pennsylvania town struggling to recover from the disappearance of steel- and manufacturing-industry jobs, has a tendency toward the falsely universalizing notion of class solidarity and the Marxist tradition of transformation through the interplay between technology and culture. It was this approach that led me to the study of theatrical avant-gardes and, eventually, Augusto Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed and to participation in social activism and organizing in Chicago with both working-class Marxists and groups defined through the politics of identity. Boal's techniques are an extension of the work of Marx—and his insistence on the development of class-consciousness—building on the work of Brecht to facilitate conscious critical engagement in his audiences and the efforts of Paulo Freire to encourage conscientização, or critical consciousness, through his pedagogical practices. My own subject position has left me disposed to see myself within this universalizing "consciousness" that tends toward the erasure of difference in order to build unity around an abstract relation to the means of production.

Although Boal's approach to social change operates through an understanding of change as immanent on an individual level, his effort, following Freire, to reintegrate the artist and intellectual into established communities through an application of their knowledge and tools—even if only to help unlock the latent

potential of that community—represents an effort to apply an outside force on community structures in order to facilitate change. This aspect of Theatre of the Oppressed is not fundamental to the technique but is a common shortcoming of many applications, described, for example, by Laura Edmonson in "Confessions of a Failed Theatre Activist." I found myself critiquing my own applications of the Theatre of the Oppressed techniques—with my use of them in my pre-K classroom constituting a notable exception—because most of these applications were conceived as isolated events, neither operating through embedding within an established community nor using the event to establish a sense of community that could endure after the event. While this shortcoming could have been alleviated by practicing Boal's techniques as he intended—by embedding for a substantial period of time within a particular community—these techniques nevertheless rely on an understanding of the artist and intellectual as outsider offering opportunities to defamiliarize the everyday through performance. While this approach resonated with my own understanding of the role of the intellectual in revolution within Marxist thinking, I experienced it as being in conflict with the values that I was developing in my efforts at social activism.

My study of the InterPlay approach to performance and social change has been, in part, an effort to understand how subjectivities dissimilar from my own conceptualize the process of change and how my own concept of change can co-exist in community with those of others. Rather than emerging from the academic tradition of Marxism as Theatre of the Oppressed does, InterPlay grows from a foundation in Christian liberation theology and the embodied knowledges of feminist and gay liberation social movements. In a time characterized by rapid globalization and

unprecedented technological development, social organizing across difference is crucial to any effort to achieve social change. Recognizing the ways in which InterPlay has evolved from subject positions and intellectual traditions different from my own, I endeavor to understand how my background relates to the InterPlay approach to change and to discern how I fit into their community of difference.

Performance and Social Change: the Aesthetic and the Social

The InterPlay approach to theatre for social change challenges discursive constructions of the relationship between the aesthetic and the social. Characterizing change as an immanent process, InterPlayers seek to bring about social movement by opening up latent capacities and modes of understanding on an individual basis, thereby transforming everyday life practices. This change is achieved as each person shares the InterPlay philosophy and practices, "body-to-body," with others. InterPlay is political, not in the sense of advocating for a particular platform, but in the sense of experimenting with alternative social relations and formations. Rather than exclusively striving to achieve social movement by organizing and fighting for representation and policy change, the InterPlay movement endeavors to unlock immanent capacities and realize social change through performance and embodied social practice.

This understanding of immanent change through aestheticized performances of self in the everyday contests scholarly constructions of the relationship of the social and the aesthetic. Andrew Hewitt's term "social choreography" seeks to conceptualize dance, and socially structured patterns of movement more generally, as sites of social indoctrination as well as resistance. He presents the aesthetic as "not

purely superstructural or purely ideological. Social choreography is an attempt to think about the aesthetic as it operates at the very base of social experience" (2005, 2). Similarly, in *Social Works*, Shannon Jackson claims that "to take an aesthetic stance on the social is to exercise the relative autonomy of the aesthetic domain, using that distance to defamiliarize normative categories and modes of perception," (2011, 25) arguing that, in order to more fully understand the nature and impact of social practice art, we need to acknowledge how these works both exemplify and call attention to the heteronomous nature of artistic praxis. Both Hewitt and Jackson argue against the notion that a separate aesthetic realm is a mere reflection of social realities.[14] They maintain the discursive construction of art as an autonomous category in order to argue that this autonomy authorizes it with the power to change, through defamiliarization, the social. This conceptualization of autonomy is crucial to the theorization of change with regard to the traditional social movement theory, as well as the discursive construction of economic forces as autonomous within traditional Marxist notions of base and superstructure, which understand systemic change as the result of an external force.

However, these discursive constructions of the aesthetic and the social continue to be rooted in the logic of an industrial era, failing to account for the blurring of play and everyday life that I have described in the practices and

---

[14] These theorizations of the relationship between social and aesthetic are similar to those of other scholars cited throughout this text. For example, Richard Schechner and Victor Turner, in their understanding of aesthetic and social dramas, conceptualize the two realms as separate domains acting upon one another in a continuous feedback loop. Their theory is encapsulated in a diagram that structures this relationship as a figure eight in which the result of an aesthetic drama becomes the starting-point for a social drama and vice-versa. In this conceptualization, both domains remain efficacious, with neither realm becoming a mere reflection of the other. Additionally, Thomas Hendricks's characterization of play as the creative engine of cultural production and labor as the engine of economic production described in the section on InterPlay(bor) strives to construct a similar parallel.

philosophy of InterPlay—a blurring that is also characteristic of late capitalist

frameworks more generally. Jon McKenzie, in his *Perform or Else* (2001), argues

that scholarly understandings of the relationship between the aesthetic and the social

are rooted in a binary between labor and leisure—work and play—that no longer

applies in the context of the late capitalist workplace. McKenzie calls for a revision of

Turner's theory of the liminal to the liminoid, which I have used to characterize

InterPlay throughout this thesis. Turner's theory describes the anti-structural capacity

of ritual, theatre, and play as well as their concomitant potential to produce

communitas. His distinction between the liminal and the liminoid lies in the transition

from a pre-industrial agrarian context to an industrial one in which the realms of labor

and leisure become more strictly separate. McKenzie coins the term *liminautic* in

order to describe a "postindustrial liminality," (93) which results from the breakdown

of the work/play dichotomy through technological innovation. I argue that InterPlay

is an example of a liminautic phenomenon that, in an era of continuous technological

change, conceptualizes the simultaneous transformation of individuals and their social

relations with one another as an immanent quality of a socioaesthetic realm.

     The InterPlay approach to change as an immanent process manifests itself

through their efforts to transform their own local communities rather than to intervene

in those of which they are not a part. While their fundraising model offers them the

autonomy they require in order to operate as a community of difference—in which

InterPlay leaders are utilizing the practices and philosophy in ways that are

appropriate to the goals and values of their particular communities—the InterPlay

movement doesn't conceptualize this autonomy as a source of power that enables

them to transform other communities, but only as the means through which to maintain the self-governance of their own process for change. The InterPlay understanding of change as something constant, creative, and potentially healing is also characterized by its rejection of models of thinking that rely on the creation of binaries in categorizing human experience. In closing, I will examine how the rejection of binary thinking in the InterPlay philosophy contributes to their understanding of change as immanent and how this approach to the categorization of human experience reflects this reconceptualization characteristic of late capitalism.

Healing Splits

Rather than positing change as the result of an autonomous external force, practitioners of InterPlay conceptualize change as something immanent to both individual people and the systems that they collectively create. InterPlayers, in their effort to build communities of difference, acknowledge the heterogeneity of both individuals and groups. It is this heterogeneity that allows for change to be conceptualized as an immanent process. Individual change is experienced as an opening up of latent capacities and modes of perception through play and the application of this attitude of playfulness to everyday life. On the organizational level, the InterPlay community experiences change as an ongoing redefinition of their organizational structures through constant acknowledgement of the differences embodied in their community. The InterPlay approach to social change understands the growth of the InterPlay movement as a process of attraction that takes place within communities to which its members belong. For these reasons, during the InterPlay Art and Social Change Untensive, Winton-Henry described "balanced

holistic leaders" as "probably InterPlay's biggest contribution to social change"

(conversation with the author, Oakland, California, 7-30-2015). As individuals

choose to make the InterPlay practice and philosophy an ongoing part of their lives,

they unfold latent potentialities in the many communities of which they are already a

part.

This understanding of individuals and systems as heterogeneous entities

results in part from a rejection of binary thinking in the InterPlay "embodied

philosophy." This philosophy rejects the artificial categorization of human

experience, encouraging participants to "have" their experience without needing to

verbalize it—imprisoning it within linguistic structures. InterPlayers describe efforts

to avoid this categorization and its resultant forms of binary thinking as endeavors to

"heal" what they refer to as "splits." These "splits" are constructed divisions that

influence the way in which the world is experienced. The division between mind,

body, and spirit is one of the core examples of these kinds of "splits" to which they

refer. In *The Wisdom of the Body*, Porter and Winton-Henry characterize these splits

saying:

> We are asked to view the world and our experience of it as discrete,
> independent, and even conflicting parts, rather than seeing it as a whole. Our
> culture and language, our frameworks for understanding and describing our
> experience, and our social, political, and economic systems encourage split
> thinking and action… Individual, collective, and systemic splits are often
> interrelated. In InterPlay, we seek to identify splits and either heal or
> counterbalance them. (1995, 19)

The InterPlay philosophy struggles to make its rejection of binary thinking and the

categorization of human experience understood within a language constructed largely

on oppositions.

Although their rhetoric is often characterized by a desire for a lost wholeness, I maintain that co-founders Winton-Henry and Porter, when addressing these "splits," do not advocate a Hegelian synthesis—the forced integration of oppositional categories—but a recognition of an interrelatedness that undermines the discursively constructed separation. They cite Robert McAfee Brown's book *Spirituality and Liberation* (1988) as an inspirational source for their thinking; Brown argues that the path to resolving binary thinking lies not in agonism nor in an artificial synthesis, but in the "radical recognition of complex interrelatedness" (112). InterPlayers understand categories of human experience not as separate and autonomous, but rather as complexly interrelated. This understanding can be seen in the way that Brown's language makes its way into Porter and Winton-Henry's *The Wisdom of the Body*: "Because of the language we use we assume that the distinctions between these categories are clear. In fact, closer examination reveals that the information that we have separated into these categories is completely intertwined, if not inseparable" (20). This understanding of human experience as an interwoven whole extends beyond the fragmentation of mind/body/spirit to all sorts of divisions: inner/outer, self/other, micro/macro, work/play, and social/aesthetic.

My study of the InterPlay performance practice and the community of its practitioners has sought to contribute to a more complex understanding of the interrelatedness of the domains of the aesthetic and the social and the process by which change occurs. The InterPlay philosophy reflects the breakdown of oppositional categories characteristic of late capitalist systems of production. Although for many scholars, this breakdown of the distinction between base and

89

superstructure has served as yet another basis for theorizing the significance of economic production in the shaping of social existence, it is my hope the InterPlay conceptualization of change as immanent will help others to understand performance not as merely a mirror reflecting social realities, but as an efficacious force in the shaping of our social world. InterPlayers believe that by engaging in performative play they are capable of creating a socially transformative community. This transformation is, for them, an immanent process of becoming for individuals as their understanding of the separation of play and everyday life becomes blurred.

Given the breakdown in categories of human experience characteristic of late capitalism, I argue that play should no longer be conceptualized as an activity separate from everyday sociality that produces change through an exertion of its autonomy onto the social realm, but as an immanent process of change constitutive of a socioaesthetic domain. This blending of the aesthetic and the social into a socioaesthetic realm manifests in the organizational practices of the InterPlay movement. This movement conceptualizes play as an activity immanent to systems that produces relational change to accompany or counterbalance rapid technological change. The InterPlay conceptualizations of change as immanent and of categories of human experience as complexly interrelated contribute to a deeper understanding of embodied performance play as a process of becoming that enables the actualization of potential social formations through rehearsal and enactment. What these formations might look like will depend on the range of voices included in this socioaesthetic play.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor. 1977. "Reconciliation Under Duress" in *Aesthetics and Politics*. London: NLB.

Andersen, Niels Åkerstrøm. 2009. *Power at Play: The Relationships between Play, Work, and Governance.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind; Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. San Francisco: Chandler Pub. Co..

Bishop, Claire. 2004. "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics." *October* 1 (110): 51-79.

Boal, Augusto. 1985. *Theatre of the Oppressed.* New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Body Wisdom, Inc. n. d. *InterPlay.org*. www.interplay.org. Accessed Mar 27, 2016.

Body Wisdom, Inc. 2014. *The Secrets of InterPlay Manual.* Oakland, CA: Body Wisdom Press.

Body Wisdom, Inc. 2012. *The InterPlay Experience*. Oakland, CA: Body Wisdom Press.

Bowman, Mark. 2012. *Oral History Interview: Phil Porter*. LGBTRAN.org. http://www.lgbtran.org/Exhibits/OralHistory/Porter/PPorter.pdf. Accessed Feb 24, 2016.

Bourriaud, Nicolas. 2002. *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Les Presses du réel.

Brown, Robert McAfee. 1988. *Spirituality and Liberation: Overcoming the Great Fallacy.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 2000. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Caillois, Roger. 1961. *Man, Play, and Games.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Caines, Rebecca, and Ajay Heble. 2015. *The Improvisation Studies Reader: Spontaneous Acts.* London: Routledge.

Carlson, Sarah. 2013. "InterPlay: A Tool for Cultivating Expression in Technique Class." *Journal of Dance Education* 13 (2): 61-63.

Cuninghame, Patrick. 2010. "Autonomism As A Global Social Movement." *WorkingUSA* 13 (4).

Dennis, Rea. 2010. "Intimacy at Work: Playback Theatre and Corporate Cultural Change in Mercedes Benz, Brazil." *Journal of Organisational Transformation & Social Change* 7 (3): 301-319.

Edmonson, Laura. 2011. "Confessions of a Failed Theatre Activist: Intercultural Encounters in Uganda and Rwanda" in *Avant-Garde Performance and Material Exchange: Vectors of the Radical.* Ed. Mike Sell. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ferris, William. 2002. "Theatre Tools for Team Building" in *Harvard Business Review*, 80 (12): 24-25.

Flanagan, Mary. 2009. *Critical Play: Radical Game Design.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Freire, Paulo. 2000. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* 30th anniversary Ed. New York: Continuum.

Gendlin, Eugene T. 1978. *Focusing.* New York: Everest House.

Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction.*
 Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Garden City, N.Y.:
 Doubleday.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of*
 Experience. New York: Harper & Row.

Hardt, Michael. 1999. "Affective Labor." *Boundary 2* 26 (2): 89-100.

Harvie, Jen. 2013. *Fair Play: Art, Performance and Neoliberalism.* Houndmills,
 Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Helliwell, John and Haifang Huang. 2011. "Well-Being and Trust in the Workplace."
 Journal of Happiness Studies 12 (5): 747-767.

Henricks, Thomas S. 2006. *Play Reconsidered: Sociological Perspectives on Human*
 Expression. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Hewitt, Andrew. 2005. *Social Choreography: Ideology As Performance in Dance and*
 Everyday Movement. Durham NC: Duke University Press.

Hicks, Cherrill. 2016. "What's behind the infantilising trend for adult 'play'?." *The*
 Telegraph, March 3. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/wellbeing/mood-and-
 mind/whats-behind-the-infantilising-trend-for-adult-play/.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human*
 Feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Huizinga, Johan. 1955. *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture.*
 Boston: Beacon Press.

Integrated Coaching Solutions. n.d. *Integrated Coaching Solutions.*
www.integratedcoaching.com.au. Accessed Mar 27, 2016.

Jackson, Shannon. 2011. *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics.* New
York: Abingdon, Oxon.

Jackson, Shannon. 2008. "What is the 'Social' in Social Practice?: Comparing
Experiments in Performance" in *The Cambridge Companion to Performance
Studies.* Ed. Tracey Davis. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism.*
Durham: Duke University Press.

Katsiaficas, George N. 1997. *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous
Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life.* Atlantic
Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.

Katzenbach, Emily. 2000. "Dance/Movement Therapy and the Interplay Technique
with Adolescent Students: Assisting the Developmental Process." Master's
Thesis, Columbia College Chicago.

Keller, Jared. 2015. "The Psychological Case for Adult Play Time." *Pacific Standard*,
April 9. http://www.psmag.com/health-and-behavior/throw-out-your-
computer-and-grab-some-legos.

Kerr, J. H., and Michael J. Apter. 1991. *Adult Play: A Reversal Theory Approach*.
Amsterdam; Berwyn, Pa.: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Kershaw, Baz. 1992. *The Politics of Performance: Radical Theatre As Cultural
Intervention.* London: Routledge.

Kücklich, Julian. 2009. "Michael Jackson and the Death of Macrofame" available at:
    https://lists.thing.net/pipermail/idc/2009-June/003664.html. Accessed Dec 12,
    2015.

Landy, Robert and David T. Montgomery. 2012. *Theatre for Change: Education,
    Social Action and Therapy.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lazzarato, Maurizio. 1996. "Immaterial Labor" in *Radical Thought in Italy: A
    Potential Politics.* Eds. Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt. Minneapolis, Minn.:
    University of Minnesota Press.

Lipsitz, George. 2015. "Listening to the Lambs" in *The Improvisation Studies
    Reader: Spontaneous Acts.* Eds. Rebecca Caines and Ajay Heble. London:
    Routledge.

Lobman, Carrie and Barbara E. O'Neill. 2011. *Play and Performance.* Play & culture
    studies, v. 11. Lanham: University Press of America.

Lotringer, Sylvère and Christian Marazzi. 2007. *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics.*
    Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Madison, D. Soyini. 2005. *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance.*
    Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Marx, Karl. 1973. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy.*
    New York: Vintage Books.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1967. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy.*
    New York: International.

McKenzie, Jon. 2001. *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance.* London:
    Routledge.

Nachmanovitch, Stephen. 1990. *Free Play: Improvisation in Life and Art.* New York:

    G.P. Putnam's.

Porter, Phil. 2005. *The Slightly Mad Rantings of a Body Intellectual Part One.*

    Oakland, CA: Wing It! Press.

Porter, Phil., Cynthia. Winton-Henry, and Body Wisdom Inc. 1997. *Having It All:*

    Body, Mind, Heart & Spirit Together at Last. Oakland, CA: Wing It! Press.

Porter, Phil., and Cynthia. Winton-Henry. 1995. *The Wisdom of the Body: The*

    InterPlay Philosophy and Technique. Oakland, CA: Wing It! Press.

Schechner, Richard, and Victor W. Turner. 1985. *Between Theater & Anthropology.*

    Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Scholz, Trebor. 2013. *Digital Labor: The Internet As Playground and Factory.* New

    York: Routledge.

Shusterman, Richard. 2012. *Thinking Through the Body: Essays in Somaesthetics.*

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Ross. 2012. "How Play and Games Transform the Culture of Work."

    American Journal of Play 5 (1): 1-21.

Stern, Tom. 2014. *Philosophy and Theatre: An Introduction.* London: Routledge,

    Taylor & Francis Group.

Sutton-Smith, Brian. 1972. "Games of Order and Disorder." Paper presented to

    Symposium on "Forms of Symbolic Inversion." American Anthropological

    Association, Toronto, December 1, 1972.

Sutton-Smith, Brian. 1997. *The Ambiguity of Play.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard

    University Press.

Turner, Victor W. 1982. *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play.* New York City: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Turner, Victor W. 1974. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors; Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Turner, Victor W. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co..

Wegner, Gretchen Jayanti. "'Sneaky Deep' Inquiry: Integrating Body Wisdom, Bodyspirit and Critical Action in the Classroom." Master's Thesis, Vermont College of Union Institute and University.

Winton-Henry, Cynthia. 2009. *Dance-- the Sacred Art: The Joy of Movement As a Spiritual Practice.* Woodstock, VT: SkyLight Paths Pub..

Winton-Henry, Cynthia, and Phil Porter. 2004. *What the Body Wants, from the Creators of Interplay.* Kelowna, BC: Northstone Pub..

Winton-Henry, Cynthia, and Phil Porter. 1993. *Body & Soul: Excursions in the Realm of Physicality and Spirituality.* Oakland, CA: Wing It! Press.

Yenigun, Sami. 2014. "Play Doesn't End With Childhood: Why Adults Need Recess Too." *All Things Considered*, *NPR*, August 6. http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2014/08/06/336360521/play-doesnt-end-with-childhood-why-adults-need-recess-too.