

**Opening Up Playback Theatre:
Perspectives from Theatre of the Oppressed and Developmental Transformations**

Nisha Sajnani, PhD

Director, Creative Alternatives
www.creativealternatives.co

David Read Johnson, PhD

Director, Institutes for the Arts in Psychotherapy
www.developmentaltransformations.com

Corresponding Author:

Nisha Sajnani

nisha@creativealternatives.co

Playback Theatre is a widely used form of applied theatre that provides individuals and communities a method of telling and listening to stories of human experience. This article aims to examine Playback Theatre from the lens of two other forms of applied theatre practice, Theatre of the Oppressed and Developmental Transformations. Our aim is to lay the foundations for supportive, contributory dialogue among similarly-minded applied improvisational theatre forms; dialogues that have generally been lacking in contemporary discourse. Through this dialogue, the function of story and testimony will be examined from the Romantic, Marxist, and postmodern philosophical lens' of these approaches, which may highlight potential avenues for the evolution of all three forms and specific openings within Playback Theatre.

A central purpose of Playback Theatre (PT), a theatre based on the spontaneous enactment of human experience, is to “draw people closer as they see their common humanity”.ⁱ Fox writes ‘if oppression can be defined as having no one to tell their story to, our mission has been to provide a space for anyone and everyone to be heard’ⁱⁱ. Both Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) and Developmental Transformations (DvT) also aim to facilitate the expression of human experience, reduce isolation, encourage dialogue, and attempt to disrupt oppression. All three forms are embedded in liberation strategies towards opening opportunities for free expression against the constraints of suppressive societal and cultural forces and institutions. Each utilizes improvisational, non-scripted theatre, evoking scripts, scenes, and stories from voluntary participants. In this sense, all three forms are a ‘theatre of the people.’ The differences among these three forms vary in their relationship to personal story, to psychotherapy, and to direct social and political critique. They also differ with respect to the intellectual traditions, aesthetic choices, and

social contexts of their progenitors. Nevertheless, the impetus of this paper arises from a gentle critique of Playback Theatre which, we believe, partially constrains its own efforts toward freedom and social cohesion through its allegiance to personal testimony characteristic of the Romantic tradition. We hope that by viewing Playback from the perspectives of Theatre of the Oppressed and Developmental Transformations, these constraints may be loosened.

Playback Theatre

Playback Theatre is a form of interactive non-scripted theatre developed by Jonathan Fox in 1974 wherein stories shared by audience members are improvised by a team of actors who reenact their stories through multiple dramatic forms. Fox intends PT to be an extension of a forgone oral tradition within which communities generate insight regarding their lived experiences through the sharing and witnessing of each other's storiesⁱⁱⁱ. He describes PT as a force for preserving social ecology by "transforming people's lives and making aggregations of people into communities of memory"^{iv}. He envisions the form as a means of intervening in a 'culture of separation' through the mutual sharing of lived experience and by strengthening the capacity for communities to experience and sustain multiple and complex perspectives^v.

The aesthetic space of a PT performance requires an empty stage space with two chairs set to one side for the *Conductor*, the intermediary between the audience and the stage, and for the *Teller*, a member of the audience who chooses to share a story. Across the back of the stage are boxes or chairs for the actors and a musician's area to the other side, opposite the Conductor. The props used traditionally consist of a set of colored

fabrics that can signify emotions, objects, and characters as needed.

Assumptions/Principles

The origins of PT are marked by a departure from the scripted theatre towards a return to an oral tradition of knowledge gathering, translation, and transmission. In order to support acts of collective remembrance within a culture of separation, PT grounds its practice in a theatre whose currency is not well-rehearsed prose but the emergent narratives that comprise the cultural knowledge of a people.

The fact that Playback theatre is an improvised, non-scripted form is of central importance to Fox who contrasts this form to a literary tradition and its conflation of aesthetics with artifacts (performance as product), “its tyranny of language, its culture of performance, its social practices,[and] its recreational purpose”^{vi}. Instead, Fox wished to position Playback Theatre as a theatre form that privileges “action over words, collectivity over individuality and hierarchy, simplicity and environmental involvement over technological grandeur”^{vii}. These values are evident in the simple, mobile aesthetics of the Playback form. Here, Playback mirrors values espoused in the Romantic tradition: celebrating each human being within his/her natural surroundings as a reaction against the industrialization and codification of human experience that arose in the early 19th century^{viii}. In his writing, Fox evokes images of families sitting together and telling each other stories, of transmission of knowledge from one generation to the next; with simplicity, in each other’s presence, ignoring for the moment the rush of the world that surrounds us. The sounds of the musician accompanying a Playback performance support the Romantic atmospheric of memory and innocence. This is echoed by playback theorist and practitioner, Heinrich Dauber, who emphasizes how PT has exchanged a

“consumer society of mass produced goods and services for a simpler, more convivial community oriented lifestyle”.^{ix}

Fox delineates several other concepts that he sees as central to the philosophy and practice of PT. The first of these is *spontaneity*, which he defines as “that flow of sensory information, evaluation, and action that fuels our ability to adapt with creativity to a constantly changing environment”^x. He proposes that improvisational theatre provides a ‘practicing ground for life,’ a means to simultaneously experience a moment and also gain perspective on it.

Service is also an ideal that is central to Playback, in contrast to a “self-indulgent, proud and hierarchical” theatre that tends to ignore its ethical responsibilities to address social needs. Fox uses the term ‘citizen actor’ to describe the task of the Playback actors who “perform as needed for the community [and] then melt back into the social fabric.”^{xi}. He also underscores the necessity of *grace* that “does not seek for perfection so much as find the perfect in what is”^{xii}.

The sacredness conferred upon everyday human experience, the grace that arises from everyday human failure, position PT as a force for social change against cultural activity that valorizes conformity and alignment with the dominant cultural narratives. Salas asserts the subversive nature of the form: “Playback theatre’s commitment to subjective truth...is radically empowering...in political contexts where the official story does not acknowledge personal, subjective experience.”^{xiii} As we will explore later, this perspective assumes a tension between subjective experience and dominant social narratives, inherent in the Romantic tradition. Where the Teller’s story colludes with or reinforces the official story, being unable to revise, critique, or comment upon it may

limit PT's ability to serve as a radically empowering force.

The *red thread* is a term that is used in PT to describe the connection that is created between audience members through the telling of their stories^{xiv}. Fox writes that “in stories, the value, the meaning, often reveals itself only indirectly”^{xv} and, therefore, conversation is taking place amongst those gathered even if, as playback practitioner Folma Hoesch, has noted, “stories are not commented on, analyzed, or worked out therapeutically.”^{xvi} Jenny Hutt and Bev Hosking, two PT practitioners, have taken the position that a group that gathers for a PT performance will tell and hear what they are able to tell and hear which also seems to acknowledge that these subconscious conversations are limited to the palate of those who attend and participate.^{xvii}

Finally, the redressive function of PT lies in its being both an artistic and interactive social event^{xviii}. It seeks to reveal humanity through purposeful, artistic accomplishment within an environment that is conducive to social interaction. Both Fox and Salas write about the role of the Conductor as being central in achieving an effective balance between artistic and social efficacy. Fox describes the Conductor as occupying a liminal space between the actors and the audience, not separate from either but a conduit for feelings, words, and images. In addition to the Conductor being a fellow actor and emcee, Fox states that the Conductor also leads the “actors and audience in the direction of ...the ‘illud tempus,’ that locus of meaning and rejuvenation which we often think of as a paradisiacal Eden but whose actual rediscovery is fraught with uncertainty”^{xix}. The Conductor encourages anyone to tell their story and notes that failure to do so “repeats the syndrome of [the isolated individual’s] interaction with society”^{xx}.

Fox resists modernist definitions of PT as a specialized form of educational

theatre or therapy. Referring to the originator of psychodrama, Fox notes that “one reason why Moreno, despite his early appearance on the scene, always remained outside the establishment was his willingness to go all the way in terms of purging feelings...the result, consistently, was high drama and a jolt to our habits of emotional distance and rationality”^{xxi}. Instead, Fox favors an “adult exchange between actors and audience rather than one which invites a kind of infantilism- a theatre that does not try to seduce me of my thoughts at the moment of termination, but has the confidence and courage to respect them”^{xxii}.

Playback Theatre, in the writing of Fox and Salas, appears to eschew the axioms of modernity and postmodernity through its grounding of *truth* (epistemology) in the subjective experience of the individual, *beauty* (aesthetics) as arising from harmony with Nature, ideas associated with the Romantic era, and *morality* (ethics) as predicated on Enlightenment ideals of common sense and tolerance wherein human beings are enrolled as reasonable and consistent agents of society able to tolerate differing narratives in egalitarian public spaces.

Invariant Components of a Performance

Constraints produced by the Playback form will likely result from the components that are not invited to vary. In Playback, these include 1) the role of the Conductor, who maintains an authoritative, benign, and central role; 2) the Teller’s story, which is often viewed as sacrosanct and belonging to the Teller, and 3) the absence of other perspectives on the Teller’s story shared by audience members, as required by the nonjudgmental environment of Playback and as limited by the composition of the audience.

A typical PT performance may begin with an introduction ritual in which

company members enter the aesthetic space and introduce themselves by sharing a brief personal narrative that relates to the theme in question, if there is a theme. As a means of preparing the audience to share their own stories, the Conductor may invite audience members to greet one another and then to share a brief experience as it relates to the theme. These initial experiences are played back through a variety of short forms leading to longer poetic renderings of personal story. This prelude might serve the purpose of decreasing the anxiety associated with telling a personal story in a public space as it reveals the form to be largely affirming of the stories shared. As the Teller describes their story, the Conductor asks them to pick specific actors to play the characters. When completed, the Conductor says, “Watch!” and the actors play out the story without rehearsal, usually with the accompaniment of a musician.

After the story is enacted by the actors, the Conductor turns to the Teller and asks if the performance matches their experience. If it does not, the actors usually will replay the revised version. Here is an example from Fox:

(Actors turn to the audience. Applause.)

Conductor: Before you sit down, I’d like to ask you to comment. Did that fit in with the spirit, if not all the details, of what happened? You can comment.

Ben (Teller): Yes.

Conductor: It did?

Ben: (nods)

Conductor: Well, thank you very much. (Ben sits down.)^{xxiii}

More often than not, the Teller expresses gratitude and says that the actors portrayed his/her story faithfully, and sits down. The Conductor does not ask for commentary from the audience nor questions any aspect of the story but rather, elicits the next story. Finally, performances are often concluded by witnessing a culminating enactment or poetic gesture by the company.

Throughout the performance, an atmosphere of reverence and respect for an individual's personal experience and right to tell their story is maintained. At the end of each performed story, the actors reverently turn toward the Teller in silence, awaiting the Conductor's question whether they had faithfully portrayed the spirit or essence of the Teller's story. The troupe conveys the feeling of their obligation to perform "acts of service," in which they attempt to "match" or "capture the essence of" the Teller's "truth," rather than any form of departure or commentary on it. The Conductor preserves a zone of protection around the Teller's experience which communicates, "nothing will interfere with the telling of this story."

Fox writes of an experience from which he learned the need to maintain this atmosphere of respect, having experimented with deconstructing and playing with Tellers' stories:

Once at a residential workshop a few of us were fooling around at the end of the evening. We started doing Playback, but the goal was to violate, not honor the Teller. The scenes were hilarious and incredibly energetic, as we released tension from the burden of so much hard, constructive work during the day. Many people were involved, including myself, and the scenes got wilder, until finally, exhausted, we all went off to bed. But

that was not to be the end of the story. Some people had been deeply hurt by what most of us saw as ‘play’ and it took a long time to clear up... I have thus learned first hand of the danger of such irreverent urges...The power of the liminal is so great that it cannot be played with lightly.^{xxiv}

Hutt and Hosking, like many playback practitioners, understand that “acceptance of the stories that are told is a highly valued aspect of this approach”.^{xxv} To those who have expressed “impatience or frustration of that stories are not ‘deep’ enough, not ‘political’ or not ‘political enough”, Hosking has stated that “ in [her] experience a community tells stories that they are interested in and that they are ready to tell and listen to.”^{xxvi} Once subject to other perspectives, the Teller is placed in a vulnerable position, which if allowed, may soon dissuade anyone from volunteering to be a Teller, critically interfering with Playback’s capacity to function.

Critical Perspectives on Playback Theatre

These invariant components within Playback, which certainly appear to be reasonable and necessary, nevertheless give rise to the following questions: 1) To what extent does the nonjudgmental atmosphere of PT allow implicit power dynamics, cultural and ethnic biases, or collusions with oppression to remain hidden and unexamined? 2) To what extent does locating the story within the Teller’s territory prevent examination or revelation of the story as the result of *collective* processes; that is, as emerging from within the Teller’s and the group’s racial, ethnic, socio-economic, gendered and familial history and in relationship to their ideas about how the audience imagines them, and thus

not wholly belonging to the individual ? 3) To what extent does the role of the Conductor sustain the illusion of the benign patriarch who, halfway between the Teller and the actors, remains charismatically neutral and above the fray, thus possibly avoiding examination or discussion of his/her use of power?

Fundamentally, our critique of Playback lies in its constraints against collective ownership and the decentering or questioning of authority, perspectives more fully expressed in Marxist and postmodern intellectual traditions. We turn now to two other forms of applied theatre, Theatre of the Oppressed and Developmental Transformations, which represent these alternate traditions, respectively. Both forms attempt to disrupt the usual integrity of the leader calling him/her the *Joker* and *difficultator* (TO) or the *playobject* and *broken toy* (DvT). Both create an atmosphere where the stories/views of the person/Teller/group are subject to feedback, challenge, and (playful) commentary. Both encourage the revealing and challenging (TO) or playing with (DvT) the cultural biases of the leader and participants, as both assume that bias and indeed, error, are always present. In bringing these forms of applied theatre into dialogue with Playback, perhaps new possibilities can be imagined.

The Theatre of the Oppressed

The Theatre of the Oppressed is a composite system of theatre-based exercises and performance strategies developed by Augusto Boal in the early 1960's in South America in response to the military dictatorship in Brazil and later, in Europe, in response to internalized oppression and its constellation of anxiety, depression, isolation, shame, and guilt that compromise human vitality and the possibility of change. At the core of

Boal's practice is the belief that theatre can enable everyday individuals, enrolled as *spect-actors*, to effect change in society through an active rehearsal of embodied reasoning. Since the publication of his seminal volume, *Theatre of the Oppressed*^{xxvii}, there have been many evolutions, adaptations, critiques, and context-specific development of his work in theatre, education, therapy, and advocacy around the world.^{xxviii}

Assumptions/Principles

Poetics as Politics. In his writing, Boal begins by intertwining poetics and politics. He relies on an Aristotelian concept of matter (art and science) as an enactment of potential, an evolving movement and not a finished product. However, departing from Aristotle, Boal suggests that the arts and sciences are not isolated but interrelated processes and that all that is 'in progress' is subject to politics: "the laws that rule over the relations of all men in their totality"^{xxix}. Central also to his philosophy is an understanding of power, knowledge, and justice as socially stratified, constituted, interlocking, and politically reinforced. He joins Bertolt Brecht in his Marxist understanding of society as resulting from the conflict between social classes (e.g. bourgeoisie and proletariat), and between the forces of production (e.g., labor force and technology) and the relations of production (e.g., individuals and institutions). Accordingly, Boal views the person as subject to socio-political forces, and thus society's possible futures must be interpreted in terms of these conflicts. While the bourgeoisie have their truth reflected in the architecture and artifacts of society, the proletariat or working classes have not had the same means to claim social, political, or economic space and therefore, their truths are always in the process of becoming, always emergent

and dependent on a struggle. Boal's theatre-based pedagogy emerges from an identification of one's relationship to current geopolitical expressions of a persistent, albeit increasingly complex, class conflict and embeds itself within this same conflict. It is not a neutral art. In his work on theatre and therapy, Boal suggests that isolation and other oppressive internal forces such as shame, depression, and anxiety arise from perverted social relations of power that are internally echoed, or introjected through a process he refers to as *osmosis*^{xxx}.

Dialectical Aesthetics. The aesthetics of the oppressed are embedded within an ongoing, evolving struggle; a dialectical embodied process of reasoning. In Boal's Marxist cosmology, human beings are produced out of their social interactions, are constantly changing, and do not have inherent virtues or flaws. Subjects are re/produced through encounters between differing and opposing forces. Similarly, in his pedagogy, a theatrical work cannot begin nor end in equilibrium, but rather "it must show the way society loses its equilibrium, which way society is moving, and how to hasten the transition...a theatre that attempts to change society cannot end in repose"^{xxxii}. In opposition to the tranquilizing aesthetics proposed by philosophers like Aristotle and Hegel, Boal relies on Brecht's aesthetic equation. In this formulation, what ought to be staged is the disequilibrium, the instability of justice, a clear exposition of the contradiction of social needs. "Whereas, proponents of an idealist poetics might inspire a quiet somnolence at the end of the spectacle; Brecht wanted the theatrical action to be the beginning of action: the equilibrium should be sought by transforming society, and not by purging the individual of his just demands or needs"^{xxxii}. In this formulation, the social, political and economic forces that compel the dramatic action are laid bare for the

audience to observe. It arouses the critical consciousness of the spectator and their capacity for action. Finally, the staged conflict must be left unresolved so that the fundamental contradictions of society emerge with greater clarity. The audience is left with a thirst for equilibrium, a desire for justice, and the palpability of the choices they may claim. What Boal adds to Brecht's equation is the possibility of direct action by inviting the spectator to the stage:

The poetics of the oppressed focuses on the action itself: the spectator delegates no power to the character to either act or think in his place; on the contrary, he himself assumes the protagonist role, changes the dramatic action, tries out solutions, discusses plans for change—in short, trains himself for real action. In this case, perhaps the theatre is not revolutionary in itself, but it is surely a rehearsal for the revolution.^{xxxiii}

For Boal, then, oppression is not an untold story (as in Playback), but a story that stops short of redressive action. Thus, Boal would prefer the clash and conflict of TO over the quiet, satisfying moment of silence typical at the end of a Playback story.

An Attitude of Rehearsal. Change in TO is approached through an *attitude of rehearsal*. The stories of those disenfranchised from their land, labor, capital, and/or affiliations are shared within rehearsal processes that lead to the development of images and public scenes that represent a collectively defined inequity or moment of oppression. However, these stories are understood as narratives in process, not as finished works.^{xxxiv} Consequently, TO is a theatre of rehearsal wherein people are encouraged to break with

the polite applause central to a bourgeoisie code of manners and instead to interrupt the action, to ask questions, to dialogue, and to participate in exploring all of the possibilities of addressing the inequities being staged.

This attitude of rehearsal is sustained by an intermediary figure called the *Joker* who, aligned more closely to the spectator than to the characters in the scene, explicitly calls for an analysis of the scene and jumps in and out of the action on stage. Methodologically, Boal's Joker embraces interchangeability and multiplicity. At the same time, the artistic predispositions of the Joker emphasize techniques that analytically deconstruct habits of thought, action, and time; they foster positive disorientation, the kind that demands new and/or deeper insight. Through a process that Boal refers to as *analogical induction*, the Joker invites participants to relate their individual stories to larger social and political realities as a means of moving from singular accounts to identifying to the locations and mechanisms of oppression that repeat within the collective, plural, experience of the group^{xxxv}. However, the Joker's role is also to interfere with simple solutions to the social contradictions staged and to *difficultate*, to stand outside the fictive reality staged, encouraging spect-actors to struggle with the complexities of injustice. Granted, the Joker's prompts and questions also arise from and are limited by his/her own cultural context^{xxxvi}. Therefore, it is imperative in this form that the Joker understand to some degree the perspective of the dominant forces, and their inner dynamics and strengths, so as to keep the exploration open and to present real challenges to proposed solutions. This is also important because direct perpetrators of the oppression staged are often not present and the audiences' own collusions with injustice are not always voiced by audience members themselves.

Boal discovered this impulse for the rapid solution in many of his audiences. As theorist and practitioner Mady Shutzman has stated, “the joker is a theorist...and a trickster who employs an aesthetic of ambiguity to obscure easy answers, to discourage heroism, and to deem submissiveness untenable.”^{xxxvii} The audience in TO therefore is not invited to *solve* the problem or to succeed. In fact, the majority of interventions offered in a Forum theatre performance, for example, will fail to represent a just outcome. Therefore, the focus is on inviting as many interventions as possible so as to rehearse acts of participation, to avoid pre-empting the audience’s desires to act and then, after the performance, to encourage audiences to realize plausible interventions in their real contexts. In contrast to the idea in Playback that the Teller is the source of a story that must be accepted, the story in TO is a collective possession, a work-in-progress that is altered, transformed, or abandoned as the group attempts to solve a social problem. No one in the room has a privileged position regarding the story.

Theatre of the Oppressed’s Perspective on Playback

Similarly to Playback Theatre’s departure from scripted sources of cultural knowledge, TO rejects the imposition of social and cultural values as defined by those who have the means to circulate their ideas. However, whereas Playback is concerned with the identification and preservation of a community’s truths (‘a common humanity’), TO is concerned with the exposure of lies which sustain the hegemonic practices that continue to advantage some groups over others. Within TO, the revelation of these lies begins with the intentional shedding of habitual social mores. The identification of and purging of coercive and restrictive lies is necessary to the survival of oppressed groups. TO will ask “what is at stake for those gathered?” Therefore, TO will question

Playback's positioning itself within a decontextualized, neutral space: for remaining neutral allows oppressive forces to continue unimpeded.

Second, TO will be interested in examining the power dynamics influencing or living within the story, and particularly in identifying acts of passivity or collusion by the characters. Instead of viewing each story as the telling of a subjective experience, TO will view the story as a relationship between participants in an exchange of power, that may or may not constrain conditions of free choice and mutuality. TO will also encourage naming or locating the oppressors in each narrative in order to avoid the repetition of harm that comes with silencing or occluding the presence of perpetration. Each story shared will be understood as a complex interweaving of personal and political narratives. For Boal, a story is a call to action, it portrays a problem that must be solved. A TO audience is not told, "Let us watch!" but "Let us do!" This difference is reflected in TO's orientation to time: a story is told in order for some change to occur, so TO's orientation is toward the future. Consistent with its Romantic roots, Playback seems oriented toward the past: a story is told to pass on experience, we are told what has happened, we are to listen, to receive.

Third, TO will seek to open up who can pose questions, comment, and act upon the images and scenes created in a PT performance. TO will privilege an aesthetic of discrepant perspectives, pluralism and instability over a monocular presentation of subjective truth. Thus it may be the notion of private ownership, the complete acceptance, of the Teller's story within Playback that is most challenging to the collective sensibilities of TO.

Developmental Transformations

Developmental Transformations, originated by David Read Johnson, is a dynamic, embodied, relational practice involving the continuous *transformation* of *embodied encounters in the playspace*. Johnson originated his approach in the United States in the early 1980's as a form of clinical intervention. It has continued to evolve and has been articulated as a form of embodied meditation, performance, and as an approach to social change.^{xxxviii} Central to the practice of DvT is the use of improvised free play as a means of disrupting encrusted (and at times harmful) forms of being and relating through expanding one's capacity to tolerate the anxiety that arises out of instability experienced in the body, within relationships and in the world, towards an increased capacity for acceptance, empathy, flexibility, intimacy and, above all, life-giving curiosity or *aliveness*. This play is realized within the context of individual or group encounters with a person(s) trained in this method who acts as a facilitator, immersing themselves in their participants' playspace to encounter and engage with the barriers that inhibit *presence*, otherwise described as an ongoing and available responsiveness, rather than fear of the instability of Being and relations with others.

Johnson's approach to encouraging freedom amidst instability occurs along a flexible, natural developmental sequence in which participants, together with a facilitator, freely improvise movements, sounds, images and scenes that arise from their thoughts and feelings in the moment within a defined playspace. The role of the facilitator is to maintain a state of play as participants encounter images and scenes that are troubling, unpreferred, or unplayable towards states of increasing freedom from the grip of painful

experiences and deeper capacities for self-acceptance and intimacy within their relationships.

Johnson describes four types of play that naturally emerge during the course of work in DvT. They are characterized by progressively intimate levels of relationship to one's body and to others in the imaginary social microcosm of the playspace. *Surface Play* revolves around social stereotypes and the issues that most immediately rise to the surface, especially power dynamics based on perceptions of difference in age, gender, class, ethnicity, 'race', and sexuality. *Persona Play* is characterized by references to the personal history of participants and is marked by an exploration of one's roles (e.g., as daughter, lover, mother, or sister). Here, personal stories not unlike those told in PT are revealed. *Intimate Play* includes movements, sounds, images and scenes that reveal and explore the spectrum of possible and impossible situations that have existed, might exist, and do exist between the players. *Deep Play* emerges as repetitive images and scenes referring to what has been played with in past encounters dissipate into traces, and the play becomes comprised of the dynamic and unstable actions of each other's glances, sounds, gestures, and bodies. Johnson has articulated the nuances of this work with both individuals and groups.^{xxxix}

Assumptions/Principles

DvT has been influenced and articulated through the philosophical prism of Buddhism, existentialism, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, critical race theory, performance theory, and client-centered approaches to psychotherapy.^{xl} However, at its core, DvT is informed by Johnson's phenomenological inquiry into the nature of play, unencumbered by any intermediary concepts. He remains inspired by acts of

spontaneous transformation explored by Viola Spolin, and by the removal of barriers to being (the *via negativa*), studied by Jerzy Grotowski. The fundamental meditation in DvT is on the possibility of attaining a sense of freedom within an intimate relationship with another, to be in the world despite its lack of groundedness, its multiplicity, its irony, reflecting DvT's postmodern sensibility.

Instability. The primary guiding postulate of DvT is that Being is unstable and that this instability is derived from the experience of *difference* which Johnson describes as “the discrepancies and incompleteness we encounter when we sense the world and struggle to comprehend it by stabilizing concepts, ideas, and repetitions”.^{xli} Here Developmental Transformations is aligned with the Buddhist axiom that all life is impermanent and turbulent. Human attempts to stabilize a self and a sense of coherence in society result in habitual repetitions that solidify into overdetermined performances of being and relating that prevent intimacy and growth. Johnson suggests that the human struggle is to remain engaged with the turbulence of variable and unpredictable change as it gives rise to life-giving movement. This is also what is required for the practice of theatrical improvisation and the first principle of DvT: *transformation*. In contrast to forms of applied theatre and psychotherapy that privilege linear narratives, consistent characters, and coherent story lines, this method purposefully attempts to disrupt existing patterns of being and relating, choosing instead to privilege that which is discrepant from the main story in order to clear a path for new and emergent ways of being to arise.

DvT assumes that stories serve to stabilize the author's experience of being, and thus, unlike Playback, tries to disrupt a person's “story” in the hopes of leaving it open and available to transform. From a DvT perspective, a Teller's story explains, justifies,

blames, comforts. The story can be more or less accurate, or a complete lie; it can serve to teach a moral lesson or can serve to demean or marginalize others. The obstacle in the hero's journey is, from another perspective, a victim. The actors finish their embodied reflection and gaze at the Teller, looking for the acknowledgement, "yes, that's how it is!" DvT intends to disrupt such endings, indeed, in its commitment to becoming, must deny endings.

Embodiment. The second principle of DvT proposes that being consolidates itself into both an energetic and material body. Johnson proposes that these energetic and material states of the body overlap and are experienced simultaneously, at levels of presence, desire, persona, and otherness, disrupted by encounters with other people. This disruption causes anxiety and may be experienced as a constraint of one's own freedom, especially in intimate encounters.

Encounter. The paradox of simultaneously existing as an energetic and material body is amplified exponentially when we are in proximity to another. Suddenly, our turbulence is met with the turbulence of an Other replete with their own impulses and desires. Just as our bodies are unstable and constantly changing, so too are our relationships with one another. The fear of being constrained and actual past experiences of being constrained in different ways, can lead a person to restrict the degree of intimacy they allow with others. DvT addresses this existential challenge by focusing individuals on their encounter with one another in order to reduce their fear of proximity.

Playspace. Finally, DvT occurs in a *playspace* defined as "a mutual agreement among the participants that everything that goes on between them is a representation or portrayal of real or imagined being".^{xliii} This particular conceptualization of play requires

of the participants a restraint against harm, mutual understanding, and the honest revealing of its pretend status. In this way, the conditions of the playspace are understood to define an ethical boundary around a moral space, which differentiates *real* actions from the *desire for* actions. These parameters of the playspace may contribute to decreasing the impulse for intimate and social violence as harmful enactments are allowed to be represented within a fictional frame.^{xliii}

Whereas TO uses theatre as a rehearsal for real action in the world that will lead to substantive change, DvT's perspective is that the rehearsal element of theatre should be applied to violent or oppressive actions, that is, that play is not only a means for social change, it is an end or goal of social change itself. In this sense, DvT's orientation to time is that of the present, rather than the future orientation of TO: the goal is to achieve mutual understanding and restraint from harm among the participants here-and-now in the present moment, and then again in the next moment as these conditions are weakened or breached.

Playobject. The facilitator in DvT acts as a willing guide who leads the way into the playspace and who attempts to maintain an active, spontaneous, playful, humorous, and creative relationship with the participant(s). The facilitator, as *playobject*, acts in a similar manner to Boal's Joker, in that he/she faithfully reflects back to the participant(s) how they appear to experience the world, and at other times, can portray various obstacles to the participant's views, challenging them to consider alternative perspectives. These embodied acts of deconstruction allow the facilitator and participant to inhabit their socially constructed gendered, racialized, and sexualized roles (amongst others) while simultaneously calling these same roles into question, a task greatly aided though

playfulness, humor and irony. The facilitator, as playobject, also serves to highlight the many ways that they may both collude with, oppress, or hypocritically complain about others. In contrast to Playback, where it is rare for the Teller to reveal a story in which they perpetrated on someone else, it is quite common in DvT. Johnson describes the facilitator as the participant's *broken toy* that the participant must learn to play with despite its torn edges, worn surfaces, and missing parts. In this fashion, DvT intrinsically conceptualizes authority as damaged and relative, encouraging participants to actively approach and play with its various incarnations.

Developmental Transformations' Perspective on Playback

Developmental Transformations views each "story" produced by a Teller as multi-authored, with contributions from the Teller, their family, their cultural traditions, their various perpetrators and enemies, and even the audience, for the Teller will shape their story in anticipation of how a particular audience will receive it. Consistent with its postmodern sensibilities, DvT thus de-centers authorship and raises questions about the sacredness of any story. Each story lives in a mutual space, and for the price of that mutuality comes a loss of control and possession. Similarly to TO, singular stories shared in DvT have collective significance and become shared territory; they are collages. For DvT, the imaginal space cannot be divided into private properties.

A DvT perspective allows for an acceptance of the self-serving nature of most storytelling: Tellers are less likely to tell stories that implicate their own deficits, abuses, and moral faults as this would most likely be unpalatable to them and to their audience. DvT forgives us, but does not ignore the fact that we are the star of our own show, the hero or heroine of our own journey. In order to maintain one's proximal territory as

good, the bad is inevitably shifted into other territories of the story, typically enacted by the obstacles presented to the Teller.

In so doing, a DvT perspective on Playback will attempt to surface the hidden collusions of the Teller and Conductor with current stratifications of power, the subtle collective agreement to blame Others who are not represented by people present in the room. DvT will seek out and portray the Otherness set aside in the Teller's story, to give voice not only to the Teller, but also to the One to Blame implicit within that story. DvT will no doubt utilize its fundamentally comic stance to the world to buffer the effect on the Teller: we are all fools, we are all to blame! DvT will disrupt the tendency toward seriousness in a Playback performance, concerned that the quiet moments of respect are covering new acts of silencing otherness.

Analysis of a Playback Theatre performance

In order to illustrate the differences in perspective of Theatre of the Oppressed and Developmental Transformations on Playback Theatre, we will examine an actual PT performance. The following is an excerpt from a PT performance provided by Jonathan Fox in his book, *Acts of Service*.^{xliv} The performance begins with a number of fluid sculptures reflecting brief anecdotes from the audience and then moves to a story by Ben about a fight between his two sons, a story by Gerald about ignoring his family when he buys a computer, then several sound sculptures, then a story by Tessa about having to give her dog away. Then Jonathan asks members of the audience to become actors. Their first story is by Barbara who tells a story about her obnoxious brother refusing to get off the phone. The next story, by Judy (a PT actor) follows:

Judy says it is a story about brothers and sisters. When she was ten, she and other children in her neighborhood were putting on a play about Till Eulenspiegel, a mischievous person who annoyed the townspeople so much, they hung him. She enrolled her 4 year old brother as Till, and devised a harness and tied a rope to it, and pulled him up in the air over a rafter, while he pretended to be dying. This was staged in her family's garage. Her father arrived and found his son hung up in the air, and Judy and the other children chanting, "Hang him, hang him!" Her father was shocked and outraged, but - to her - not understanding that this was just theatre and her brother was perfectly safe. When the actors played out the scene, the person playing the father was forgiving of her, unlike the real story, but Judy said she preferred it like that, because she had always felt her father had not appreciated her interest in theatre and she would have wanted him to be forgiving.

Conductor (to the Actors): Hold this for a second! (To Teller) Is that what happened?

Judy: I wish it had. I think after all those years, I finally got what I wanted.

Conductor: Uh, huh... Tell me what really happened when he came in.

Judy: I was punished very severely, and sent to my room, and not allowed to play with those friends for a long time.

Conductor: Now, as you know, sometimes in Playback Theatre we ask people, particularly when they tell a story that has been an unhappy one, because it's theatre we can redo it... because in a way that was...

Judy: That was it.

Conductor: Right.

Judy: That was just great.

Conductor: Thank you very much Judy, and thank you audience actors. (they return to their seats. Applause.)

Now in this telling, the Teller casts her father as “not understanding” but is satisfied with the Actors’ rendition of the story in which he is understanding once informed that his son was only being hung from the rafters as part of a play. Here the Conductor offers the Teller to retell it in its original form, but she prefers not to.

Now, is it possible that members of the audience might have had a similar unsympathetic reaction if their 10 year old daughter actually hung their 4 year old son up over a rafter as part of a play? Is it possible that some 4 year olds might have felt obligated or forced to cooperate with their older sister against their better sense? True, the story was pretend, but the rope and the rafter were not pretend. Clearly, other versions of the story might implicate the Teller as having not used her best judgment, but in this case are not explored.

From TO and DvT perspectives, there are a number of stories that have not been expressed: the father’s, which is how to instruct his 10 year old daughter why hanging her brother on a rope in the garage without parental supervision might be dangerous. The brother’s, who might have felt forced to volunteer for the role. The other children’s, who may have been excited to engage in this type of sadistic activity. Another question: why were a group of young children left alone in the garage for long enough for this to happen; where was the mother?

Let us compare for a moment how the other two approaches might develop this story if unconstrained by the Playback form.

A TO approach if presented with this story, might go something like this:

Joker: What kind of oppression is present in this story that is also present in our society?

P1: It is about absent fathers. The parent is responsible for what went on in his house.

P2: It is about the suppression of children. They can be seen but not heard.

Joker: What do we know about the tale of Till Eulenspiegel?

P3: It's a medieval folk tale about a trickster, Till Eulenspiegel, whose name is a pun with two meanings: owl mirror, which means being a wise reflection on society; and "wipe the arse"; combined it means "wise ass." This trickster did hurtful tricks especially as a way of exposing the stupidity and corruption of officials and institutions in Germany. The operatta Judy remembers was Strauss' "tone poem" from around 1900, in which the trickster is beheaded by the town at the end.

Joker: So he is The Joker!

All: laughter.

Joker: So perhaps I should play him!

All: Yes.

P2: But wasn't Judy being a prankster too? And she got punished as well!

Joker: Does this story remind you of a situation of oppression that exists today?

P3: It makes me think of the suppression in our culture of the joker, the commentator, the theatre as social critic.

P1: It makes me think about censorship and the corporations that own our media and control what we think about.

P2: It also makes me think about how marginalized comedians and all artists are, even though they are the ones who hold up a mirror to society.

Joker: It's dangerous to be a social critic and the townspeople didn't buy it just like Judy's father didn't buy it. Let's create images representing a moment each of you related to in the story (Here, personal stories shared within a TO group are used to propel investigation into larger social themes of oppression. Participants, at this stage, might create various images and scenes relating to the oppression of the social critic in society and this might become the basis for further work through image or forum theatre).

A DvT encounter, when presented with this story might go something like this:

Facilitator: That was so unfair for your father to punish you!

Judy: I'll say.

F: After all, your brother was four years old, so he was completely capable of signing the informed consent form you gave him before hauling him up.

J: Well, I didn't really have a form...

F: Oh, why would you need one when, as his older sister, you only had his interests in mind? After all, I'm sure you did not enjoy seeing him playing the role of the scapegoat, being teased and harassed by the mob below!

J: It was entertaining.

F: Entertaining?

J: Yeah, fun.

F: Yes, as is all good theatre! After all, it was...

Together: ONLY THEATRE!

F: You know, it is SO GOOD to be able to express one's sadistic, homicidal urges SAFELY through theatre, isn't it!

J: I'll say.

F: That's why I became a drama therapist!

J: Really, you have sadistic urges?

F: (Darkly.) Well, actually, yes I do.

J: Toward me?

F: Now that you mention it.....ha, ha ,ha, let me take you over to the corner here!

J: What are you doing?

F: I'm going to hurt you.

J: You're going to hurt me? I don't want to be hurt!

F: Excellent, that's perfect, it's no fun if my victims want to be hurt.

J: What are you going to do?

F: Don't worry, it's only pretend, ha, ha, ha!

J: You're making fun of me.

F: Big time. You know, I love this story because it must be the reason you became interested in applied theatre.

J: You mean my father not understanding I was only playing...?

F: Yes, so from then on you said to yourself, from now on I am going to try to show people that it is important to be able to tell their stories in a nonjudgmental atmosphere.

J: Yes, my father...

Both: SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SO JUDGMENTAL!

F: No matter how sadistic the story.

J: No matter how sadistic the story.

F: Are the knots tight enough?

J: No, you can make them tighter. (laughs)

F: My pleasure.

These two variations might be how Theatre of the Oppressed and Developmental Transformations would approach Judy's story. In Fox's analysis of this session, in *Acts of Service*^{xlv}, he makes no mention of these alternate readings of Judy's story, accepting instead her view of her father's "misplaced rage." He emphasizes the inclusivity of Playback Theatre, its "communal" nature, its privileging of "social relatedness," and the generally open-ended nature of PT. On the surface, it appears that Fox's fundamental assumption is in the well-meaning and goodness of people. Whereas TO may make the assumption that people will act in order to maximize their own power, and DvT may make the assumption that people will act in their own self-interest, PT may avoid representing these possibilities.

The challenge is clear: to open up the dialogue from what occurred in Fox's text is to reveal disturbing power dynamics, historical legacies, and decenter the victim role, so that neither the Teller nor the audience is protected from alternate readings of their story but rather brought closer through a more permeable, multifaceted yet gracefully flawed representation. How can this be done without placing the Teller in too vulnerable a position?

Imagining Opportunities for Playback Theatre

We must leave it to the practitioners of Playback Theatre to determine whether and how variations of technique suggested here can be integrated into the work. We will only point to a few moments during a Playback Theatre performance that TO and DvT

perspectives will identify as potential opportunities to open up the Playback form. Indeed, some of these suggestions are already quite familiar to PT practitioners.

The first moment is during the Introduction by the Conductor, as he/she is warming up the audience and communicating what the purpose of PT is and the nature of stories. The Conductor's task is to establish the frame of safety and communal purpose by emphasizing the respect each story will receive and the necessity for the suspension of judgment. However, here is an opportunity (both at the beginning and throughout the performance) for the Conductor to encourage the audience to reflect on 1) how stories arise within one's cultural, ethnic, national, historical legacy, 2) that the stories are often the record of a conflict among parties that differ in power and privilege, 3) that stories are told from the perspective of the Teller which may differ from the stories as told by others who may be present or absent, and 4) that stories may not be true.

The next opportunity arises when the PT actors introduce themselves through the sharing of their own personal anecdotes. Here, actors might model a range of stories highlighting their own mixed or discrepant experiences of being a target or agent of oppression and in so doing, expand the boundaries of what can be told and heard during a PT performance. Having a company of actors that physically resemble but also differ from the community gathered may also serve to elicit a broader range of experience. Providing this range of experiences may also allow diversely located audience members more opportunities to feel a sense of resonance and identification.

Another moment occurs when the Conductor asks the Teller to tell the story. It may be possible here for the Conductor to open up possibility simply by asking each Teller: "So you have a story?... (Yes)... Great. Is this a true story or a made-up story?"

After the Teller has told the story and has chosen the actors for the various roles, the Conductor might also ask: “So two more questions: From your point of view, who has the power in this story? And would the other people in the story tell the story the same way?” These questions, while remaining open-ended and neutral, help to keep the edges of the story open to new possibilities.

The next moment will be during the enactment wherein actors could symbolically, or through the use of narration, represent the internalized or systemic perpetrators and forces implicated in the story. A few of the actors might also take responsibility for oscillating between faithful and divergent renderings of the stories shared. In this way, actors avoid the trap of an overly literal reflection and can inhabit, as the Joker does, a playful commentary that might provide additional dimension and perspective. By adopting a more ironic and playful role, the actors may also find a way to reveal their own assumptions and associations about the story rather than having to constrain their thoughts and feelings until after the performance.

Another moment will be that at the end of the enactment by the actors, when the Conductor turns to the Teller. Clearly, asking the Teller whether the enactment “fit in with” or “expressed the essence of” their story is likely to bring closure to the process. Instead of this question, others may help to open up possibilities: “What is your reaction to this performance of your story?” “If they were to do the story again, what should they emphasize more?” “If the other people in your story were here, how would they react to this performance?” “Would they want to alter some part of this story?.....Which part?” “Is there a way you could change something in the story that would make it turn out better

for you, without making it worse for somebody else?” These questions might serve to encourage a re-telling of the story with some type of variation.

After each enactment, the Conductor could also ask the audience to share stories or their reflections about the Teller’s story as a means of extending the singular narrative to the collective, leading possibly to the selection of the next Teller. The Conductor could also ask the audience to share their experience of participating and being witness to a Playback performance, on being facilitated and having their experiences represented by others, so as to invite any suppressed comments to come forward toward a greater openness. The role of the Conductor may also be rotated amongst members of the PT company so as to afford multiple shapings of each story offered by the audience.

These moments are especially rife with possibility for integrating the perspectives of Theatre of the Oppressed and Developmental Transformations into the traditional Playback Theatre form. We offer these ideas in the spirit of encouraging continued experimentation and exploration of the Playback Theatre form, and its powerful approach to communal storytelling.

A number of practitioners have published variations of Playback Theatre that already integrate some of these ideas. Hannah Fox has been experimenting with the intersections of PT and TO since 2001 and offers that TO-related exercises might precede a PT performance as a means of providing participants an opportunity to develop a collective analysis about salient themes prior to sharing personal stories.^{xlvi} She has also suggested that the reverse has also been useful in that personal stories shared within PT might become a spring board for an investigation of social themes through TO-related methods of inquiry and performance.

Armand Volkas' work in *Healing the Wounds of History* offers an example of a use of Playback Theatre that incorporates the influences of both TO and DvT, methods in which he has been trained.^{xlvii} The important aspect of Volkas' work is in bringing members of polarized groups, such as Palestinians and Israelis, or Japanese and Koreans, into the same room together. Each group inevitably tells stories in which the other group is portrayed as the perpetrator. These conditions more fully satisfy the perspective of TO in identifying the influences of one's cultural context, and DvT's perspective of having the Other present.

Nick Rowe has provided an analysis of PT that emphasizes theoretically many of the points raised here including the need to 'open up' the playback form so as to allow for a "response: one that is never more than fully human, always partial and inevitably shot through with subjectivity and omission".^{xlviii} His work is especially important for playback actors whom he encourages to accept their fallibility and vulnerability in each encounter they attempt with their audiences.

The work of Creative Alternatives' Living Histories Theatre Ensemble, directed by Nisha Sajnani, takes up many of the ideas mentioned in this paper. Both of these companies have sought to forge stronger social networks within cities, community agencies, and schools by cultivating diverse and mixed audiences, by developing forms of representation that reveal the cultural associations and biases of the actors, and by intentionally focusing on experiences of displacement and belonging within their audiences.

Finally, Jonathan Fox has also discussed the necessary evolution of the PT form towards an increasing openness and awareness. In a recent article written for Interplay, the newsletter of the International Playback Theatre Network, he writes:

But as I continued through the 80's and 90's, my view shifted. To focus on the individual story felt insufficient. I became much more aware of the group story (emerging as the "red thread"). We also began to question whether in fact the experience of telling was always positive. What were the ethics of public telling? Did tellers feel shame telling in Playback? Did they regret it afterwards? What about when our code of respect for the teller clashed with our sense of justice fairness? For instance, how to handle a prejudiced teller? And how should we deal with those stories where the teller's experience in part of a larger sociopolitical story?^{xlix}

In the remainder of his article, Fox points to the need to expand Playback both vertically, by encouraging representations of the social story within each personal narrative offered, and horizontally by encouraging diversity within the audiences gathered so that other perspectives may be more likely to be heard.

Conclusion

Though Playback was originally situated in theatre, Theatre of the Oppressed in politics, and Developmental Transformations in psychotherapy, all three emerged out of the liberation sensibilities of their authors, meaning they intend to leave traces of the possible with each participant, and support an openness to emergent knowledge in society at large. All three of these methods have much to gain from the other and further investigation into the interstices between these forms will certainly be a contribution to

the field. Through their commitment to performance, these methods produce a multiplicity of representations that displace, by the very process of proliferation, the hegemonic authority of conservative ideology sustained by its myths, stereotypes, rituals, and narrow aesthetic practices. These multiplications and proliferations of difference engendered by Playback, Theatre of the Oppressed, or Developmental Transformations, are evidence of the radical capacity of art to deconstruct, resist, and change oppressive systems of representation and control.

Endnotes

ⁱ See the Center for Playback Theatre: <http://www.playbackcentre.org/>

ⁱⁱ Jonathan Fox, *Acts of service: Spontaneity, commitment, tradition in the non-scripted theatre* (New Paltz, NY: Tusitala, 1994), 6.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Ibid.*

^{iv} *Ibid.*, 212.

^v Jonathan Fox, "A Ritual for Our Time" in *Gathering Voices: Essays on Playback Theatre*, eds. Jonathan Fox and H. Dauber (New Paltz, NY: Tusitala, 1999), 121

^{vi} Fox, 1994, 75.

^{vii} *Ibid.*, 75.

^{viii} I. Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism* (London: Chattis & Windus, 1999)

^{ix} Heinrich Dauber, "Tracing the Songlines: Searching for the Roots of Playback Theatre" in *Gathering Voices: Essays on Playback Theatre*, eds. Jonathan Fox and H. Dauber (New Paltz, NY: Tusitala, 1999), 67-76

^x Fox, 1994, 215.

^{xi} Fox, 1994, 214.

^{xii} *Ibid.*

^{xiii} Salas, 1993, 12.

^{xiv} Folma Hoesch, "The Red Thread: Storytelling as a Healing Process" in *Gathering Voices: Essays on Playback Theatre*, eds. Jonathan Fox and H. Dauber (New Paltz, NY: Tusitala, 1999) 46-66

^{xv} Fox, 1999, 119.

^{xvi} Hoesch, 1999, 49

^{xvii} Jenny Hutt and Bev Hosking, "Playback Theatre: A Creative Resource for Reconciliation", retrieved December 10, 2010, <http://www.brandeis.net/ethics/peacebuildingarts/recasting/gallery/hutthosking.html>, 1-42

-
- xviii Jo Salas, "What is "Good" Playback Theatre?" in *Gathering Voices: Essays on Playback Theatre*, eds. Jonathan Fox and H. Dauber (New Paltz, NY: Tusitala, 1999), 17-35.
- xix Fox, 1994, 134.
- xx Ibid, 136.
- xxi Ibid, 71.
- xxii Ibid, 150.
- xxiii Ibid, 226.
- xxiv Ibid, 106-107.
- xxv Jenny Hutt and Bev Hosking, 15
- xxvi Ibid, 16
- xxvii Augusto Boal, *The Theatre of the Oppressed* (New York: Urizen Books, 1979)
- xxviii Augusto Boal, *Hamlet and the Baker's Son* (New York: Routledge Press, 2001); Ibid, *The Aesthetics of the Oppressed* (New York: Routledge Press, 2006); Jan Cohen-Cruz and Mady Schutzman, *Playing Boal* (New York: Routledge Press, 1994); Ibid, *A Boal Companion: Dialogues on Theatre and Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge Press, 2006); Nisha Sajjani, "Theatre of the Oppressed: Drama Therapy as Cultural Dialogue" in *Current Approaches in Drama Therapy, 2nd Edition*, eds. David R. Johnson and Renee Emunah (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 2009), 445-460
- xxix Boal, 1979, 11.
- xxx Augusto Boal, *The Rainbow of Desire* (New York: Routledge Press, 1995)
- xxxi Boal, 1979, 106.
- xxxii Ibid, 106.
- xxxiii Ibid, 122.
- xxxiv Ibid, 142.
- xxxv Boal, 1995
- xxxvi Paul Dwyer, Making Bodies Talk in Forum Theatre
- xxxvii Cohen-Cruz and Schutzman, 1994, 147.
- xxxviii David R. Johnson, D. "Developmental Approaches in Drama Therapy" *Arts in Psychotherapy*, 9, (1982) 183-190; Ibid, "Developmental Transformations: Towards the Body as Presence" in *Current Approaches in Drama Therapy, 2nd Edition*, eds. David R. Johnson and Renee Emunah (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 2009), 89-116. Ibid, "The Developmental Method in Drama Therapy: Group treatment With the Elderly" *Arts in Psychotherapy* 13, (1986), 17-34; David R. Johnson, Alice Forrester, Cecilia Dintino, Miller James, and Greta Schnee, "Towards a Poor Drama Therapy" *Arts in Psychotherapy* 23, (1996), 293-308; Fred Landers, "Dismantling Violent Forms of Masculinity Through Developmental Transformations" *Arts in Psychotherapy* 29, (2002) 19-30. Christine Mayor, *Playing with Race: Drama therapy, Critical race theory, and Performance Studies* (Masters Thesis, New York University, 2009)

-
- xxxix Johnson, 2009.
- xl Johnson, 2009, Landers, 2002, Mayor, 2009
- xli Johnson, 2009, 90.
- xlii Ibid, 93.
- xliii Johnson, 2009, Landers, 2002.
- xliv Fox, 1994.
- xlvi Ibid, 37-55.
- xlvi Hannah Fox, *Weaving Playback Theatre with Theatre of the Oppressed* (Center for Playback Theatre: New Paltz, NY, 2007)
- xlvi Armand Volkas, "Healing the Wounds of History," in *Current Approaches in Drama Therapy, 2nd Edition*, eds. David R. Johnson and Renee Emunah (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 2009),145-171.
- xlvi Nick Rowe, *Playing the Other in Playback Theatre*, (UK:Jessica Kingsley, 2007), 182.
- xlvi Jonathan Fox, "Playback Theatre Expansion", *Interplay: Newsletter of the International Playback Theatre Network*, June 2010, 33-34.