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What this socio-biological emphasis does is open up two things – to make their interest in play become an interest in full human flourishing, rather than simply to fabricate good intentions (or at least, some relatively easy pathways) to some degree of human flourishing. I think we're all Homer Simpsons at heart, needing to be shown the error of our ways.

For me there's a political question about this framework. It is driven much by the current trends of “behavioural economics” and “choice architecture” (known as the Nudge school), dominated in quite a lot of policy and business. They think we're all essentially Homo sapiens, constantly searching for the right contexts and conditions for our self-expression and creative urges.

Sure – and what this question demonstrates is how thinking about play reveals subtleties at all levels of reality. It's only in recent years that I've realised how much my understanding of play is rooted in my (layman's) understanding of various scientific disciplines. What I described as “the player's paradox” above is a framework taken from complex adaptive systems theory – which sees play as the potential for elements within a system (whether they be molecules, ants or people) to act with a degree of energetic unpredictability, those actions building into wider waves of change that help the overall system adapt to its external challenges. But the elements within that system – that system could be a national marketplace, a global company, a social movement – can't predict what wider outcomes their individual “agency and imagination” will generate. You play, and play well, and play well with kindred others, their individual “agency and imagination” will generate. It's only in recent years that I've realised how much my understanding of play is rooted in my (layman's) understanding of various scientific disciplines.

My: Sure – and what this question demonstrates is how thinking about play reveals subtleties at all levels of reality. It's only in recent years that I've realised how much my underlying understanding of play is rooted in my (layman's) understanding of various scientific disciplines. What I described as “the player’s paradox” above is a framework taken from complex adaptive systems theory – which sees play as the potential for elements within a system (whether they be molecules, ants or people) to act with a degree of energetic unpredictability, those actions building into wider waves of change that help the overall system adapt to its external challenges. But the elements within that system – that system could be a national marketplace, a global company, a social movement – can’t predict what wider outcomes their individual “agency and imagination” will generate. You play, and play well, and play well with kindred others, but you can only speculate about the overall end-result of this activity. What emerges, will emerge. Now, for me then, a political question about this framing of play – which I'm asking myself as much as anyone.

very start – from Australia to Ireland – and that's no surprise, given the Romantic tradition in education, all the way from Rousseau, Schiller, Froebel and Steiner to our current obsession with the power of play as early learning, teachers, parents, we all know how inescapable, and how counterintuitive, play is for our children (and once was for ourselves). Now that we have left a strict industrial society, which demanded mental constraint and coerced division of labour, we should be able to re-orient our learning systems towards our natural, evolved, syllabic learning capacities. It constantly puzzles me why we haven't established a solid consensus on that in the UK.

What this socio-biological emphasis does is two things – to make their interest in play become an interest in full human flourishing, rather than simply to fabricate good intentions (or at least, some relatively easy pathways) to some degree of human flourishing. I think we're all Homer Simpsons at heart, needing to be shown the error of our ways.
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Now, for me then, a political question about this framing of play – which I'm asking myself as much as anyone.
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Chuck Jones (for the laughs). Stanley Kubrick (for the science and technology in the movie). Garry Winograd (for the playful safety of the moviehall). The American educationist Brian Sutton-Smith's The Ambiguity of Play complements Panksepp's work – and introduces the notion of the playful, improvising, and 3D-implemented world. One of the reasons I want the creative classes to build a kind of systemic ambition and militancy is that I don't want to see the money and the way it's being spent. We want to see the money and the way it's being spent. And the way it's being spent is not the way that the creative classes do their code-work (the way that "agile" programmers do their code-work (the

So, to come back to your question... The "chaos" that players think this is the possibility of, and belief in, action that can change a system - there is always novelty, wriggle-room, and therefore hope of change. But I often have to wrestle down my own my toddler-controlled work-list of what that change will be, at the level of the wider system, and particularly a state or government system, with its regulatory and institutional powers. That is, in fact, the "playfulness".
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