CHAPTER 2
INTERCULTURALISM

2.1 The Concept of "Interculturality"

Interculturalism is the interaction between cultures, exchange and communication where the individual recognizes and accepts the reciprocity of the other's culture. It suggests interaction, sharing, and complementarities recognition of the culture of the other without it being divided between other cultures or the culture of the host country, also called the norm culture. In other words, interculturality can be seen as a way of being, a view of the world and other people, a kind of egalitarian relationship between human beings and peoples - it is the opposite of ethnocentrism. Interculturality is bringing multiculturalism a step further.

Multiculturalism aims to be a response to the reality of today’s society. It takes into account new cultures without however making real bridges between the host /norm culture and the new culture brought in by new citizens.

Dr. Greg Tanaka, in his book “The intercultural Campus”, introduces the concept of interculturalism and explains it as a way to recognize the ways in which we are all diverse; whether we are a member of a majority or minority group. Interculturalism is also about dialogue; building connections with the people around you and talking about not only the ways in which you are different but also the ways in which you are the same.

Dictionaries of literary and/or theatrical terms define interculturalism as a specific philosophical and aesthetic perspective which allows a view of the integral cultural system (culture understood and 'practiced' as an integral system)
Today, we can say that many societies across the world are multicultural. Migration, movement of people as well as immigration has reshaped the society. Multiculturalism aims to be a response to the reality of today's society. It takes into account new cultures without however making real bridges between the host norm "culture and the new culture brought in by new citizens.

The primordial body denotes the primitive body of men from the stone-age. The bodies of the primitive man were ruled by instincts, which were nearly animal. The collective consciousness and archetypal images the body perceived, was made visible through their ceremonial gatherings and other activities related to his environment, namely the jungle. Also with the life and struggle of the man, there originated the rituals and performance.

The Body varies from culture to culture and for each performer in different culture the body training and the energy distribution in his body differentiate.

The traditional mythologies of the body adopted by the Asian practitioner do not assume a physical body which is separate from the mental, emotional, cosmological and philosophical modes of existence but rather a body which instantiates all of the above. When the actor in the west uses his body to represent reality, the Asian actor’s body becomes a reality. As said earlier, particular modes of training and particular genres of performance demand specific bodies fashioned in particular environment for a particular set of performance expectations.

For e.g. the process of practice in Japanese Noh theatre are a set of cultural assumptions, about the body, mind and performers energy which are particular to Japan. The subjectivity of the performer is hence derived from a culturally linked psycho spiritual process. Hence the language of the body and the expression it reveals in space can be identified from the traditional
performance art of the culture, and the groups and institutions in that particular culture or country. The necessity of exploring the various aspects of the body, related to colonization, culture, race gender, economic status, intercultural aspects, multimedia, psychospiritual evolution suppression, new age media, and film culture etc is very important in theatre. In theatre each body thinks differently speaks differently and express differently.

The techniques which constitute a particular technology of the body cannot be divorced from the discourses and assumptions which inform how that set of techniques is understood and/or represented. For eg for a devoutly religious actor, the subjectivity produced through his practice and experience of noh acting assimilated through the tenets of religio-philosophical thought may lead toward aesthetic and personal enlightenment.

When we say each body varies in theatre, the difference of each body is prominent and visibly differentiated by its expressions and even its energy pattern.

For e.g. in the traditional ancient Indian theatre the energy is concentrated in the spine. In Balinese theatre the two energy patterns the vigorous keras and the soft delicately pattern Manis is concentrated in the chest and shoulder portions. The body images each body creates in space, also varies according to the culture and transition the body had to face in the past. Taking e.g the colonial body exclusion or suppression can often literally be seen as embodied. The post colonial body disrupts the constrained space and signification left to by colonizers had become a site for resistant inscription. The Negro performer in theatre space is not differentiated to the white body only by its colour but the element of slavery and resistance it expresses through its performance.
Similarly, considering the third world performances and performers in theatre, it attributes a kind of resistance and aggressiveness, in their body kinesis.

In the contemporary Indian theatre the body kinesis has a very deep rooted expression, which changes continuously with all the factors related to its environment. The key factors which decides the body dynamism of the contemporary Indian performances and it after results in theatre, is an area, where less study had been done. This proposed study moves through body and culture the intercultural analysis regarding the contemporary Indian theatre performance through a global perspective.

2.2 The intercultural body

The root of interculturalism begins with colonization. The colonies of eastern empire in the east and the American colonization and lot of invasions all around the world had made immense changes in different cultures. Slavery, war, cultural, invasion and modern development have transformed bodies and mind of different races and culture.

From the point of view of the colonizer specifically, fears and curiosities sublimated fascination with the strange or the primitive are expressed in concrete physical and anatomical images.

In general the post colonial body disrupts the constrained space and signification left to it by the colonizers and become a site for resistant inscription. The post colonial subject is often preoccupied with refusing colonially determined labels and definition especially those which operate in the name of race and gender.

The derogated body is mainly degraded and infiltrated with disease or figured as grotesque, it has also undergone frequently denied freedom. There is also the metamorphic body like the Australian aboriginal dreams which is a spirit
with transformative powers. The metamorphic body of the dreamer supplies a surrealistic flame that stresses the persistence and resistance of aboriginal culture.

Transformations of the post colonial body are theatrical through rhythmic movement such as dance which brings into focus the performing body.

2.3 A review of current thinking on interculturalism: Bhikhu Parekh - interactive multiculturalism

Outside of policy circles, the debate on interculturalism has also generated a wealth of academic commentary. Among the most influential figures in this debate are Bhikhu Parekh, Paul Gilroy, Avtar Brah, Amartya Sen and Miles Hewstone.

Parekh's main contribution to this debate is his understanding of pluralism; what he also calls 'interactive multiculturalism' (2007). Importantly, Parekh does not understand this version of multiculturalism as ghettoisation but as a dialogue between communities and individuals where each sees the value of opening up and learning from the other (2007). Central to Parekh's understanding is: "the cultural embeddedness of human beings, the inescapability and desirability of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue, and the internal plurality of each culture" (2006).

For Parekh, a critical appreciation of culture is an important feature of our daily lives. Culture is an important negotiated influence in our lives. Outward is culturally structured and people are deeply shaped by culture. However, this does not mean that people cannot "critically evaluate its beliefs and practices and understand and sympathise with others..." (Parekh 2006, p.336). Parekh locates interactive multiculturalism in relation to the state.
For Parekh, this dialogue and discussion of plural values is the basis for a successful multicultural society. A successful multicultural society cannot be built on the commitment to any single ethnic or cultural project or on the adherence to one particular set of substantive values. Multicultural society is too diverse for this. Rather, common belonging among citizens is built on a commitment to political community and to the dialogue, reciprocity and recognition that that entails (2006, p.342). A successful multicultural society values its members by reflecting their diversity in its structures, institutions and policies. This avoids the situation where people can be fully citizens but yet still feel that they are outsiders (2006, p.342).

Parekh concedes that this kind of dialogue requires certain conditions. Participants in the dialogue should enjoy a broad equality "of self-confidence, economic and political power and access to public space" (2006, p.337). In this sense interculturalism is dependent upon wider notions of redistribution and is not itself a panacea (2007a).

Paul Gilroy's most recent contribution to the debate on intercultural society has centred around two pivotal notions. One has been the centrality of ‘race’ and racism in post-colonial culture.

Interculturalism requires spaces for interaction and dialogue. This point is stressed by both Hewstone and Parekh. Hewstone talks about intercultural dialogue in terms of ‘contact’. He points to the need for places and spaces for different groups to come together, cooperate, build lasting friendships and reduce prejudices. Parekh's stresses the importance of spaces for intercultural dialogue but sees these spaces as transformative components of a highly participative and plural democracy. Gilroy also sees the value of intercultural spaces, though his emphasis on informality reminds us that through creating spaces for interculturalism it is possible to stifle sites of interculturalism by
subjecting them to the categorisations which they resist and which form the basis of their creativity.

Intercultural spaces for intercultural dialogue can be both valuable and potentially transformative if the right conditions exist. However, we must also recognise that intercultural spaces already exist and their importance should not be underestimated or jeopardised.

2.4 Theatre Interculturalism: The nature of Intercultural exchanges

The nature of Intercultural exchanges must be studied in a deep way to analyse how the body dynamism works in this exchanges. There are some who claim intercultural products as belonging solely to their native cultures, thus giving rise to what Charles Taylor calls non-recognition—not giving due credit to other cultures and races. To address this aspect of monoculturalism, and to a certain extent, a fallacy in multiculturalism, it is important to view intercultural exchanges as periods of revolutions. Like in periods of scientific revolutions, intercultural exchanges involve a change of worldview, a change of meaning and a change of the repertoire of questions. Intercultural exchanges cannot be properly conceived as an accumulation of past cultural experiences but can the hybrids must be regarded as new entities? The implication is that it is harder to pigeonhole new cultural products.

The facts that the propagators of a new cultural product belong predominantly to a race or that the culture thrives mainly in a certain country are not proofs of entitlement. The former will marginalize the effort of the minority who contributes to the new hybrid while the latter is building on the fallacy of the former, i.e., the country of origin supersedes the contribution of the minority. With globalization, intercultural exchanges will take place on a wider scale and the politics of recognition will escalate. Once we recognize that no one culture can claim sole ownership over intercultural hybrids, we can remedy a
fundamental flaw in monoculturalism and multiculturalism. But is it possible or right to jump in to such an assumption?

Intuitively, we associate cultures with certain ethnic groups or with countries of origin and it is the most natural way to speak of cultures. The ownership of cultures can be problematic, through the exploration of the nature of a cultural hybrid. Cultural hybrids include, but are not limited to, a new philosophy, a new form of literature and a new scientific outlook produced in the aftermath of an intercultural exchange. The claim to the entitlement of a cultural hybrid is part of the politics of recognition that is highlighted by Charles Taylor. As mentioned by Taylor, the demand and the need for recognition remains one of the propelling forces for contemporary politics.

Ethnic groups and nations have been suppressed, injured and gone to war because of misrepresentation. It is a problem worth considering because of the extent and frequency of intercultural exchanges in the course of human history, and thus, a large source of conflict for various ethnic groups.

There may be a period in our ancient history when cultures may be properly denoted as belonging to an ethnic group but with each intercultural exchange, these cultures are deeply transformed. The essentialist model of culture is a hidden assumption in monoculturalism and multiculturalism and a fault that interculturalism should correct.

This is one important question that surrounds cultural hybrids and we shall investigate how monoculturalism, multiculturalism and interculturalism attempt to answer the question and their implications.

2.5 Intercultural Theatre training concepts in Asia

To explore more on the Inercultural body dynamism it is really crucial to understand the different visions of Intercultural practioners who
continuously tries to exchange, assimilate, explore and execute the body mechanism or dynamism in Theatre. Two stalwarts in this area are Peter Brook and Tadashi Suzuki whose vision about evolving the Intercultural body mechanism should be shared. The body and its mechanism in Theatre is also part of a training system acquired through the traditional cultural aspects of an individual. This is very much adhered to his ancestral knowledge of day to day life and way of living. Hence when such a training is given to a foreigner there is a deprogramming or decoding of his inner mechanism related to his culture. This inner change is a new body memory or body realization which flowers inside him. Hence it is important that we have to explore or pass through the different aspects of training rendered to a performer from his culture as well as from other cultures. For example the actor who played the part of Dharmaputra in Peter Brooks ‘Mahabharatha’ came to India two years before the process started to learn what is ‘Dharma’. This makes it clear that it is very important that a performer must understand the training process or the soul of another culture and its latent meanings, when he works with other cultures. Hence we will go through two great masters of Intercultural Theatre namely Tadashi Suzuki and Richard Schechner.

2.6 Training of Tadashi Suzuki

As Tadashi Suzuki thinks there must be a code to uncover and bring to the surface the physically perceptive sensibility which actors had originally, before the theatre acquired its various codified performing styles, which can heighten their innate expressive abilities and to examine the differences in physical perception among different peoples, such as are found while the actors on stage just stand still, or have an impulse, take some action. We have to integrate these differences into something we humans could share as a common property, beyond all differences in race and nationality.
First of all, the necessity of inspecting our human orientation, in sensibility or feeling, toward the ground or floor—the attraction for the ground which the lower half of the body feels. There are some basic ways of using the body as perceiving various nuances of feeling, and then arranging them to formulate Suzuki method.

Technically speaking, this method consists of training to learn to speak powerfully and with clear articulation, and also to learn to make the whole body speak even when one keeps silent. It is thus that actors can learn the best way to exist on the stage. By applying this method, he wants to make it possible for actors to develop their ability of physical expression and also to nourish a tenacity of concentration.

In short, this training is, so to speak, a grammar necessary to materialize the theatre. However, Suzuki feels it is desirable that this "grammar" Should be assimilated into the body as a second instinct, just as you cannot enjoy a lively conversation as long as you are always conscious of grammar in speaking. These techniques should be mastered, studied, until they serve as an "operational hypothesis," so that the actors may truly feel themselves "fictional" on stage. For actors to realize the images they themselves pursue, they will have to develop at least this basic physical sensibility.

A "cultured" society is one where the perceptive and expressive abilities of the human body are used to the full; where they provide the basic means of communication. A civilized country is not always a "cultured" society.

It is true that civilization originated in connection with the functions of the human body; it may be interpreted as the expansion of basic functions of the human body or the extension of the physical faculties—of the eyes, ears, tongue, the hands and feet. For example, the invention of such devices as the telescope and microscope is a result of human aspiration and endeavor to see
more, radicalizing the faculty of sight. The accumulated effect of such endeavors is civilization—the product of the expansion and extension of physical faculties.

What we have to consider, then is the kind of energy required to materialize such aspirations. That leads us to think about modernization. A criterion some sociologists in the United States apply to distinguish between modernized and pre-modernized societies is the ratio of animal-energy to non-animal-energy. Animal energy here refers to the physical energy supplied by human beings, horses or cattle, etc.; while non-animal-energy refers to electric power, nuclear power and the like. One way of showing whether a country is modernized is to calculate how much non-animal-energy is used. Roughly speaking, in African and Near Eastern countries, for example, the ratio of animal-energy used is very high, compared with such countries as ‘the United States or Japan, where -energy derived from oil, electricity, nuclear power is used in all processes of production.

If we apply this thinking to the theatre, we notice that most contemporary theatre is "modernized"; non-animal-energy is fully utilized. Lighting is done through electricity. Elevators and revolving stages are operated by electrical energy. The building of the theatre itself is the end-product of a variety of industrial activities from the concrete foundation to the props and scenery.’

On the contrary, the Japanese Noh theatre is a surviving example of pre-modern theatre in which almost no non-animal-energy is used. Take music for example. In the modem theatre, it is recorded and reproduced through amplifiers and loud-speakers, whereas the voices of the dancer-actor and the chorus and the sound of the instruments played on stage in the Noh theatre are conveyed directly to the audience. Costumes and masks for Noh plays are made by hand, and the stage itself is built based on traditional principles of carpentry. Although electricity is used for lighting nowadays, it is limited to
the minimum, never like the elaborate and colorful lighting of the "modern" theatre. The spirit of creating something out of human skill and effort pervades Noh theatre. So much so that the Noh can be said to be the epitome of pre-modern theatre. It is a creation of animal-energy.

As the theatre, either in Europe or in Japan, has kept up with the times and has come to use non-animal-energy in every facet of its activities, one of the resulting evils is that the faculties of the human body and physical sensibility have been overspecialized to the point of separation. Just as civilization has specialized the job of the eyes and created the microscope, modernization has "dismembered" out physical faculties from our essential selves.

Suzuki tries to restore the wholeness of the human body in die theatrical context, not simply by going back to such traditional theatrical forms as Noh and Kabuki; but by employing their unique virtues, to create something transcending current practice in the modern theatre.

We need to bring together the physical functions once "dismembered"; to regain the perceptive and expressive abilities and powers of the human body. In doing so, traditional culture is maintained within civilization.

In method of training actors, Suzuki place special emphasis on the feet, because of the belief that consciousness of the body's communication with the ground leads to a great awareness of all the physical junctions of the body. From this it is very clear about how a person belonging to a particular culture imbibes the energy extended by that culture transforming it in to his theatrical training or concept. When another person from a different background enters to this orbit there is an overlap of body mind and voice in performance.
2.7 King Lear (Theatre) and Akira Kurosawa’s Kumonosu-ju or Throne of Blood (Film)—Analysis of two Intercultural performances in Japan

Even when intercultural exchanges take place within the non-West, they are often mediated through Western culture and/or economics. They point to a continuum of intercultural practices ranging from the collaborative to the imperialist and argue for a hyphenated hybridity via an engagement with postcolonial theory and a more sustained systematic engagement with the politics of intercultural performance's production. In Europe, Eugenio Barba (Barba 1995; Barba & Savarese 1991a) and Peter Brook (Heilpern 1977) were seminal in explicitly incorporating performance styles from non-Western cultures, although both have been accused of colonialist impulses, of searching for a transcendent 'purity' lost to Western theatre in the exotic-a metaphysical quest for a truth that holds everywhere and at any time, irrespective of historical or cultural differences.

An important non-Western example of inter-/extra-cultural performance is the Japanese practice of Butoh (Fraleigh 1999; Ikeda & Arts Documentation Unit 1997). The genealogy and practice of Butoh is profoundly intercultural. Butoh was born of Japanese -post-war resistance to cue enforced "Americanisation" of Japan that affected every aspect of the culture. Western avant-garde artist’s hostile to-bourgeois morality and industrial modernity inspired the Butoh founders Kazuo Ohno and Tatsumi Hijikata (Holledge & Tompkins 2000).

Japan was one of the first countries in Asia to explore Intercultural exchanges and possibilities of such performances both in Film and Theatre. LEAR is one of such a collaborative project that fuses the ideas of a Japanese feminist playwright and a contemporary Singporean director - practitioners who wanted to use the play to make both a feminist statement and a comment on the concept of ‘new Asia.’ Ong Keng Sen states, in his notes for the LEAR program, that he wanted to question tradition and to recast it as a progressive concept, tradition is perhaps best seen as a continuum rather than a
monolith. King Lear was chosen as a work of 'universal significance' which did not bias any of the six cultures involved in the project. Ong Keng Sen states in the program that it is 'an inter-cultural project' in which he wished the cultures to exist together 'not in an amalgam which would reduce their difference,' but he wanted them to present their differences through the production resulting in a LEAR which 'no one culture should be able to understand in its entirety. With its polyfusion of cultural symbols, from the Noh Old Man and Mother to the Chinese Opera-singing older daughter and the Thai younger daughter, each of the performers brought cultural, gender and performative specificities to the work.

If it is a work that has little relevance to old canons but is of heavy importance for a re-imagining of Asia, a work which careers towards what Ong Keng Sen calls 'new Asia,' then how can this be read by a contemporary Western audience? Where does King Lear fit within this process? Is spectacle enough? And is there evidence of cultural exchange? With each performer using his/her own language, there could have easily been no points of connection. Just a cacophony of cultural difference. However, for a western spectator there were the English surtitles, sparse yet beautiful, to guide the narrative and emotional flows.

The first scene sets the tenor for a production that resonates with cultural difference yet at the same time tentatively presents this spectator with an invitation to participate. The lights are down in the theatre, shadows are cast, shadows of an Old Man, searching, wandering. As he walks around, inhabiting the performance space his long shadow creeps across the bodies and faces of the spectators seated in the balconies of the theatre. 'Who am I?' he asks as his presence is inscribed upon us. I was sleeping in the terror of a nightmare I cannot recall,' we are immediately implicated in the story, drawn in, powerfully summoned to come to the assistance of this character. This performance style, merging minimalism in terms of both set and
characterisation draws on the techniques of contemporary performance, stripping King Lear back so that what emerges is a performance work that has resonances for a contemporary audience. A performance that highlights universal themes - death, life and power and most particularly a work that imbricates the spectator into its process. For example, in scene sixteen the Old Man calls upon his dead wife. His voice is heard, I can hear memories deep within me, my wife is resurrected I will go on living.' The narrative is hauntingly sparse yet effective, and continues in this vein. For me the powerful, and at times overwhelming, emotion of the piece comes through the combination of this sparsity and the often- dissonant use of vocal sounds. The performance ends with the older daughter lonely and alone searching for an escape from the 'uninhabited kingdom.' The ghost of her mother appears and 'dances like a bird,' the bird of freedom that continually evades the older daughter. The older daughter, defeated, murmurs ‘Who is behind me? Who is behind me?’ and the performance is over.

As a critical spectator/witness, however, scepticism is always a factor in engagement. Questions about the nature of the nature of the exchange linger, for example: could the performers understand one another? Was this project an exchange? The background material scouring for proof whilst translators were used to facilitate exchange and the project did involve frustrations (in this regard) for the director and performers, the participants felt moved by the work after its Tokyo season. Yet there is no cleansing sentence or statement to act as a panacea for my concerns and I wonder why, if authenticity is problematic, we feel the performers understood, or had access to some kind of singular theme or essence within the performance. Even if they did, given the huge cultural differences would they have noticed?

Abdul Gani Karim, who performed the role of the Retainer, thinks that the production required some degree of translation or mediation of many of the traditional practices involved. There appears to have been some 'promiscuity'
with cultural influences, although it also appears that this promiscuity may have pivoted around a central icon of NOH which did not/was not altered. Perhaps, then, what LEAR asks is not about the validity or authenticity of cultural exchange, but the need to reframe the role of the spectator in response - so that attention is not removed from the beauty of the fusions and spectacle of representation to potentially outmoded questions about essentialism and authenticity. Rather that the focus remains on the dynamics that result or may result from new kinds of cultural fusions.

Intercultural exchanges have occurred and been documented in both Western and non-Western theatre since the beginning of this century. There should be a profound search of what the term Intercultural exchange might mean in a contemporary performative context, particularly with reference to the Japan Asia Foundation Asia Centre's LEAR project.

One area is intensely interesting, is the intersection of postmodernity and interculturalism, or questioning how they infuse one another. Can interculturalism be seen as an element of postmodern theatre? If interculturalism is about some form of cultural exchange, in which, due to the existing canon, exchangers must be careful to acknowledge their positions and aims in order to avoid the label cultural tourists or appropriators, then how does this exchange differ from an act of postmodern pastiche, for example? Surely postmodernism is about the fusion of cultural forms or elements - is this not also what interculturalism is about? In fact could postmodernism’s deconstruction of theories of authenticity not be employed to the enhancement of interculturalism? As Schechner argues (in discussing the work of Native Canadian visual artists) the use of 'bricolage' is an important tool in terms of cultural representation as it signifies not 'slavish imitation' but 'transmutation, transformation. However, whilst intercultural theatre and postmodern theatre certainly overlap and share many of the same techniques, including bricolage, pastiche and deconstruction, not all intercultural theatre or performance can be
described as postmodern. Works like LEAR provide valuable opportunities for theorists and critics to question the parameters of interculturalism and to acknowledge that, despite the complexity of the issues involved, some attempt must be made to engage with the issues of representation and exchange that surround interculturalism. However, if defining interculturalism is always provisional outside of particular works then perhaps the focus should be on the process of definition rather than solely on the term per se. The ideas of exchange and translation are fluid and ever evolving, and, therefore, Interculturalism is defined precisely by the fact that its parameters change in each application.

Interculturalism recognizes that cultures interact at a higher and creative level, giving rise to a product that is vastly different from the inputs and one way to illustrate this is to look at an intercultural film, specifically, Akira Kurosawa’s 
*Kumonosu-ju* or *Throne of Blood*. It is a work that marries traditions separated by hundreds of miles and aptly demonstrates the mobility of cultures. Kurosawa’s film retains so little of Shakespeare’s play that we ask if faithfulness is a good criterion to start with. While other adaptations like the Polanski version cast *Macbeth* in its setting and period, Kurosawa has brought *Macbeth* to a foreign land and told the tale in symbols appropriate to the indigenous culture. The work excites imagination as we are confronted with new situations and representations. The questions that we ask in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* are no longer meaningful and significant here: What do the three witches symbolize in the Medieval and Christian context? Is Macbeth a tragic hero in the Greek tradition? Instead, we have to ask what does the spinner symbolize in the Japanese tradition? Why does Kurosawa remove all the soliloquies and retain none of Shakespeare’s dialogues? What do the fog and mist symbolize? Kurosawa recognizes that adapting literature to the screen is not one of translation but of transformation. Instead of importing elements like Christian doctrines and Greek theatre from
Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* to *Kumonosu-ju*, Kurosawa has replaced them with Buddhist philosophy and Noh theatre. As Buddhism permeates the film, the same story of betrayal takes on a different symbolism. For example, instead of having three omniscient witches in a subtle mockery of the Holy Trinity, Kurosawa puts a mysterious old woman at the spinning wheel, dramatizing Buddhist ethics in Noh fashion. The circular structure of the film—with the characters going around the forest in circles, the spinning wheel and numerous repetitions—emphasize the crushing laws of *karma* where freedom does not exist (which is a major theme in *Macbeth*). As a result, all scenes of *pathos* and acknowledged guilt in *Macbeth* are eliminated from *Kumonosu-ju*. The end result is that Kurosawa has created an unheroic film tragedy where its protagonist, Washizu is not a free agent. He does not possess any greatness, inward and outward to withstand the forces that propel him.

On the other hand, the juxtaposition allows viewers who are familiar with Shakespeare to interpret unfamiliar Japanese art in the Shakespearean tradition. Noh theatre and Buddhist philosophy takes on a new symbolism. This is what happens during an intercultural exchange—a familiar part of another culture enters an unfamiliar sphere and becomes radically transformed.

Hence the cultural identity of each body varies and when different cultures meet, the dynamism of the body related to each culture, blend into common performance behaviour, clearly identifying each cultural attitudes and body images in performance. Before analyzing the Intercultural aspects of Indian Theatre, there should be a clear understanding the transformance of Indian Theatre -mind - body in terms of independence, global changes and attempts of Intercultural dialogues which I am trying to analyse in the coming chapters, starting with post independence Indian Theatre.
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