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Abstract
This research contrasts the speeches of European directors Ariane Mnouchkine and Peter Brook to the criticism of Rustom Bharucha, Indian director, regarding cultural dialogues and scenic creation, specifically in the context of Europe - East.
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Introduction
This research presents the reflections of European directors Ariane Mnouchkine and Peter Brook about the cultural exchanges in their theatrical works and oppose them to the questions of Indian director Rustom Bharucha. To this end, the interviews and books of Brook and Mnouchkine were read (1st year of the survey) to be then opposed to the following books of Bharucha: The Politics of Cultural Practice, Thinking through Theatre in the Age of Globalization and Theatre and the world: performance and the politics of culture (2nd. year of the survey).

Results and Discussion
Brook and Mnouchkine became known for, among other achievements, directing multicultural collective theatrical productions in the Europe, having great inspiration in Oriental, African and Arab cultural manifestations, seeking thereby building a multicultural scenic speech. However, for Bharucha, such interest and admiration for non-European exotic cultures bring issues that cannot be naively disregarded. The mere inspiration and appropriation of the eastern spectacular forms by European subjects would be more connected to the wonder and curiosity about exotic forms than to the proposition of an effective exchange, thus disregarding specific contexts of certain communities.

It is important to remember that European countries were colonizers in the past (notably Britain and France, countries from where Brook and Mnouchkine come). We can therefore question whether both sides - research group and researched community - would be equally benefiting from a cultural dialogue and assembly. If there isn’t a mutual benefit, we fall into a relationship ‘explorer - exploited’, which would finally take to a business relationship in which traditional spectacular forms would become objects of consumption.

Another point to be noted is that the opportunities and facilities enjoyed by European researchers would not be the same for directors from the “third world”. In order to deliver a cultural dialogue, it is essential to overcome the barriers of geographical contact, which is not always possible to all groups. Thus, the relations of cultural exchange in theater are regulated by the difficulties / opportunities of access of the receiving culture to the target culture. Such difficulties can be overcome more or less easily depending on the income and social power of the research group.

However, at the same time, we can ask ourselves if a theatrical group could not set up a play about a distant social context. Should we therefore speak only of issues that are geographically close to us? What are the proper ways of representing someone geographically and culturally distant in a play?

Conclusions
Intercultural studies do not suggest an answer. According to Pavis, there is something presumptuous or rather naive in the sense of wanting to propose an interculturalism theory in the contemporary scenario, where the complexity of factors involved in any cultural exchange and their formalizing difficulty are known (PAVIS, 2008, p.177). At the same time, it must be taken into account that, in a cultural dialogue, there will always be frictions and negotiations. This way, one must not ignore the risks and admit there should be questions in a way that such negotiations and eventual representations of others are not made naively, but responsibly.
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