



Research article

The Ecology of Body Memory in Heisnam Kanhailal's Theatre

Anannya Nath

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Adarsha Mahavidyalaya, Behali, India.

Abstract

Performance arts provide an ontological framework that enables memory to be performed in ways that make private memory public. 'Public' here refers to the spatial component where groups meet and share memory. Theatre, a component of performance arts, is a cultural practice carried out in public arenas. Heisnam Kanhailal's theatre, popularly known as the "Theatre of the Earth," rooted in a culture empowered by the earth questions the edifice of Indian dramaturgy and revolutionises performance through the enactment of suffering on stage. The actor in his theatre becomes an embodiment of 'organic memory,' the medium through which ancestral teachings of a community and sensory knowledge of being find an outlet. The focus on the actor's body rather than the conventional emphasis on the psyche suggests that acting is sustained and relayed as an active force. This paper aims to understand how the physical body in Kanhailal's theatre transforms into a collation of communal memory which creates a space for communication between the deliverer (actor) and the receiver (spectator). By studying the body dynamics shown in his plays, *Pebet*, *Memoirs of Africa*, *Dakghar* and *Draupadi*, the assessment traces the affective as well as discursive modes of sustaining identity codified in the ecology of the community. Therefore, by making theatre evocative of their history of powerlessness and the bodies of actors representative of these sensitivities, theatre rooted in the community's ecology creates sites of remembrance, the mental loci of which could be imaginatively accessed and explored.

Keywords: Theatre, Ecology, Actor, Catharsis, Sustainability



Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions

Introduction

Performance arts provide an ontological framework enabling private memory to be performed in ways that make it public. 'Public' here refers to the spatial component where groups meet and share memory. Public memory operates within specific social frameworks which are patterned into neat frames of "remembered actions, images, sounds, smells, sensations, and impressions" (Boden and Hoskins, 1995). In consequence, performance arts become conductors that pull memory out of individual human containers like the mind, body and skin and place it closer to the social,

Article History: Received: 31 December 2023. Revised: 18 February 2024. Accepted: 19 March 2024. Published: 21 March 2024

Copyright: © 2024 by the author/s. License Aesthetix Media Services, India. Distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Citation: Nath, A. (2024). The Ecology of Body Memory in Heisnam Kanhailal's Theatre. *Rupkatha Journal* 16:1. <https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v16n1.15>

cultural, and collective world. This nature of memory to flow seamlessly from one entity to another establishes that it is not “fixed or competitive” (Olick, 2016) but rooted in more open and productive encounters. One such production is theatre, a form of performance art that uses memory for affective and discursive ends.

Theatre is navigational in its ability to utilise complex and difficult memories in ways that enable the past and present to come to life simultaneously while informing each other. In fact, performers use memory both to blur and to enlighten past and present events. The literal embodiment of memory on stage can activate a form of psychological recovery from past trauma or injustice by making such theatrics contextualise the crisis to the audience. Theatre is a space where “the memories become three-dimensional and are given a pulse” (Belliveau, 2018, p. 137).

Indian dramaturgy, especially the proscenium is indebted to the spread of English drama as a colonial enterprise (Mee, 2007, p. 01). While classical Indian drama has been able to overturn European hegemony, it has largely become the conclave of a bourgeois episteme and the recreation of theatre as a promising “national” enterprise solidified within a homogenous, collective ethos implies a cleansing of subversive, marginal and often contradictory voices within this space. In parts of the country untouched by this centrality of thought, there is a strong presence of a diverse panache of memories that cannot be sustained within the national, singular lexicon.

Heisnam Kanhailal’s theatrics, popularly known as the “Theatre of the Earth” is the conceptualising of theatre in ways that performance becomes rooted in a culture empowered by the earth which questions the edifice of Indian dramaturgy and revolutionises performance through the enactment of suffering on stage. Social, political, and cultural ideologies are communicated in his theatre through the interplay of ancestral teachings of the community and sensory knowledge of the performers. The performers in his theatre become conduits of ‘organic memory’ thereby sustaining the theatrics throughout the performance. The focus shifts from the conventional emphasis given on a performer’s psyche to their physicality on stage.

This paper aims to study how the physical body in Kanhailal’s theatrics transforms into a collation of communal memory which creates a space for communication between the deliverer (actor) and the receiver (spectator). Taking recourse to Rustom Bharucha’s performance texts of two of Kanhailal’s famous plays, *Pebet* and *Memoirs of Africa* as well as the seminal stagings of *Draupadi* and *Dakghar*, the study analyses how the performers’ bodies in these plays create an ecology for the community’s memories. In a way, therefore, the plays are archival, evocative, and central to the understanding of Meitei society.

Distinctive Features of Kanhailal’s Theatre

Ferrarotti opines that memory has a base in the community. It is experiential in the communal sense of the term. Kanhailal’s theatrics is rooted in a search for his own ethnic idiom which he finds in the age-old lore of Meitei intellect. However, this intellect is released and realised only through the physical body of the performers. Ferrarotti’s focus that memory involves “the group, the collective unconscious, (and) a stream of consciousness which links everything” (Ferrarotti, 1990, p. 30) can be extended to suggest the instinctual, primordial impulses that links

the physical body in Kanhailal's theatre to the real world of native life. Therefore, the very first step towards understanding his theatrics involves understanding the confluence of these elements taking place in the performers' physiognomy.

The theatre of Kanhailal with its reliance on Meitei community's experientiality essentially becomes a place-based performance. Peter Jackson theorises that the political relevance of place-based performances are 'contested social events' which are 'inscribed in the landscape' (Jackson, 1988). This regional specificity of place-based performance as against the 'productive' counterpart sponsored by the cultural, social, and economic institutions of the state or other organisations relegates them to an outer public sphere of accessibility. Kanhailal's theatre reclaims this space by projecting volatile and vulnerable truths on stage without the entourage of linguistic politics which shows how universal performativity becomes when released through the body. The language thus created, becomes a repertoire of knowledge emerging from the daily struggles of their community and history. The display of suffering, however, continues to be universal in appeal.

The creation of body vocabulary is closely tied to the lack of verbal dictum in his plays. As stated above, there is an absence of 'linguistic politics' in Kanhailal's theatre, which naturally suggests that there is complete reliance on the performers' presence. Kanhailal states,

"We believe in the autonomy of theatre, which is why we swallowed the text and absorbed it into our bodies instead of merely verbalizing the lines through our mouths, our expressions and our gestures." (Kanhailal, 2016)

It is fascinating that Kanhailal's theatrical interpolation considers the body as autonomous, capable of carrying the language of suffering. This language, codified in the cultural expression originating from ancestral traditions is reclaimed through the collective pool of memory that the community shares. The active recollection of this codified memory can be achieved only by being 'present.' The lack of dialogue in Kanhailal's plays is a necessity, borne out of the desire to unite audiences across cultures in a space of shared suffering. Language restricts emotions when the audience fails to understand the dialogue. But, when the body imposes itself instead of language, ready to tell a story, it coerces the audience to participate equally in the process of meaning-making.

Another distinctive element of Kanhailal's theatre is minimal stage aesthetics. While reading the stage directions to his plays, one easily notices how there are no fancy lights, no musical arrangement except those on cues, no emphasis on sartorial appearance. The rise of Indian dramaturgy with its reliance on a unified national consciousness pushed and limited the public space available for regional performance arts because it did not fit within the preferred aesthetics and place-identities of funded policy. Kanhailal's creativity often represents a cultural resistance to the aesthetic hegemony of Indian dramaturgy. His actors become the 'space' for the craft, the aesthetics essential to the proscenium are subjugated so much so that the least attention is paid to the setting. The dramas become universal in their undertone, in the sufferings and joys, violence and resistance where artificial space becomes immaterial. It can be happening anywhere and at any time. Limited dependence on props is a characteristic of Kanhailal's theatrical corpus and is found in all his plays.

The Plays of Kanhailal

Kanhailal's plays, *Pebet* (1975), *Memoirs of Africa* (1985), *Draupadi* (2000) and *Dakghar* (2006) portray the tumultuous elements that inform the Meitei imagination. *Pebet*, produced in 1975 is part of 'phunga wari' or fireside stories narrated to young kids by their grandmothers. Entranced deeply within the Meitei psyche, *Pebet* is a commentary on "political and cultural indoctrination" (Bharucha, 1992, p. 33). *Pebet*, a small bird, is constantly threatened by a Cat that tries to capture her brood. To protect them, *Pebet* flatters the Cat until her kids grow strong enough to fight against their oppressors. However, in Kanhailal's play, the youngest child is captured and coerced into mimicking the oppressor's antics so much so that the mother imagines her entire brood captured and indoctrinated by the politics of submission.

Memoirs of Africa (1985) continues this politics of subordination. The play is essentially about "the almost primordial memory of oppression that activates the present and may continue to haunt the future" (Bharucha, 1992, p. 72). Imagining Manipur as a kind of 'Africa' ensnared with several stereotypes, Kanhailal's play demonstrates a cyclic existence of Nature's regenerative prowess and never-ending struggles. Through this play, Kanhailal wants to show the cruelty of the psychotic coloniser, who kills with a smile. This sadism is very graphic and external as the elements of animality are personified on stage.

In 2000, Kanhailal staged *Draupadi* at the Akademi of Fine Arts in Calcutta which created an uproar amongst the gatekeepers of morality. While it takes its story from Mahesweta Devi's short story with the same title published shortly after the Emergency, Kanhailal's *Draupadi* contends the issues of authoritarianism that have always swayed the region. As Sabitri Heisnam, playing Draupadi, strips herself naked on stage, it creates a ruckus among the spectators. Many call out Kanhailal as libidinally aggressive, of deriving pleasure by watching his wife naked in front of the public. The abject incident of occurrence portrayed what Trina Nileena Banerjee calls the 'performance of pain.'

Dakghar (2006), following Rabindranath Tagore's monumental play, is also subverted in its adaptation by Kanhailal. Here, Amal is no longer a child, nor is he played by a child artist. Instead, it is Sabitri who plays Amal, and reproduces, quite astonishingly, the innocence of a ten-years-old boy, and his "restlessness and despondency" (Rojio, 2016, p. 169). This is captured cleverly through the interplay of silences and a rustic musical idiom that accompanies the performance. Not only is *Dakghar* an act to be seen, but one that solicits the spectator's sympathy for it haunts and lingers in memory long after the act has been done. After all, it highlights the spiritual contents of human suffering.

The discourse of Kanhailal's theatre is rooted in the political and social history of Manipur. Even after India's independence and the eventual formation of Manipur into a full-fledged state in 1965, its autonomy was curbed and resisting voices silenced. The gnawing poverty and violence, the malaise of external aggression, religious indoctrination, and the question of regional autonomy are all parts of Kanhailal's theatrical oeuvre of oppression. Rustom Bharucha notes, "In the cries of despair there is anger but also an undercurrent of shame" (Bharucha, 1992). The poverty and decay of life in Manipur are reflected in his 'poor theatre' which is devoid of any external aesthetics. The actor, whose identity is informed in the soil of their land, has only his body at his disposal. Once the actor learns the reality of his physical culture, training becomes more

significant. Kanhailal's theatre, while encountering the memories of the past, also considers present injustices by relying on the organic 'emotions' displayed by the actors as a part of primordial collective memory that must be sustained through their bodies.

***Pebet* and *Memoirs of Africa*: Ritualistic Body Vocabulary**

Most of Kanhailal's plays were performed without any performance text. He saw no need for the preservation of an art form that depended on body memory. It was Rustom Bharucha who first decided to put them to writing, most notably, *Pebet* and *Memoirs of Africa*. In *Pebet*, the actors playing Pebet's children form a semi-circle on the ground, lying in foetal positions. As Pebet begins to give birth, she hums, then pants. This is followed by cries from the chest, showing labour pains and finally, as she delivers, she screams the animistic 'T E T U.' This internalization of an animistic expression which is so central to life, is rooted in what Kanhailal believes is a shared symbiotic relationship with the natural environment.

Dialogue in *Pebet* has a superficial significance. It is used to flatter the Cat and later, to chase him away. This underscores how primitive body vocabulary is self-sustaining and capable of embodying the dialectics without the need for externalization. The actors move their bodies in a ritualistic sequence, which is inspired by many tribal communities' working movements. In fact, the body transforms into a dialogue itself capable of performing a ritual that creates an active aura of 'grace' that vibrates as the true language of theatre. To achieve this, the actor is engaged in a daily routine of physical, vocal, and respiratory exercises.

Similarly, in *Memoirs of Africa*, the protagonist is a sexless entity who goes by the word 'Mi.' Mi is also the sixth element in Meitei philosophy of life-force. It is the 'living shadow.' Mi is accompanied by two Nupis who are young women but half-spirit and half-human, representing the deepest sources of creativity. The antagonists are the ruthless Mimanu who cannot be destroyed but are capable of destruction. Just like *Pebet*, there are minimal bearings on the stage. In the beginning of the play, Mi sits like a seed in the centre of the stage, ready to bloom. The Nupis enter and move sensuously, devoid of any human element. They glide stealthily across the stage, waving their hands in their entirety continuously and sing a tune along with its echoes. Bharucha explains how the gesture of "drawing the hands to the navel" shows the incorporation of the "soul into the body, thereby infusing it with a life-force" (Bharucha, 1992, p. 92).

The changes civilizations endure make everyday existence a paradox, where humans oscillate among numerous vicissitudes of emotions. Therefore, the body reacts to contemporary conflicts and chaos instinctually by making use of movements and sounds produced naturally. For example, when a toddler is rocked by its mother, breastfed, and carried on her back, her body produces rhythms that are instinctual, borne out of her motherhood and are, therefore, natural as well as generational. A feature of Kanhailal's theatre is to be sensitive to these rudimentary processes of work rhythm, of its tempo, organicity and flow. Taking the mother-child metaphor further, it is seen that the mother becomes the performer who 'alerts' or bestows consciousness in her toddler, the 'spectator.' Similarly, prayers can be seen as another organic part of a community where people perform a collective consciousness between intention and action. Thus, the rituals which

are primordial to survival, necessitates mobility of the body as against the immobility of the psyche. This is how meaning is created in the theatre of the earth.

The ritualistic elements in Kanhailal's theatre are developed through practice and training. In *Memoirs of Africa*, the character of Mi performs a pattern followed in the ritual dance of Lai Haraoba signifying the identification of her body. Similarly, the creation of vibrations in the entire body while performing an act is taken from the tranced possessions experienced by the priestess (maibi) in rituals, creating a surge of energy. Other examples include movements learned from combat techniques of the Manipuri martial arts, the exaggerated gait of Moirang Paba performers, improvisation on the practice of *khingdokpa*, brandishing fingers like weapons associated with *singba*.

Ethnographic and archaeological research shows that many communities experience ritual as part of their daily life, in part because their material world is perceived as powerful, animated, and subjective to human agency; therefore, many quotidian activities are embedded with acts of ritual (Allen, 1988; Hastorf, 2007; Sillar, 2004). Kanhailal's creative opus drawn from the physical elements of tribes allows his actors to be trained with the ease of the tribals who while performing the most mundane drudgeries of life, move with grace and a sense of ease. This is reminiscent of the idea that rituals are extensions of daily life, as iterated by Bradley Vivian (Vivian, 2003).

Kanhailal's artistry erases the polarisation of ritual memory and memory encoded in the everyday ecology of performance as two opposite poles. Handelman has claimed,

"It is possible and necessary to first separate ritual as a phenomenon from its sociocultural surrounding and then reinsert the ritual back into its environment to assess an interpretation." (Handelman, 2004)

This is similar to Kendall Phillips' reimagining of the difference between what constitutes 'public memory' and 'memory of publics.' The first refers to "memories which affect and are effected by various publics," following from Hannah Arendt's argument that 'public' is a spatial and temporal component where people act together to remember together, thereby creating memory through collective action. On the other hand, 'memory of the publics' is a reproduction of memories carried out in public arenas; these are cultural practices bearing the semblance of ritual and repetition.

Besides, the correlation between ritual and memory-theatre is manifested through the everyday ecologies of local livelihood where people filter painful political and cultural episodes of the past. The stories of power and resistance denote not only memories of the past, but resources for the present. People in the region face many of the same challenges they have faced for centuries. By remembering stories of how their ancestors navigated through these difficulties, or opposed authority and resisted indoctrination, "people share strategies of resiliency and resistance" (Huff, 2014). These memories serve the dual task of informing the present and preparing the youngsters for the same. When enacted, the ecology of suffering so intrinsic to their community becomes what Rajan and Duncan call an "ecology of hope" which is a localized concept of generating a 'middle' space that examines change and agency through recognizing 'humanity and nature in action' (Rajan and Duncan, 2013). In the theatre of the earth, as the actor learns the different body movements, attune their physicality with the corresponding elements of nature, and seamlessly

balance their bodies to the simulacra of being, they create a concrete space within which to locate and articulate their own personal and political histories.

***Draupadi* and *Dakghar*: Body Vocabulary in Adaptations**

Draupadi and *Dakghar* are adaptations that Kanhailal modified according to the cultural needs of Manipur. In *Draupadi*, there is a “sudden loss of comprehension” (Mishri, 2011, p. 606) which unsettles the knowledge of the community as it is known. The final act of nakedness on the part of the character of *Draupadi* prefigures how the body is the centre of meaning and memory. Performed by Sabitri in the initial production, her *Draupadi* encapsulated the spectators by the “stylized movement with which she takes the stage” as well as the “expansive rage compressed in the few words she utters” (Mishri, 2011, p. 611). Dipti Mishri continues,

“Sabitri, her back to the audience, advances menacingly toward the soldier, initially holding together at her front the single length of cloth that has been handed back to her after her rape. As she approaches the now cowering soldier, she opens her cloth all at once with a bloodcurdling scream: ‘Confront my body!’ Swirling the cloth around to almost completely cover the soldier, she stands naked over him.” (Mishri, 2011)

Draupadi is specifically concerned with ‘performing the ecology of pain.’ Speaking of this pain which is as organic as it is central, the actor ‘activates’ a kind of energy, a body language, where the spirits of past pain of the women may be mobilised in the crisis of the present moment through a willing, renewed, and ritual engagement with that pain. This act of theatricalising political rage was manifested later in 2004 when twelve Meitei women stood naked outside the Assam Rifles headquarters, holding up banners (in English) that challenged in red text on white: “Indian Army Rape Us!” and “Indian Army Take Our Flesh!” (Thokchom, 2004). As they protested, unaware of Kanhailal’s play, they also bridged the differences between theatricality and reality, “the felt and the perceived, the instrumental, the ethical and the political” (Banerjee, 2016, p.155).

Dakghar by Rabindranath Tagore had a ten-years-old lonely, ailing boy as the protagonist who becomes a sixty-year-old woman in Kanhailal’s adaptation. Despite the incongruence of something as basic as the protagonist, the play was an immense success. Savitri could transcend the turbulent states of emotions and replicate in her sixty-years old feminine body, the spirit of a child. Her only privilege has been the many years of spiritual experience over a kid which came from living through trauma and pain. The aesthetics created by her body became therapeutic for the spectators who, rather than observing the performance, participated in it. Her body was a site of power which enabled her to tap into the corpus of ‘body culture.’ Ideally, Kanhailal’s plays have minimal musical cues to help with the performance. The actor in this play fiddles with mythical dialogues which are spoken lyrically as her screams merge with silences. During moments of silence, the actor closes her eyes, provoking different emotions among the spectators. The utterance of incantation by a *maiba* (priest) to wake Amal’s sleeping body carries hypnotic powers of mimesis associated with various Meitei myths. Just as in *Draupadi*, when the actress strips herself naked or in *Dakghar*, where Amal dies, the lack of speech renders these performances accessible across regional, cultural, political, and linguistic boundaries.

It is not the occurrence of memory as performance that is self-serving but the performativity of the performance that creates the cultural situation where participants necessarily enact memory. Thus, showing cannot be removed from the organic component of creating an act, that is, it cannot be curated as a third-person perspective, but lived and enacted through and through which requires performativity. As soon as collective memory is foregrounded for display, performance must transform into performativity. Kanhailal's theatre does that by allowing the actors to acquire performativity, gained through actor training. Therefore, memory mediates between performance and performativity and in Kanhailal's actors, the history and the harsh realities of daily life provide the conduit for such mediation. Subjectivity is then resurfaced or installed for an audience to painfully recreate the ecology of suffering.

Ecology of Body Memory: Process of Learning

One of the essential elements of the body vocabulary that is intrinsic to the theatre of the earth is developing sensorial memory. Just as a child slowly grows and becomes aware of its immediate environment by being in touch with its five senses, uses Nature as a living participant and then transcends it, sensorial memory is similarly learnt. This process of becoming is an act of memory that the actor learns because of the ecological system around him. The body vocabulary thus acquired is part of a new, artistic language called the 'yeklon.' Within the 'yeklon' lies the 'paphal,' the Meitei motif of a serpent looped in the form of an infinity symbol. It has no beginning or end but exists in a loop signifying the intersection of the two worlds, within and outside of oneself. It is the symbolic relationship of body and mind, human and earth. Embedded in this vocabulary are involuntary reflexes like sneezing, hiccupping, yawning, throbbing of eyes, inhalation, exhalation, and stretching- a diction suggesting how whatever transpires inside the mind gets manifested naturally in one's behavioural patterns and ethics. According to Barba, the immediacy of action depends on the control and concentration of the actor's energy.

Sensory memory is tapped into the body through the conscious process of exercising, pushing the limits of body dynamics, enmeshing it with the ecology of which this memory is a part and thereby expanding the dimension of physical and mental endurance. Each movement of the body starts from the '*bindu*' or point posture and involves exercises that extensively make use of all the five '*indriyas*' or senses in sync with the physical body. Not only do these exercises create a stimulation necessary for creating a body vocabulary, but they also connect the actor to the earth. It is especially true of the exercises that teach the gravitational pull of the earth while learning to balance the body weight. Similarly, the voice exercises involve teaching an "array of guttural sounds" inherent in humans- shouting, screaming, crying, hiccupping, infant's cry, among others. A performer must awaken this voice and recognise the similarity with the inner voices of other natural creatures. The outer voice is, of course, the one acquired from society.

Once the sensorial memory is acquired, the actors operate within a disciplined 'trance' which, rather than making Kanhailal's craft 'exotic' or advertising his ethnicity, is used to tell the painful stories of suffering. The actor in trance is a depersonalized individual- that is, the actor and his character submit to the forces larger than them, allowing primitive supernaturalism to communicate with the biology of their being thereby bringing ancestral knowledge and suffering into active consciousness. It is no mimicking the written word, but living the ecology of suffering

actively, and in ways that the stage creates a space for transferring these memories to the spectator from the actor.

Moreover, the actors in this form of theatre memorise their natural life in congruence with the ecological system, taking that as the truth. This attainment of knowledge is achieved through various interactions between the earth and the actors. They begin by practicing in the wild, around species other than humans. The space where they practice becomes an entity that enables the actors to perform. They converse with what they believe to be the spirit of the empty space where elements of nature meet. As the senses are recognised and sensory memory released, the actors benefit from various processes of naturalisation and ritualisation. Naturalisation ensures that the body, now in tune with nature, becomes aware of a 'life flow' for further natural responses. To this end, the actors are expected to control their senses, learn mutuality amongst themselves, train the heart to become intelligent and explore specific powers tapped in the organic movements.

Once naturalisation becomes repetitive, ritualisation sets in. However, to perform that which is acquired naturally and accessed ritualistically, subtlety is required. The actors learn to transcend different forms of emotions, uncover instinctual psyche, and execute their performance as an intention of transforming natural into artificial to justify the art. This leads to the realisation that one's body presides over the character they play. Thus, at the confluence of cognition, instinct, intellect and spirit, drama happens.

Conclusion

The theatre of the earth, by allowing the actors the space to generate an ecology of their (communal) suffering transforms the stage into a mind where memories of the community's sufferings appear and events replayed. Kanhailal's ancestral teachings ask the participants to be "alive, physically, and mentally, and try to project our 'soul' in tune with our inner (organic) rhythm" (Kanhailal, 2016, p. 16). With his theatre, Kanhailal wants to evoke an organic 'haunting' effect in the spectator. It is not merely cathartic in the sense that the spectator feels their primitive memories released but also bears an aftertaste, one that lingers long in the sensations after the performance. Bixler notes,

"In turn, these performed memories become dialogues with the knowledge and memory of the audience, as the spectators' own personal memories or knowledge of the events surge forth and mingle with those of the characters and actors." (Bixler, 2002)

The reconstruction of such memories reflects the postmodernist centrality with reviving marginal histories, long repressed in official accounts. Jeanette Malkin explains in her study on memory-theatre that traumas, taboos, and repression are the stuff of postmodernism:

"Postmodernism is crucially bound up with agendas of remembrance and forgetting, serving, at least in part, to re-call the past from repression or from its canonized 'shape' in order to renegotiate the traumas, oppressions, and exclusions of the past." (Malkin, 1999)

The theatre, because of its nature of social immediacy and eternal present, directly links these memories with the audience who respond by creating memory images of things to be remembered, retracing them for a cathartic effect within the mental loci which could be explored

and accessed imaginatively. This form of memory-theatre which relies on the physicality of the performance to access mental images serve as vehicles for processing and releasing the rage, hurt and trauma of past injustices (Regan and LeBaron, 2018, p. 219). After all, people respond and come together through loss and share meaning of emphatic living only collectively. Thus, the actor and the spectator find themselves in a causal relationship of purgation.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest.

References

- Allen, C. J. (1988) "The Hold Life Has: Coca and the Cultural Identity in an Andean Community." *Smithsonian Series in Ethnographic Inquiry*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Banerjee, Trina Nileena. (2016) "Kanhailal's 'Draupadi': Resilience at the Edge of Reason." *The Works of Heisnam Kanhailal; Theatre of the Earth (Essays and Interviews)*. Seagull Books. 153-165.
- Belliveau, George. (2018) "Releasing trauma." *Memory*. 129-138.
- Bharucha, Rustom. (1992). *The Theatre of Kanhailal: Pebet & Memoirs of Africa*. Seagull Books Pvt Ltd.
- Bixler, Jacqueline E. (2002) "Re-membling the past: Memory-theatre and Tlatelolco." *Latin American Research Review* 37.2. 119-135
- Boden D and Hoskins A. (1995) "Time, space and television." Unpublished paper presented at 2nd Theory, Culture & Society Conference: Culture and Identity: City, Nation, World, Berlin, 11 August, 1995.
- Bradley, R. (2003) "A Life Less Ordinary: The Ritualization of the Domestic Sphere in Later Prehistoric Europe." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 13.1, pp. 5-23.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0959774303000015>.
- Ferrarotti F. (1990). *Time, Memory, and Society*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Handelman, D. (2004) "Introduction: Why Ritual in Its Own Right? How So?" *In Ritual in Its Own Right*, ed. D. Handelman and G. Lindquist. 1-32.
- Hastorf, C. (2007) "Archaeological Andean Rituals: Performance, Liturgy, and Meaning." *In The Archaeology of Ritual*, ed. E. Kyriakidis. 77-108.
- Huff, A. (2004) "Weathering the 'long wounded year': livelihoods, nutrition and changing political ecologies in the Mikea Forest Region, Madagascar." *Journal of Political Ecology* 21, 2014. 83-107.
- Jackson, P. (1988) "Street Life: The Politics of Carnival." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 6 (2), 1988. 213-27.
- Kanhailal, Heisnam. (2016) "Ritual Theatre." *The Works of Heisnam Kanhailal; Theatre of the Earth (Essays and Interviews)*. Seagull Books. 28-58.
- LeBaron, Michelle, and Regan, Paulette. (2018) "Reweaving the past." *Memory*, edited by PHILIPPE TORTELL et al., Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Malkin, Jeanette R. (1999) *Memory-theatre and postmodern drama*. University of Michigan Press.
- Mee, Erin B. (2008) *Theatre of Roots*. Seagull Books.

- Misri, Deepti. (2011) "'Are you a man?': performing naked protest in India." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 36.3. 603-625
- Olick JK.(2016) "The poverty of resilience: on memory, meaning, and well- being." *Memory Studies* 9 (3). 315–324
- Phillips, Kendall R. (2004) "Introduction." *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall R. Phillips. 03–17
- Rajan, S.R. and C.A.M. Duncan. (2013) "Ecologies of hope: environment, technology and habitation-case studies from the intervenient middle." *Journal of Political Ecology* 20. 70-79.
- Rojio, Usham.(2016) "Kanhailal's *Dakghar*. Cultural Myths as Images." *The Works of Heisnam Kanhailal; Theatre of the Earth (Essays and Interviews)*. Seagull Books. 166-173
- Rosenfeld, Silvana A., and Bautista, Stefanie L. (2017) "An archaeology of rituals." *Rituals of the Past*. University Press of Colorado. 3-20
- Sillar, B. (2004). "Acts of God and Active Material Culture: Agency and Commitment in the Andes." *In Agency Uncovered: Archaeological Perspectives on Social Agency, Power, and Being Human*, ed. A. Gardner. 153–89.
- Thokchom, Khelen. (2004) "Naked Anger at Army." *Telegraph*, July 16, 2004. http://www.telegraphindia.com/1040716/asp/frontpage/story_3502565.asp
- Vivian, B. (2004) "'A Timeless Now': Memory and Repetition." *Framing Public Memory*, ed. Kendall R. Phillips, 2004. 204.

Anannya Nath is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Adarsha Mahavidyalaya (Govt. Model College), Behali, Assam. She holds a Master of Arts in English Literature from Tezpur University and is actively involved in research. Her areas of interest are Translation and Memory Studies, Indian Writing in English and Comparative Literature. Apart from academia, she is a creative writer and translator and has published her work in several national journals. She was also longlisted for the Mozhi Prize, 2023.
