Rupert Goold's *Macbeth* (2010): Surveillance society and society of control[*]

Víctor Huertas Martín
Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

ABSTRACT

This article deals with Rupert Goold's film version of *Macbeth* (2010). Based on a stage production, this film is set in an unspecified Soviet country. I will analyze Goold's creation of a stage-to-screen hybrid recording framed as a surveillance film. Relying on Michel Foucault's and Gilles Deleuze's works as well as various contributions made by Cultural Materialist and New Historicist critics, I intend to explore the power relations in this surveillance film. I will also examine how the surveillance film conventions deployed by Goold turn the narrative into a meta-filmic event. This allows the viewer to perceive surveillance as part of the subject matter of the story and as inseparable from its narrative structure. Eventually, this will serve to explore how surveillance entirely transforms the filmscape. What begins as a film set in a surveillance society ends up as an environment dominated by a society of control.

KEYWORDS: Shakespeare on film; *Macbeth*; power relations; surveillance society; Foucault; Deleuze.

Macbeth (2010) de Rupert Goold: sociedad de vigilancia y sociedad de control

RESUMEN: Este artículo trata la versión cinematográfica de *Macbeth* de Rupert Goold de 2010. Basado en una producción teatral previa, esta película se contextualiza en un país soviético sin especificar. Analizaré la creación a manos de Goold de una grabación híbrida entre el escenario y la pantalla encuadrada como una película de vigilancia. Sirviéndonos de los trabajos de

Macbeth (2010) de Rupert Goold: sociedade da vigilância e sociedade do controlo[**]

RESUMO: Este artigo analisa a versão para cinema de *Macbeth* (2010), por Rupert Goold. Baseado numa produção teatral, este filme tem lugar num estado soviético não especificado. Irei analisar a criação, por parte de Goold, de uma gravação híbrida (do palco para o ecrã) enquadrada como um filme de vigilância. Baseando-me no trabalho de Michel Foucault e de Gilles Deleuze assim como

---

Michel Foucault y Gilles Deleuze, así como de varias contribuciones de los críticos del Materialismo Cultural y del Nuevo Historicismo, pretendo explorar las relaciones de poder en esta película de vigilancia. Por otra parte, examinaré cómo las convenciones cinematográficas de la vigilancia empleadas por Goold convierten la narración en un evento meta-fílmico. Esto permite al espectador percibir la vigilancia como parte del contenido y como parte inseparable de su estructura narrativa. Finalmente, esto servirá para estudiar cómo la vigilancia completamente transforma el espacio de la película. Lo que comienza como una película contextualizada en una sociedad de la vigilancia termina como la recreación de un ambiente dominado por una sociedad de control.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Shakespeare en cine; *Macbeth*; relaciones de poder; sociedad de vigilancia; Foucault; Deleuze.

em várias contribuições feitas por críticos pertencentes ao materialismo cultural e ao novo historicismo, irei explorar as relações de poder neste filme de vigilância. Também irei analisar de que forma as convenções do filme de vigilância mobilizadas por Goold transformam a narrativa num acontecimento meta-fílmico. Isto permite ao espectador percecionar a vigilância como parte do conteúdo da história e como inseparável da sua estrutura narrativa. Finalmente, isto servirá para estudar de que forma a vigilância transforma por completo a paisagem fílmica. Aquilo que começa como um filme situado numa sociedade de vigilância acaba como um ambiente dominado por uma sociedade de controlo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Shakespeare em filme; *Macbeth*; relações de poder; sociedade de vigilância; Foucault; Deleuze.

1. Introduction

> "We will annihilate his entire clan, his family! We will mercilessly annihilate everyone who by his actions and thoughts (yes, thoughts too) assails the unity of the socialist state."
>
> (Stalin, qtd. Service 2004, 340)

… Says the tyrant whose specter this film invokes. "Yes, thoughts too." Much attention has been paid to the totalitarian features of Rupert Goold's *Macbeth*.[1] Stalin's words echo the commission to massacre the Macduffs after learning that the thane of Fife challenges Macbeth's authority by departing to England (4.2.150–54).[2] Like Stalin's, the Scottish King's tyranny extends to many other

---

[1] This film is a transposition of Goold's stage production at the Minerva Theatre for the Chichester Festival (2007). After being performed in London and New York, the BBC was interested in filming this production and Goold, as well as the whole cast and crew, with John Wyver—head of Illuminations Media—as producer, participated in the process. Eventually, the recording was broadcast on PBS in October 6 2010.

[2] I am using Braunmuller's edition of *Macbeth* (2003).

families—"New widows howl, new orphans cry" (4.3.5)—who, as Goold explicitly suggests in several scenes, are decimated under his regime if they "talk of fear" (5.3.37), or if, as Angus' bugging shows in one scene, they speak inappropriate thoughts out loud.[3] However, neither Macbeth nor Stalin could have anticipated the influence that surveillance societies and societies of control would have in popular fiction and in our daily life in the twenty-first century.

Macbeth's order is, in Goold's "stage-to-screen hybrid" film, transmitted through an intercom connected to an institutional surveillance network. As Goold confirms (Dickson 2016), he was partly inspired by Macbeth's line "There's not a one but in his house | I keep a servant fee'd" (3.4.131–32), alluding to King James' vainglory at keeping an eye on his subjects' privacies (Thomas 2014, 220; Stewart 2003, 76). He also relied on various books on the Gunpowder Plot—e.g. Antonia Fraser's *Gunpowder Plot* (1996)—and on Shakespeare's possible sympathies for recusants during the Jacobean period (Greenblatt 2004; Hunt 2005; Ackroyd 2006). And he must have been inspired by Gregory Doran's film *Hamlet* (2009) and its display of CCTV cameras within the Danish State.[4] In more multifarious ways than Doran's, surveillance devices in Goold's film frame the production as a pseudo-Socialist dystopia with an eponymous hero based on the sociopathic Joseph Stalin.[5] Yet, my intention here is to transcend these alleged parallels between Macbeth and Stalin and explore larger issues connected to surveillance in the production.

My contention is that Goold's *Macbeth* uses the surveillance film genre to explore power issues in Shakespeare's play-text. These have been reworked in a modernized adaptation which emphasizes the theme of surveillance. Surveillance is not monolithic and exists

---

[3] In this film, after the death of Banquo, Goold inserts the "Stasi Montage." This section consists of a series of short scenes where snapshots of state violence are shown. The police break into a man's room; Alsatian dogs pursue several runaways who try to get across the border; men are led to execution; victims are buried, etc. In the meantime, the Witches—as Servants in Macbeth's household—prepare the table for the coronation banquet.

[4] In an Interview, Wyver explains Goold's interest in the recording of Doran's *Hamlet* (2016). On surveillance in Doran's *Hamlet*, see Lefait (2013–2014).

[5] Martin Amis had already noted that Ross' "Alas poor country…" (4.3.166–74) speech can be associated with the "evocation of a terrorized society" under Stalin's rule (2003, 86).

outside the tyrant's control. In fact, surveillance is not simply part of the state apparatus in Scotland but it belongs to the formal structure of the film. A major point of the analysis will be the examination of different types of surveillance in Goold's adaptation. Also, I will examine how the surveillance-based cinematic devices employed by Goold indicate or reflect a transition from a Foucauldian disciplinary society towards a Deleuzian society of control. Whereas both society models work on the premises of surveillance, they operate differently. While the former model bases its power on localized totalitarianism, the latter builds up a more liquid state of vigilance.[6] My interest in this essay is to examine how Goold's surveillance-based aesthetic choices affect the narrative structure of the film and how these choices help in understanding the larger concerns of surveillance.

Macbeth—whose protagonist has been widely represented on stage as a European dictator (Camati 2005, 341)—can be studied in relation to the deal-making and mutual discrediting through surveillance, plotting, denunciation and delation between rival families taking place in the Jacobean period (Nicholls 1991; Archer 1993; Wills 1995; Greenblatt 2004; Kinney 2008). These plots often blew up in these families' and the crown's faces. King James, himself a watcher and confederate to those who desired Mary Stewart's execution (Schmitt [1956] 2009, 27; Thomas 2014, 150), suffered distress with the public observance his subjects inflicted on him, as Stephen Orgel has pointed out (2011, 29–34). In this regard, Wilson sees the supernatural parade of kings in *Macbeth* as a court masque possibly including the figure of Mary Stewart recalling James' matricidal treason (2013, 290), and therefore as the laying bare of the king's private guilty thoughts. Arguably, the show of kings and the apparition of the murdered queen would unravel popular thoughts and suspicions over the monarch's involvement in the execution of Mary Stewart.

From this it follows that, as surveillance films often demonstrate, state and private spying against political enemies and opponents could be turned against those in power too. In his reworking of the play, Goold's Orwellian nightmare connects the narrative to

---

[6] Experts like David Lyon (2007; 2008) have demonstrated that an apocalyptic analysis of surveillance can be too simplistic and reductive.

contemporary worldwide surveillance exercised "when [people] are thinking, reading, and communicating with others to make up their minds about political and social issues" (Richards 2013, 1935). Communication technologies provide wide access to people's thoughts and ideas through the storing of their readings, their electronic messages, payroll information, bills, and miscellaneous records which allow an approximate reconstruction of their private lives. If Weberians regard state vigilance as a safeguard for our freedoms, many contemporary scandals indicate its frequent unconstitutional, unlawful, and anti-democratic uses (Lyon 2008). Thus, it can be asserted that Goold's film voices contemporary concerns over surveillance and the control derived from such an activity, thus being the first one to develop this dramatic theme in the Scottish Play. Surprisingly, although widely explored in *Hamlet* films, surveillance has not been thoroughly examined in any *Macbeth* screen version (except for Welcome Msomi's *uMabatha*, 1970). Arthur F. Kinney, however, has demonstrated that the theme is prominent in Shakespeare's play-text (2008).

2. Theoretical framework

Surveillance studies are intimately conjoined with popular fiction and European thought. In this respect, three possible models of surveillance will be identified here. John Michael Archer has called attention to the route to surveillance study opened by Norbert Elias (1993). Elias studies early modern views (and particularly Francis Bacon's) of the monarch's governance as an "angelical power"— seeing what is denied to the subjects (Bacon 1999, 249)—moving toward analyses of surveillance seen as a weapon used in the wars between small aristocratic units (1982, 331). However, Goold's vision on surveillance seems to have been filtered through Michel Foucault's more sophisticated analyses of "Panoptic" institutions. Foucault envisages power as a compartmented structure based on Jeremy Bentham's prison model. This analogical space is divided into sections marking out those who present deviant conduct or abnormal behaviors (Foucault [1975] 2012, 166). In an Althusserian analysis of institutions, these localizations of space frame post-revolutionary institutions such as the school, the prison, the family or the hospital as essentially oppressive and determining for the individual's conduct. However, as Foucault indicates, the

boundaries between the statuses of watcher and watched can shift and power is not possessed by a single entity. Analogously, Gilles Deleuze points to the cultural transition from a post-revolutionary disciplinary society—mostly characterized by institutions—towards the so-called "society of control," where surveillance is in the hands of corporations producing constant tabulations in power relations, undermining all the compactness of institutional apparatuses. Control becomes a less predictable, less institutionalized, more slippery, and depersonalized entangled network which appears to grant more freedom to the citizen but is effectively more controlling through an increase of surveillance mechanisms—i.e. via smartphones— which have widely enlarged the opportunities to accumulate data and information (Deleuze 1990; 1992).

Thus, without our noticing, surveillance becomes part of our daily existence, though still needing means to regulate it. As already mentioned, popular fiction has tackled the abuses derived from surveillance to the extent that surveillance studies may have been partly shaped by popular fiction (Lyon 2007). In fact, there seems to be a connection between the origins of film and surveillance practices. As Catherine Zimmer (2015, 6–7) and J. McGregor Wise (2016, 3) point out, surveillance caught early filmmakers' imagination: Lumière's *Workers Leaving the Factory* and their bosses watching them could be seen as an example of surveillance. However, surveillance in fiction has increasingly focused on the recording of deviant activity. In this regard, as Zimmer observes, filmmakers' inclination to record illicit acts has determined current conceptions of surveillance films (2015, 7). Additionally, the self-reflexivity of the surveillance film retrieves the *theatrum mundi* metaphor for cinema (Lefait 2013; 2013–2014). Thus, surveillance allows the viewer to reflect on the nature of filming itself and then take a flexible position of detachment and/or identification in relation to the content. In short, not only do we watch the film but, as viewers, are invited to take part in surveillance as well.

McGregor Wise has pointed out that, although each period has developed its "surveillance imaginary" with its own collection of stories and narratives, in the last few years surveillance films have proliferated as a result of the 9/11 attacks (2016: 4). In narrative terms, in these films the hero is chased by a manipulating government who, unjustly or not, impeaches him for some crime.

According to Thomas Y. Levin (2002), surveillance films constitute a perfect fusion of narrative style—with its own tropes and conventions—and content. Such content involves the watching over a victim who eventually turns to be the hero in the narrative. Dietmar Kammerer (2004)—in his analysis of *Enemy of the State* (1998), *Minority Report* (2002) and *Panic Room* (2004)—and, subsequently, McGregor Wise (2016, 10) confirm that the surveillance hero is watched but, nevertheless, is able to appropriate surveillance mechanisms to defeat his enemies.

In this production, surveillance alludes to the Otherness configured in a pseudo-Soviet arrangement. Goold's use of such Cold War film tropes within the BBC context can be read as supporting what Pierre Bourdieu has called the imperialist universalization of cultural prejudices (1999); in this case, anti-communist prejudices in anti-communist and Cold War films.[7] In fact, the Orwellian and totalitarian iconography displayed in this film—mainly in the form of Macbeth's red banner imitating Stalin's effigy—, in line with Jacques Derrida's work, seems to conjure up the totalitarian specter of hyper-utopian Socialism.[8] In my view, rather than trying to explicitly compare Macbeth to a monstrous Soviet dictator, these "residual" Stalinish features—borrowing Raymond Williams' terminology (1977, 121–27)—can be seen as Western visions of the Other (Said 2003: xiii). Goold's use of demonizing Soviet icons, such as the Orwellian Stalinesque Macbeth banner, produces images of the Soviet terror to viewers familiar with the anti-Socialist mythology.[9] Can we interpret these nostalgia-inflected icons in the light of their contemporary relevance? For Boika Sokolova, the film represents "the state of our modern world," though "re-sited to a communist past" (2013, 169). Against deterministic Althusserian and Baudrillardian views (Althusser [1965] 2005; Baudrillard [1978] 2008), it is certainly possible to read the film against the grain, relying on cultural materialism too, as

---

[7] An entry in one of John Wyver's blogs challenges the film: "What extra this cloning of Hollywood currency has brought to this production? Could winning American audience with little knowledge of the play be one reason?" (Wyver 2010).

[8] As Derrida explains, the Soviet monster has been often used by neoliberalism to present itself as a panacea against the tyrannies of communism ([1995] 2012).

[9] In an "Interview," Goold declares having been inspired by the Kremlin and Cold War films where essentially the ageing Soviet generals fight each other for power (See DVD Extras).

Celestino Deleyto has found in Hollywood partisan cinema (2003, 73). In other words, if these Hollywood clichés denounce Western terrifying visions of its past perceptions of the "Soviet monsters"— mostly framed through Cold War films and varied means of propaganda—, the imagery revolving around the Soviet iconography can lead us to think that Goold's film criticizes both Western prejudices and other forms of past totalitarianism. As presented by Goold, the Soviet dystopia which totalizes all the Eastern Block can be read as a tool to undermine such capitalist false myths on socialism denounced by Derrida. If we apply cultural materialist premises, which reject the essentialist and totalizing visions of New Historicism, myths can be criticized and interrogated (Belsey 1992; Dollimore 1989; 1992; Howard 1992; Sinfield 1992; Wilson 1992; 1993; 2013). As Catherine Belsey affirms, meanings of texts are never single and do not unilaterally come out of the interpreters' collective perceptions (1992, 41). Therefore, it can affirmed that this film speaks in the present as well as in the past tense and that the scope of the context encompasses Western as well as Eastern horizons.

3. The setting

The main setting in the film is the ballroom at Welbeck Abbey as well as exterior settings chosen for a number of scenes. This room and the other facilities at the Abbey re-create Foucault's "Panopticon." Amongst the many renovations carried out on this twelfth-century building, the Fifth Duke of Portland created multiple tunnels and corridors interwoven through the mansion,[10] which find their confluence in the ballroom, where the Earl used to hold his social gatherings.[11] Sam McCurdy, director of photography, managed to get green lighting tones for the ballroom walls, thus evoking Kubrick's *The Shinning* or hospital-based "slasher" productions. (In fact, the Witches are killers who rip the Bleeding Sergeant's heart out after he is left on a stretcher in a contiguous hospital corridor.) As Goold says, this hospital nightmare represents

---

[10] See Nottinghamshire County Council, "Welbeck Abbey History." Accessed August, 2017. http://www.worksopheritagetrail.org.uk/resources/welbeck_abbey_history.pdf.

[11] See "Director's and Producer's Commentaries" in DVD.

what he fears: finding death in the place where comfort should be expected ("Director's and Producer's Commentaries"). Also, the setting plays into the Foucauldian views of disciplinary institutions as places for punishment.[12]

As soon as Macbeth (Patrick Stewart) becomes king, the banner representing his effigy appears embodying the above-mentioned totalitarian Other in the ballroom. This banner underlines the qualities of this surveillance-based regime. In scene 3.1., Banquo (Martin Turner) confronts Macbeth's image and speaks his suspicions towards him out loud. Nevertheless, when he is about to leave the room, he discovers that a buzzing intercom has recorded his whole speech. From that moment on, we know that Macbeth's regime depends on surveillance. The banner materializes how Macbeth keeps an eye on his subjects and the intercom proves that he also hears everything. Likewise, this totalitarian banner underlines Wilson's notion that it is "language which is 'fascist'" as "it compels speech and obliges those who use it to subject themselves to the order it prescribes" (1992, 3). Despite this, Banquo is recorded as he speaks the subversive words not allowed by the regime.

McGregor Wise affirms that surveillance films need to tackle the question of the limits of surveillance in the narrative (2016, 10). However, as already pointed out, Deleuze recognizes power as diffuse and nonlocalized (1987, 52). In this light, imitating several Shakespeare films that work on the oscillations between the languages of theater and film (Davies 1991), Goold's filmscape centrifugally stretches an apparently unlimited surveillance out without totally leaving its center: the ballroom. The cables interconnecting the rooms reach the Abbey cloister, where the Macbeths discuss what to do with the daggers (2.2). They also reach the kitchen, hospital facilities, the corridors, the mansion, and, eventually, the Trans-Siberian Express.

---

[12] In dialogue with D. Cooper, M.-O. Faye, J.-P. Faye, and M. Zecca, Foucault compares the hospital with an institution that repairs the disorders produced by society. In this light, as in the Soviet Union, the intensified pairing of the medical profession with the coercive police shapes the consolidation of a fascist section of hyper-normal citizens versus the abnormal society members (2012: 126–27, 142).

4. Surveillance between different factions

Surveillance-based power in this film is shifty and complex. As Dollimore indicates, power is non-monolithic (1984). Likewise, in this film, surveillance and, consequently, power, go hand in hand. The first overt allusion to technology-based surveillance takes place when Macduff yells through an intercom from Macbeth's kitchen announcing Duncan's death (2.3.67–74). The institutional corridors at Welbeck Abbey are wired; in fact, the state equipment has existed long before Macbeth: it pre-dates his crowning. Yet, these facilities do not necessarily guarantee people's securities but only ensure that certain factions maintain their hegemonic power.

Thus, in this nightmarish world, characters mutually spy on each other. And in fact, Macbeth is spied on too, although initially, the evidence gathered does not suffice to overthrow him. After the discovery of Duncan's death, and subsequent to Macduff's summoning of Duncan's thanes to Macbeth's kitchen, Goold quotes Welles' filming of the scene by making Lennox (Mark Rawlings) and Macbeth exchange glances of complicity after the bloody daggers are produced.[13] Also Banquo, suspicious of Lady Macbeth's fainting, conspiratorially mutters to Macduff (Michael Feast): "Look to the lady" (2.3.118). Later, being "caught-in-the-act" through the intercom, Banquo is heard as he speaks against the tyrant. Although he has the moral grounds to accuse Macbeth, he lacks the political alliances for such an action.

Meanwhile, surveillance forges new alliances. After 2.3, the Porter (Christopher Patrick Nolan) takes over some of the Old Man's lines (2.4) at the Abbey courtyard. While smoking, he nonchalantly converses with Ross (Tim Treloar) about the assassination and observes Macduff's family when they leave in their car. At the same time, a long shot shows an outsider's viewpoint watching them all through the bars of the mansion gate. Unquestionably, surveillance exists outside Macbeth's rule. This means that Macbeth's spies are not the only ones who watch. Furthermore, at their meeting, Malcom (Scott Handy) and Macduff see photos of the people who suffer Macbeth's tyranny in a landscape recalling of the Gulag. These images function as triggers for the rebellion against the tyrant.

---

[13] In Welles' version, the Holy Father (Alan Napier), shown in extreme close-up, scrutinizes Macbeth after he kills the grooms.

Therefore, even Macduff is partly a sharer in the power granted by evidence to build up a legitimate case against the dictator. In fact, in a later scene, called the "Stasi Montage" by Goold (see footnote 3), a series of state crimes committed by Macbeth are shown in snapshots which make the viewer complicit with the diegetic surveillance activity. In fact, the Porter is shown watching military parades on television in a manner that invites the viewer to partake in surveillance activity.

As for Ross, Lennox, the Porter, Angus (Bill Nash) and the First Murderer (Hywel John), they all collect information for and against Macbeth. While Angus bugs people's homes to get information, the Porter spies for Macbeth, and Ross gathers files on Macduff. From the beginning of the film, Ross carries files on Norway's defeat and Cawdor's treason. Lennox collects files on those who want to oppose Macbeth. However, he also collects files on Macbeth himself. As he interrogates Ross, he is deliberately ambiguous in his explanation of Duncan's death, Malcom's imputation and Banquo's murder. Before this, during Banquo's killing on the train, the First Murderer knows that Lennox has been sent to oversee the operation and then he witnesses how Lennox shoots the Second Murderer after a short dispute. The state bureaucrats are inclined to accept any such inhumanity as mere administrative procedure. But whereas the First Murderer, Angus and Ross are swifter in turning against Macbeth, Lennox and the Porter embrace *realpolitik* and willingly collaborate with him. Ironically, Lennox's files on Macbeth ("I have a file | Of all the gentry…" 5.2.8–9) are decisive to buy him a passage to join Malcom's rebellion.[14] Thus, no matter how slow many have been in changing sides, information is a safe-conduct to make an alliance with those in power. Thus, loyalty is less important than information.

5. Sons watching parents

Foucault's analysis of power also regards the family as a major disciplinary institution. Yet, Macbeth's regime works against the stability the family is expected to provide. As Vasily Grossman says,

---

[14] In this film, the Second Murderer (Christopher Knott) is killed by Lennox after the assassination of Banquo. The First Murderer survives and becomes a member of Macbeth's secret police.

"in one hut there would be something like a war. Everyone would keep close watch over everyone else […]. The wife turned against her husband and the husband against his wife. The mother hated the children" (quoted in Conquest 1986, 256). To some extent, this passage seems to have determined Goold's vision of the Macduff family's division into different perspectives and responses to treason, some of them hostile to the mother. Lady Macduff (Suzanne Burden) tries to keep her children entertained with a pretense of normalcy while potential dangers approach. After her husband disappears, she attends one of the military parades and her worrying looks show that in the previous scenes she was keeping up appearances in the male-dominated ambience of Macbeth's kitchen.

Because of the bitter battle of wits with her bookish daughter (Lillian Dummer) and the milder conversation with her son (Hugo Docking), Macduff's wife sees her smile turned into a grin. Like Roald Dahl's Matilda, Macduff's daughter reads books and is critical of what her mother thinks and does. She asks her, mockingly: "Nay, how will you do for a husband?" (4.2.39). But the sharpest accusation comes when she addresses her scathing criticism of her mother: "Then you'll buy 'em to sell again" (4.2.41). How is her mother so naive as to sell their father out and uphold this orchestrated farce about his treachery? As opposed to this confrontational attitude, Macduff's son's approach is more sensitive and kinder as he prefers to plainly ask direct questions.[15] Here Goold introduces a dramatic statement, from which it follows that perhaps the children, even if not completely understanding the whole picture, are certain about the many flaws that both the regime and the official history of their father's treachery present. For these children, that their father is a traitor is simply a wasteful thought. Therefore, they interrogate their mother's act.

In this scene, Goold alludes to the many incidents related to children denouncing their parents during the Stalinist era. Amis' *Koba the Dread*, which, as indicated by Stewart (see "Theater Talk" 2008), was one of the sources of inspiration for Macbeth's characterization, refers to how "children who denounced their parents became national figures, hymned in verse and song" (2003,

---

[15] Goold distributes Young Macduff's original lines between the son and the daughter. A third younger daughter, a silent part, helps further develop Goold's study of the family as an institution tarnished by Macbeth's subversive regime.

154). Previously, he mentions that "some parents killed their children. And other parents ate their children" (141). Seeing how the Macduff family is treated in this film from this angle, can we say that this a situation in which the family is about to face such a serious split? The murder squad does not give us time to find out. In any case, Macduff's daughter's questions are fissures in this disciplinary state. She sees the flaws of a system that does not use surveillance to capture criminals but to punish dissenting voices.

However, even if this fictionalization of a family split is rather timorous, Goold works on this idea in the "Stasi montage." In this section, one of the families scrutinized by Lennox's secret service is assaulted at home. As mentioned above, a little boy talks to Lennox and directly points at his mother. As the mother sees the officers coming, she starts running away, leaving her child unprotected in Lennox's hands. The fact that the child does not intentionally accuse her does not alter the cruelty of the situation nor does it change the fact that Macbeth's surveillance state is a threat to the institution of the family. In this respect, Macbeth's surveillance is aggressive against the conservative disciplinary and regulative principles embodied by such an institution as part of the larger social framework.[16]

6. "Banquo and Macbeth all hail" (1.3.67)

The first man in this production who, with some sarcasm, seems to be startled at Macbeth's kingship is Banquo. As already mentioned, Banquo does not shy away from appearing to be a threat to Macbeth's totalitarian regime. Macbeth and Banquo's mutual watch starts in the ballroom—scene 1.3 in the film—, where Banquo becomes a watcher as he starts keeping an eye on everything Macbeth does and thinks, particularly as he whispers to a mannequin dressed in a military jacket and reanimated by the Witches with a pumping heart—the Bleeding Sergeant's heart. When the King embraces him, Banquo makes sure to let Macbeth see how

---

[16] In this production, Lady Macbeth (Kate Fleetwood) keeps a little shoe, a *memento mori* of her dead child. Yet, this dead child is from another marriage, as Patrick Stewart points out in an interview (see CD). Instead of children, the Macbeths keep an unusually personal relationship with a Servant (Oliver Birch), who is slightly retarded.

little he matters for the elites of the kingdom.[17] Is the peasant Macbeth perhaps thinking of high-flying with his betters? Later, in scene 2.1, a canted frame shows Macbeth confronted by Banquo in the kitchen right after the protagonist, sitting down near Fleance, tries to suggest that Banquo should be his accomplice. Banquo towers above his rival. Subsequently, he asks Fleance to quickly come back to him and threateningly makes clear to Macbeth that he will not do anything dishonorable. As mentioned above, he confides his suspicions on Lady Macbeth's fainting to Macduff and then openly addresses Macbeth while stating his suspicions of "treasonous malice" (2.3.125). Very likely, with this, Banquo has just signed his own death warrant. A reaction shot shows Stewart's resentful visage, which proves that very shortly he will take action against a possibly subversive Banquo.

After Banquo's speech is registered through the intercom in scene 3.1, David Tennant—as Hamlet— takes away one of the CCTV cameras from the wall in an outburst of rage, and Banquo furiously removes the intercom from the wall. Subsequently, his encounter with Macbeth and Lady Macbeth takes place at the courtyard of the mansion. Banquo and Fleance (Bertie Gilbert) are caught, in their travelling clothes and suitcases in hand, by a haunting party as they try to leave the country. In that guise, Banquo's promise of return for the banquet does not seem credible at all. As for Macbeth, on horse, he boisterously and even threateningly urges Banquo not to miss the feast. His theatrical stature increases as he deduces that Banquo is probably trying to gather foreign alliances to turn against him, which gives him a pretext to eliminate his rival.

7. Diegeticized surveillant omniscience

As already suggested, surveillance blurs the boundaries between form and content in the filmic narrative. As Levin indicates in his analysis of Ford Coppola's *The Conversation* (1974), surveillance films have the capacity to "move away from a thematic to a structural engagement" in the film narrative (2002, 582). When the protagonist tries to find out the surveillance mechanisms in his apartment, the

---

[17] In this film production, it is obvious that—like Stalin—Macbeth comes from the rank-and-file and his political status is inferior to those of his fellow generals. This is confirmed in an Interview with Patrick Stewart in the DVD (2010).

viewer discovers that the locus of surveillance "resides in a space that is epistemologically unavailable to [Gene Hackman] within the diegesis" and, thus, surveillance becomes "the condition of the narration itself" (583). Arguably, this "diegeticized surveillant omniscience" will be frequent in CCTV-based surveillance films of the 1990s onwards.

It can be rightfully stated that a similar effect takes place in Goold's *Macbeth*. Besides the abovementioned anonymous vigilant presence at the courtyard, there are other instances of surveillant omniscience, such as the "Stasi Montage," where several bits of state violence and documentary footage with military parades are shown while the servants prepare the table for the banquet scene. Also, some long shots feature Macbeth and Lady Macbeth covered in blood in a wide cloister corridor after the murder of Duncan. At that point, they seem to be under vigilance by some unseen mechanism. Since the Witches are the ones who stage-manage this institutional and nightmarish plot, it is not difficult to relate this omniscient surveillance to the supernatural. As Terry Eagleton states, the Witches "figure as the 'unconscious' of the drama, regarded as threatening but which tends to aggressively return, not so much subverting the binary opposition of chaos and order as deconstructing it" (1986, 2–3). Their presence de-regulates the already flabby but essentially hyper-rational, totalitarian and bureaucratic organization of surveillance in Scotland.

In fact, their surveillance seems to take place mostly around the ballroom, which preserves all the make-believe of theater. As already suggested, this area constitutes a center of surveillance in the film. Firstly, the Witches and Banquo see and watch over Macbeth's murderous thoughts. Yet, Banquo's watch backfires on him when he is caught by Macbeth's intercom as he challengingly looks at the tyrant's banner. Although Macbeth has been discovered by Banquo —"and I fear | Thou played'st most foully for't" (3.1.2–3) —, this does not at all discourage him in his murderous rule. However, it is at the ballroom that Banquo's Ghost returns as bloody witness to Macbeth's treacherous assassination. Eventually, Macbeth's last encounter with the Witches presents how the source of filmic integration between thematic and formal surveillance is articulated.

The Witches' powers depend on their technological control, no matter how rusty and dated this technology may seem to be. In

scene 4.1, the parade of Kings is presented through several superimposed takes of Fleance entering the room. This editing turns the Witches into film auteurs of sorts. Mimicking a rudimentary digital reality, the visions line up in front of Macbeth. If the Witches' powers are connected to technology, it shouldn't be a surprise that they extend their powers to the audiovisual potentialities of an editing room. The abovementioned court masque thus becomes a surveillance feast where Macbeth's thoughts of Fleance and "Banquo's issue" are visually arranged. The Witches do not only figure the subconscious, as Eagleton remarks. They are also capable of shaping it in filmic forms. Macbeth's lack of understanding of where this omniscient level of surveillance comes from evinces that he is under surveillance too. Thus, the *theatrum mundi* metaphor is recovered in the production as the hero sees himself as part of a visual narrative framing the whole event. If Macbeth can extend his command of the Scottish institutional apparatus through symbols and images of fascism, the indefiniteness and the deregulated strength of the Witches' surveillance suffices to make Macbeth's communist dystopia give way to the liquidity of more Baudrillardian simulacra in the form of scraps of filmic narrative and a disorganized amalgamation of surveillance footage replacing this decayed horror state.

An additional proof that surveillance based on visual fabrics exists outside Macbeth's rule and within the filmic structure is the last sequence, in which different settings are shown as different levels in a video game. Thus, the viewer is invited to patrol over the kitchen, the corridors, the hospital facilities, the campaign hospital, the dark tunnels of the abbey, and, finally, the lift, where Macbeth and Lady Macbeth take their last journey. Surveillance follows its own channels, aligned to the neoliberal spiral of liquidity and decentralization, which ends up eliminating all sense of consistency and real freedom. In fact, as suggested, these last shots seem to reframe the narrative as a video game, bound to repeat its narrative with very few possibilities for the player except for those programmed by an unknown creative community of designers and programmers. In the "Director's and Producer's Commentaries," Goold, in fact, alludes to these last shots as the patrolling at the final stages of such video game. This reference embodies the Deleuzian paradox that, whereas the coordinates of surveillance and power appear as diffuse and untraceable, yet it situates the watched within

the very narrow confines of an interactive narrative that allows only as many options as the programmers deem acceptable.[18] The viewer is made complicit in this effect as, like the Porter watching the military parades on television, he watches the different scenarios of this massive scrutinized matrix, perhaps unaware that he is one more part in it.

8. Conclusion

The surveillance frame used by Goold modifies the traditional modes in which British TV has recorded Shakespeare stage productions. Although this film is theatrical in its homage to an original stage-based rationale, it is unusually—for British recorded theater—influenced by a plethora of Hollywood film conventions. The fact that the film, as a Shakespeare adaptation, still constitutes a feast for the ear as well as a visual delight clarifies the complex stance of this hybrid narrative. Therefore, conventions borrowed from the surveillance film struggle with the BBC's traditional house rules of studio drama, television film or live recording.

Goold's affiliation to Hollywood generic conventions seem to align him with narratives which are critical of the dangerous cons derived from surveillance malpractice. Surveillance films and series of the last two decades confirm Deleuze's belief that post-revolutionary surveillance disciplinary values are being replaced by values of the society of control, where power consists of random shifts and tabulations that resemble the dynamics of the game show rather than the hyper-rational dynamics of totalitarian civil rule. Parallel to this transition from one power system to another, Goold's film reflects it as it shows an aural disciplinary world which also makes use of reports and documents. This disciplinary world is mostly in the hands of localized subjects and civil servants. Progressively, this primitive system gives way to a more visual tyranny based on incomprehensible images edited by unreachable entities.

This liquidity, which does not permit the viewer to rationalize how power is structured in this society of control, invokes the

---

[18] In fact, Goold's self-proclaimed intention here is to pose the question that perhaps all this will happen again (See "Director's and Producer's Commentaries").

intertextual complexity of the production. Despite Sokolova's recognition of elements alluding to our contemporary world, the pseudo-Soviet context of the film is still too general. All references to the Soviet totalitarian dystopia may amount to no more than scraps and shards of Western paranoid visions on Marxist failed utopias. However, the subconscious insights provided by omniscient surveillance show the scratches and holes of this Foucauldian nightmarish construction. A more malleable, less predictable, less organized and much less localized type of surveillance seems to run in parallel with the growth of defamiliarizing, cutting and editing in the Witches' scenes. Following an opposite route to the Lacanian and Freudian analogies on language and growth, the hyper-rational and institutionalized analogical system of discipline and surveillance in Macbeth's world has given way to a much more semiotic and infantile shapeless succession of images, which peep through the little fissures in the shield of the regime. As Wilson suggests, capitalism does not simply involve economic change but also linguistic change (1992, 2). Thus, the chaotic language of omniscient surveillance breaks all boundaries pinpointed in the Foucauldian space. As Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri suggest, the transcending of national boundaries favors the development of massively entangled networks of control (2000). In this light, state control in the film gives way to an undefined unreal macro-system of simulacra, re-editing, repeated images, unintentional and disorganized snapshots. Yet, this does not mean that control has ceased.

It is no accident that the communist Derridean Ghosts in the film are defeated by marginal figures like the Witches and other female characters. To some extent, Macduff's daughter's scrutinizing on her mother's hypocritical stance for the regime seems to point at the crumbling system of discipline and punishment. Whereas the visions that pervade Goold's disciplinary state fulfill the Western nightmares and clichés stigmatizing the Eastern Other, the feminine subversive element, embodied in the Witches and Lady Macbeth, foregrounds the marginal, the creative, and the bloody altogether. Nevertheless, female interrogation of totalitarianism does not truly lead to encouraging or positive glimpses of a Utopian tomorrow beyond Macbeth's downfall, except for Macduff's daughter's critical gaze.

Such downfall is shown when Malcom holds the tyrant's bloody head, a mutilated body part working as metonymy of the fall of the whole surveillance state. He has managed to defeat Macbeth because he has learned to control the tyrant's iconographic language. But the new government does not know that Macbeth's surveillance regime is subject to a larger regime of control over people's inner fears and thoughts. Rather than eradicating the Stalinist threat quoted in the introduction, a new liquid surveillance will unravel, manipulate and, if necessary, edit and reconfigure these thoughts in the form of montages of images and film scraps. In other words, Goold's clearly pessimistic vision presents an essentialist myth of socialist tyranny intermingling with another—perhaps also essentialist—myth of a liquid and undefined regime of far-reaching control. Is this society of control in the Witches' hands? Is it in the filmic structure itself? As in Coppola's *The Conversation* (1974), Goold succeeds in not providing clear answers to this problem posed by control societies.

References

Ackroyd, Peter. 2006. *Shakespeare (The Biography).* London: Vintage.

Althusser, Louis. (1965) 2005. "Ideología y aparatos ideológicos del Estado (notas para una investigación)." In *La filosofía como arma en la revolución*, translated by Oscar Molina, 102–28. México: Siglo XXI.

Amis, Martin. 2003. *Koba the Dread: Laughter and the Twenty Million.* New York: Vintage International.

Archer, John Michael. 1993. *Sovereignty and Intelligence (Spying and Court in the English Renaissance).* Stanford: Stanford University Press

Bacon, Francis. 1999. "New Atlantis." In *Francis Bacon (Selected Philosophical Works)*, edited by Rosemary Sargent, 239–68. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Baudrillard, Jean. (1978) 2008. *Cultura y simulacro*, translated by Antoni Vicens and Pedro Rovira. Barcelona: Editorial Kairós.

Belsey, Catherine. 1992. "Literature, History, Politics." In *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*, edited by Richard Wilson and Richard Dutton, 33-44. London and New York: Longman.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. *Intelectuales, política y poder*, translated by Alicia B. Gutiérrez. Buenos Aires: Eudeba Editorial Universitaria.

Conquest, Robert. 1986. *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, David, Marie-Odile Faye, Jean-Pierre Faye, Michel Foucault, and Marine Zecca. 2012. "Encierro, psiquiatría, prisión." In *Un diálogo sobre el poder y otras conversaciones*, edited by Michel Foucault and translated by Miguel Morey, 124–68. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Davies, Anthony. (1989) 1991. *Filming Shakespeare's Plays (The Adaptations of Laurence Olivier, Orson Welles, Peter Brook and Akira Kurosawa)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1987. *Foucault*, translated by José Vázquez Pérez. Barcelona: Editorial Paidós.

———. 1990. "Control and Becoming: Gilles Deleuze in Conversation with Antonio Negri." Translated by Martin Joughin. *Futur Anterieur* 1. Accessed September 2017. http://www.uib.no/sites/w3.uib.no/files/attachments/6._deleuze-control_and_becoming.pdf.

———. 1992. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October* 59: 3–7.

Deleyto, Celestino. 2003. *Ángeles y demonios. Representación e ideología en el cine contemporáneo de Hollywood*. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós.

Derrida, Jacques. (1995) 2012. *Espectros de Marx: el estado de la deuda, el trabajo del duelo y la nueva Internacional*. Translated by José Miguel Alarcón and Cristina de Peretti. Madrid: Editorial Trotta.

Dickson, Andrew. 2016. "Rupert Goold: 'It Was Pretty Intense, Living with My Lady Macbeth'." *The Guardian*, July 17, 2016. Accessed September 2017. https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2016/jul/17/rupert-goold-macbeth-shakespeare.

Dollimore, Jonathan. 1989. *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

———. 1992. "Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism and the New Historicism." In *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*, edited by Richard Wilson and Richard Dutton, 45–56. London and New York: Longman.

Eagleton, Terry. 1986. *William Shakespeare*. Rereading Literature series. Oxford: Blackwell.

Elias, Norbert. 1982. *The Civilizing Process. Vol. 2: Power and Civility*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michael. (1975) 2012. *Vigilar y castigar: el nacimiento de la prisión*. Translated by Aurelio Garzón del Camino. Madrid: Editorial Biblioteca Nueva.

Fraser, Antonia. 1996. *The Gunpowder Plot: Terror and Faith in 1605*. London: Orion House.

Greenblatt, Stephen. 1994. "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and Its Subversion, *Henry IV* and *Henry V*." In *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 18–47. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

———. 2004. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Grossman, Vasily. *Forever Flowing*. Translated by Thomas P. Whitney. New York: Possev-Verlag, 1972.

Hamlet. 2009. Directed by Gregory Doran. Illuminations Media and BBC. DVD.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. London: Harvard University Press.

Howard, Jean E. 1992. "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies." In *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*, edited by Richard Wilson and Richard Dutton, 19–32. London and New York: Longman.

Hunt, Maurice. 2005. "Reformation/Counter-Reformation *Macbeth*." *English Studies* 86 (5): 379–98.

Kammerer, Dietmar. 2004. "Video Surveillance in Hollywood Movies." *Surveillance & Society (CCTV Special)* 2 (2/3): 464–73.

Kinney, Arthur F. 2008. "Macbeth's Knowledge." In *Shakespeare Survey. Vol. 57: Macbeth and Its Afterlife*, edited by Peter Holland, 11–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lefait, Sébastien. 2013. *Surveillance on Screen: Monitoring Film and Television Programs*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press.

———. 2013–2014. "'This same strict and most observant watch' (1.1.71): Gregory Doran's *Hamlet* as Surveillance Adaptation." *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation* 8 (2). Accessed September 2017. http://www.borrowers.uga.edu/1072/pdf.

Levin, Thomas Y. 2002. "Rhetoric of the Temporal Index: Surveillant Narration and the Cinema of 'Real Time'." In *CTRL [Space]: Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother*, edited by Thomas Y. Levin et al., 578–93. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Lyon, David. 2007. *Surveillance Studies. An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity.

———. 2008. "Surveillance Society." Paper presented at the Festival del Diritto, Piacenza, Italy, September 28, 2008.

Macbeth. 1948. Directed by Orson Welles. Mercury Productions. DVD.

Macbeth. 2010. Directed by Rupert Goold. Illuminations Media and BBC. DVD.

McGregor Wise, J. 2016. *Surveillance and Film*. New York and London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Nicholls, Mark. 1991. *Investigating Gunpowder Plot*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Orgel, Stephen. 2011. *Spectacular Performances: Essays on Theatre, Imagery, Books and Selves in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Richards, Neil M. 2013. "The Dangers of Surveillance." *Harvard Law Review* March 25: 1934-1965.

Said, Edward. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Classics.

Schmitt, Carl. (1956) 2009. *Hamlet or Hecuba: The Intrusion of the Time into the Play*. Translated by David Pan and Jennifer Rust. New York: Telos Press.

Service, Robert. 2004. *Stalin: A Biography*. London: Macmillan.

Shakespeare, William. 2003. *Macbeth*. Edited by A. R. Braunmuller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinfield, Alan. 1992. "*Macbeth*: History, Ideology and Intellectuals." In *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*, edited by Richard Wilson and Richard Dutton, 167–80. London and New York: Longman.

Sokolova, Boika. 2013. "'Horrible Imaginings': Rupert Goold's Film Adaptation, a *Macbeth* for the Twenty-First Century." In *Shakespeare on Screen: Macbeth*, edited by Sarah Hatchuel, Nathalie-Guerrin, and Victoria Bladen, 149–69. Mont-Saint-Aignan: Presses Universitaires de Rouen et du Havre.

Stegh Camati, Anna. 2005. "Textual Appropriation: Totalitarian Violence in Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and Tom Stoppard's *Cahoot's Macbeth.*" *Ilha do Desterro* 49: 339–67.

Stewart, Alan. 2003. *The Cradle King: The Life of James VI and I, the First Monarch of a United Great Britain*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

"Theater Talk: Patrick Stewart, Rupert Goold on Macbeth." April 2008, PBS. Video, 25:08. https://www.youtub.com/watch?v=DMyfSQQamIA .

Thomas, Alfred. 2014. *Shakespeare, Dissent and the Cold War*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wills, Garry. 1995. *Witches and Jesuits*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Richard. 1992. "Introduction: Historicising New Historicism." In *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*, edited by Richard Wilson and Richard Dutton, 1–18. London and New York: Longman.

———. 1993. *Will Power: Essays on Shakespearean Authority*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

———. 2013. *Free Will: Art and Power on Shakespeare's Stage*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Wyver, John. 2010. "Macbeth with Sir Patrick Stewart: The Scottish Play from Stage to TV." *Bbctvblog*, December 9, 2010. Accessed September, 2017. http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/tv/2010/12/macbeth-patrick-stewart-tv.shtml.

———. 2016. Interview with author on June 21, 2016. Unpublished.

Zimmer, Catherine. 2015. *Surveillance Cinema*. New York and London: New York University Press.

How to cite this article:

Huertas Martín, Víctor. "Rupert Goold's *Macbeth* (2010): Surveillance society and society of control." *SEDERI* 27 (2017): 81–103.

Author's contact: victor.huertasm@uam.es

Postal address: Dpto. Filología Inglesa – Facultad de Filosofía y Letras - Universidad Autónoma de Madrid – Campus de Cantoblanco – 28049 Madrid, Spain

Submission: 29/12/2016   *Acceptance*: 14/06/2017