Watch this (actual and virtual) space: surveillance, dis/location and transit in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*

Andy Lavender

University of Surrey

ABSTRACT

This article addresses the relationship between Shakespearean dramaturgy and contemporary manifestations of surveillance, space and location. It focuses on a workshop production of *The Tempest* at the Gdansk Shakespeare Festival, which explored the use and adaptation of digital surveillance technologies in order to appraise and restage Shakespeare's dramaturgical arrangement of power relations and spatial organization. The article draws on scholarship on surveillance and transit in order to expand on the workshop production, and relate theatre and performance practice to contemporary cultural process and experience. In both production and article I attempt to move between early modern dramaturgy and late-postmodern staging to identify mutually informing principles and structures.

KEYWORDS

Shakespeare

The Tempest

digital culture

multimedia performance

surveillance

space

TRAVELOGUE 1

In August 2009 a number of colleagues and I took a trip to the Polish city Gdansk. The occasion was the opportunity to develop and present a workshop production of *The Tempest* at the Gdansk Shakespeare Festival, exploring the use of surveillance technology and contemporary media. The project came about when Philip Parr, the director of Parrabbola – a company that makes site-specific and community-based work – was looking for a partner to help deliver a project for the festival (with which Parr had longstanding relations), which in 2009 had a multimedia theme. Parr had seen previous multimedia productions by Lightwork, a theatre company of which I am the artistic director. I suggested that we turn to *The Tempest* as the vehicle for an experiment in multimedia production and Shakespearean dramaturgy, particularly in relation to contemporary concerns with surveillance and space. The play features journeying and return, confinement and release. It deals with power, observation and control. Such motifs lend themselves to the tropes and technologies of contemporary surveillance, with its cameras, recording devices, monitors and tracking systems. *The Tempest* seemed particularly well disposed both to an all-through multimedia staging, and a

thematic engagement with issues of transit, location, spatiality and media surveillance in post-industrial digital culture.

After initial workshopping at Central School of Speech and Drama, University of London, we took a company of five actors and a production team of ten to Gdansk for a week-long intensive workshop in the Klub Zak theatre. We presented an hour-long production to audiences in three showcase performances.¹ I edited the play to about half its length (we retained the Shakespearean text with no additions), developed the production concept and practice-research enquiry with collaborators, and directed the production in the rehearsal room, while Parr acted as producer in liaison with the festival. When not working, we took photos in the town centre (whose ersatz medieval facades had been renovated by the Russians), drank Polish beer and vodka, and ate in venues including the Tex-Mex restaurant appended to our pension. We were, after all, abroad.

THE TEMPEST AND ITS DISLOCATED FIGURES

Travel today, at least to large numbers of people living in post-industrial societies, means something different from what it meant to most of Shakespeare's contemporaries. As Caren Kaplan says, 'For most of my life, travel has been a certainty rather than a question.' (1996: ix) Writing from a postcolonial and feminist perspective, Kaplan distinguishes between variants of modernist and postmodern travel (with its commercial, leisure, adventure and touristic overtones) and displacement (with its implications of exile, mass migration, nomadism and forced repatriation). This distinction, albeit that it is problematised in Kaplan's work, is useful in looking back at *The Tempest*.

Whilst the play features travel – its shipwreck comes about as a consequence of a trip to a wedding – its discursive arrangement is really around different sorts of displacement, understood as a matter of coercion and not as one of personal choice. In *The Tempest*, transit (and its counter-face, stasis in the wrong place) is something done *to* people.

This resonates with the phenomenon Kaplan describes: the extension of migration, and its tendencies to displacement, dis-location, rootlessness and transit. Kelly Greenhill tabulates over sixty instances that show a gathered pattern of enforced migration from 1951-2006 over a wide geographical span, including groups of East Germans, Pakistanis, Vietnamese, Soviet Jews, Kosovar Albanians and North Africans (Greenhill, 2010: 16-17). Scholarship on broader trends in both elective and forced migration amplifies this sense of the volume and significance of the phenomenon. Esman, for instance, observes that 'Never have there been so many migrants as during the current era. According to United Nations estimates, in 2005 as many as 228 million people lived outside their country of birth, comprising 3 per cent of world population.' (2009: 4). Castles and Miller point to riots and civic incidents in Australia, Dubai, France, Holland and the USA between 2004-6 as a backdrop for their contention that 'international migration has changed the face of societies. [...] Momentous events around the world increasingly involve international migration' (2009: 1-2). Migration is hardly a new phenomenon; but it takes on a new and dynamic form after the Second World War, with a sharp rise in its incidence in the 1980s as a consequence of social and political reconfigurations and developments in transport and communications systems (Castles and Miller, 2009: 2-3). The increasing

ubiquity and complexity of migration narratives is consonant with the enabling effects of digital technologies, allowing for swifter communication over distance, and enhancing the infrastructures of international travel. Such developments in turn connect with a tendency in digital culture towards both placelessness and the proliferation of place.

This provides contemporary resonance to a Jacobean drama drenched in motifs of (de)territorialisation and decentredness. *The Tempest* is both determinedly locational and dis-located. The island setting provides an image of containment and a continuous locale, but the play depends on the sense that people are never properly on firm ground or in possession of their own turf. Much of this is to do with the changed situations in which all the characters, without exception, find themselves. All are already, in some way, destabilised when we meet them. We learn that the central character, Prospero (the erstwhile Duke of Milan), has been usurped by his own brother, set adrift in a rotten, unrigged ship, and (perhaps by magic) ends up on an island that we understand to be remote. He is, then, violently separated from his homeland, the mainland, his culture and his role as civic leader. On the island, however, we understand that he develops or is able to employ magical powers, which he uses to subjugate (so dis-locate) the island-dwellers. These include a spirit whom Prospero binds to himself over a fairly long duration ('thou didst promise To bate me a full year', complains Ariel) to perform various acts of surveillance and facilitation; and the son of a witch, whom Prospero enslaves ('confined into this rock') in order that he might fetch wood and perform other sundry duties. The island-dwellers, then, are themselves both decentred and 'grounded' by this quasi-imperialist invader. Prospero

acquires a new and powerful centrality, and his 'cell' serves as a compelling image of a nerve-centre. That said, he remains in exile and wants to return home.

Prospero knows what everyone else gets up to. His powers of surveillance and control extend beyond the confines of the island. He has Ariel conjure the storm that shipwrecks members of the courts of Milan and Naples, who had been at sea returning from 'the marriage of the king's fair daughter Claribel to the King of Tunis'. Drastically displaced from their leisure that is also business, the courtiers are further disoriented by the peculiar magic of the island, where they hear strange music, fall into enchanted sleep and witness mirages. Rootless, hapless and helpless, they are eventually led to Prospero's cell, where Shakespearean revelations are made and reconciliations effected so that the final journeying can begin. Ariel and Caliban are released from servitude. The play ends with the imminent return of Prospero and the courtiers to their domestic city-states – thereby evacuating a peculiar non-place – leaving Caliban in ambiguous possession of the island that he has previously declared to be 'mine'.

DIGITAL CONTEXTS FOR PATTERNED DECENTRINGS

If this brief précis appears to state the obvious, it does so selectively in order to suggest that, as with other ages before ours, we find in Shakespeare images of our own cultural forms, processes and dispositions. Certain principles of digital culture, to do with decentring and unfixedness, resonate with Shakespeare's early modern dramaturgy. I shall briefly sketch some outlines.

Digital technologies have collapsed time and space. People, organisations and indeed political entities can communicate with each other globally with almost no delay. The processes here intensify and extrapolate temporal and spatial qualities, so that we can talk simultaneously of 'time-space compression' and 'time-space distancing' (Larsen, 2006: 1; see also Klinenberg and Benzecry, 2005: 8). The redesignation of time by way of digital technologies allows us routinely to pause, speed up, slow down, store and retrieve communications at the push of a button or click of a mouse. Human presence is both distributed (so dispersed), and commodified by way of consumer transactions that offer heightened forms of experience in the present moment. Different sorts of convergence – of technologies, telecommunications systems, broadcasting platforms, the creative industries, creative processes – bring time-space into previously unexperienced relations. Digital culture is subject to evolving forms of what marketing people call 'reach' (the penetration of media and their messages across different territories and constituencies) and 'richness' (the conveyance and take-up of value in such communications).

This is not simply a question of new devices making for fresh habits. The incursion of the digital affects how we think, how we experience, how we act within culture. In this field of altered time-space relations, where linearity and singularity are superseded by 'variable geometries' (Gherab-Martín, 2011: 366) and the plural characteristics of the network, 'transit' becomes differently meaningful. The anthropologist Marc Augé, writing in 1992, presciently includes the term in his long essay *Non-Place: An Introduction to Supermodernity* as one of 'the fashionable words – those that did not exist

thirty years ago – [that] are associated with non-places. Thus we can contrast the realities of *transit* (transit camps or passengers in transit) with those of residence or dwelling’ (2008: 86; Augé’s emphasis; the essay first appeared in French in 1992). Transit, then, is not so much a question of passing from one place to another in pure directional journeying. It is as likely to suggest a *circumstance* that is both situated and dis-located, a state of impermanence that is nonetheless phenomenally distinct. Such a state seems peculiarly apt to a digital, network culture, in which entities can be simultaneously centred and unfixed.

In Augé’s account, non-places include those ubiquitous and somehow rootless venues associated with transit – airport lounges, motorway service stations and hotels – along with the serially proliferated supermarket and shopping mall. The island of *The Tempest*, clearly not a ‘supermodern’ phenomenon, might nonetheless be described as having some of the attributes of a non-place. It is a site through which one passes, rather than a home (unless for Caliban). It is a zone of temporary circulation, defined by systems of communication that depend on partial exclusion. And in our workshop production, at least, it was a place circumscribed by audio-visual technology.

SURVEILLANCE SPACE: PROSPERO AND PANOPTICISM

Notions of space and situatedness formed a reference point for our work. Another was provided by a related concern with modes of observation and control. The economists Malecki and Moriset observe that ‘Digital technology is the key driver of the emergence of an over-mediatized society which

features an increasing level of “panopticism” (2008: 222); a theme that has been widely addressed in studies of contemporary surveillance.² The discussion draws considerably on Foucault’s celebrated account (1991) of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century models of surveillance and control, including Jeremy Bentham’s plan, published in 1791, for a penitentiary Panopticon (Foucault, 1991: 195-228).³ Bentham’s scheme envisaged a central observation tower, where the observer could see but not be seen, surrounded by a series of cells made visible through the arrangement of light. As Foucault observes, ‘The panoptic mechanism arranges spatial unities that make it possible to see constantly and to recognize immediately’ (200) – an arrangement that characterises Prospero’s controlling mode in *The Tempest*, at least metaphorically. Prospero arranges not only space but also action and activity. The scenic and dramaturgical arrangement of *The Tempest*, commonly thought to have had its first production in 1611, evokes the arrangement of society described by Foucault as characteristic of the seventeenth century, entailing ‘multiple separations, individualizing distributions, an organization in depth of surveillance and control, and intensification and a ramification of power’ (1991: 198).

Distributions of power, arrangements of space and modes of surveillance are intimately interrelated, whatever the age. The notion that we are living in a ‘surveillance society’ has become if anything more widespread, in tandem with the increased sophistication of computer and media technologies. This raises questions about the *spaces* of surveillance, which can be thought of as broadly threefold. Firstly, there are the places put under observation, from buses to shopping malls to babies’ bedrooms. Secondly,

there is the representational space of surveillance and the aesthetics of surveillance capture, often involving black-and-white images, high camera positions and fixed focal lengths, although with technological advances some surveillance cameras can now track subjects and change their focus. Thirdly, there is the space in which surveillance is conducted, from the control room of a London underground station to the bedroom of a viewer following, say, a live camera on an individual contestant in a reality-TV show. In a book-length study of the relationship between modes of surveillance and tropes of performance, John McGrath argues that 'the experience of surveillance technologies in contemporary society is fundamentally spatial' (2004: 133). The spaces of surveillance, in this account, operate according to temporal and physical coordinates that are different from those of 'conventional space' (McGrath, 2004: 153). Drawing on Lefebvre's account of representations of space that bear upon felt experience, McGrath argues that surveillance space is both phenomenological and performative, in that it implicates the viewer or auditor, and perhaps differently, the object of the gaze. He goes on to analyse artworks that, he suggests, 'encourage us to feel, to live surveillance' (2004: 141). I suggest, below, that surveillance space in *The Tempest* is performative in the way that McGrath indicates. It produces behaviours and activities, partly through Prospero's agency as panoptic controller, and partly through the features of a spatiality that is inherently dis-located and decentred.

Surveillance now is not simply a matter of being watched, but of being both countable and trackable. David Lyon notes 'the increasing convergence of once discrete systems of surveillance (administration, employment, health, insurance, credit and so on), such that (in this case) digital data derived from

human bodies flows within networks' (2011: 109). If we are more used to surveillance, it can also be argued that we participate more productively in it, in part by submitting to the infrastructures of surveillance and dataveillance, in part through our engagement with the protocols of social networking, which facilitate various sorts of monitoring. Jonathan Finn suggests that 'It is not just that we are complicit with surveillance [...] but we are also willing, conscious producers of surveillance. We actively participate in the surveillance of ourselves and others to the extent that surveillance is fully enmeshed in our daily lives.' (78) This may apply more readily to some than to others, but the general trend marks a distinction between the early-modern dramaturgy of Shakespeare's play, where surveillance is, you might say, mono-directional, and the post-postmodern features of digital culture, where it is widely distributed and iterated. In *The Tempest*, Prospero effects a more centred and panoptic form of control than is sometimes the case in today's digital environments. The other characters are variously victims of this surveillant gaze and its structurings, rather than witting participants in surveillance as a routine social practice. In relation to our workshop production, this reduced some of the options for 'play' with the devices of surveillance currently available to us, but nonetheless provided a structure to our presentation of the 'surveillance society' of *The Tempest*, and a framework within which to operate.

I turn to Lightwork's Gdansk experiment because its attempt at a conjunction of media form and Shakespearean dramaturgy facilitates a discussion of the relations between Shakespearean text and a contemporary production context. The points of triangulation for our practice-research

enquiry were the text itself (specifically its dynamics of power and control); contemporary modes of observation (the act of looking surveillantly and the fact of being watched); and those of dis-location (the ‘uptake’ of particular kinds of space and spatial relations, to use McGrath’s term [2004: 133]). My premiss here is that theatre production can *manifest* cultural form. We aimed to figure tropes of surveillance and spatiality in the grain of the performance, not merely thematically but through the re-presentations, separations and distanciations (literal and Brechtian) of multimedia production. We were on friendly ground – for theatre, after all, is always both a shaper of space and a machine for watching.

PRODUCTION DECISIONS FOR A DISLOCATED *TEMPEST*

In Gdansk we wanted to explore the notion that Prospero (himself displaced) sees and controls everything from a central location. We also wanted our audience to ‘feel’ the space surveillantly or, at least, to have a dissonant relationship to space.⁴ We discussed the prospect of creating a promenade production, but decided that in the time available to us we would concentrate on creating a multimedia environment that would facilitate spectators in watching Prospero in a fixed central location, and observing screened images more or less as he would see them. This meant creating a controlled viewing perspective, with a large projection screen running across one side of the space, a flat-screen monitor and an easel (on which we could project an image) in Prospero’s cell, and a sailcloth at the back of the cell which showed a shadow, in effect a rear-projection (Figure 1). To this end, our arrangement

was a machine for spectating – that is, to facilitate our audience in watching Prospero's observations.

In order to disturb the fixed perspectives that usually apply to theatre staging, we 'walked' the audience into the performance space. This meant a journey through the foyer and out of the building to a large back yard, where the spectators passed a bare-chested figure carrying wood, his wrists tethered with long lengths of rope to his ankles. They passed a patch of grass on one side of their path, and a large plastic garbage container on wheels on the other, before entering the studio. Here they could sit or stand, facing a long screen the width of the playing area, with Prospero's cell on their left. This detour – in a full production we would explore more fulsome and dislocatory promenade possibilities – was intended to perform a brief decentring of the spectator's relationship to theatrical space, and provide a 'privileged' view of a backstage space that was also a space for performance (hence not backstage at all).

This space returned by way of mediated surveillance. Prospero's first exchange with Caliban was staged with Prospero in his cell, watching the flat-screen monitor. A face appears. It is that of David Rogers, playing Caliban – the bare-chested figure we walked past on our way into the space. He is standing in the garbage container – his cave, in our workshop version – facing a camera positioned clearly out of reach, with the fixed focus and low-resolution black-and-white image of a surveillance device. The actors play the scene live, with Rogers' voice and image relayed in the performance space. We worked on a conceit whereby Prospero could see Caliban (by way of the surveillance camera and a radio mic), and Caliban could hear Prospero (by

implication through a loud-speaker system) but not see him. A direct eyeline to Prospero was denied Caliban in this scene, as befits his position in the play, controlled, observed and largely ignorant of what is happening around him. This also figures a structural feature of surveillance, where the observed might sometimes see himself expressly as the subject of observation but would not normally see the observer. Space in this scene was doubly replayed, once through mediation and once through memory, as the spectator refigures in performance a space that has been traversed prior to performance.

We initially envisaged Prospero's cell as a sort of media centre, enabling him to keep everything under the sort of close and continuous surveillance that has become commonplace for many of us. This somewhat literal image was softened as we developed the project, but the idea that Prospero was in the middle of everything – even when he appeared to be absent (that is, when he wasn't in a scene) – remained throughout. Designer Tom Richardson developed Prospero's cell as a permanent fixture in the space, with Prospero as its near-permanent inhabitant. We wanted to keep Prospero's panoptic position in play in relation to the trajectories of other characters. We envisaged a phalanx of surveillance cameras as one of the means by which Prospero kept an eye on everything – a connected, networked environment where actions could be tracked virtually – and this led to other staging decisions. It freed us, for example, to 'stage' other scenes outside the performance space co-inhabited by the audience, as long as we could bring the action before the gaze of the spectators by way of the camera and the video screen / monitor.

Thus, for instance, the scene in which the courtiers fall asleep, leaving Antonio and Sebastian to plot the murder of the King, was played on a patch of grass in the courtyard outside the studio and watched by the audience on a screen inside. This particular scene also effected a temporal dislocation. It appeared to be live, an effect achieved in part through the long-shot format of a surveillance-type capture, with a fixed position and focus (so no movement of the camera or its focal length), with characters coming in and out of the frame accordingly. As with Caliban's cell, the audience saw here a space previously seen on their walk through the back yard into the studio – a fleetingly familiar space, defamiliarised. It had been my intention to run this scene live, but in the event we decided to pre-record it. The reveal that gave the lie to its apparent liveness was when the audience saw Rogers onscreen as Antonio, and barely a second later enter half-naked and carrying a wooden pallet (Caliban bearing wood, Figure 2), virtually in two spaces at once. Surveillance capture is both highly specific – it normally runs with a digital timecode, locating it precisely in time – and temporally untrustworthy, in that recording devices allow for slippages of time, presenting an actuality that is more or less present as context determines.

The spatial trajectory of the courtiers was that of a spiral, starting remote from the central performing area (so, mediated to the audience by video relay), coming closer to the periphery of the playing space, before ending in the middle of the space for the play's final series of revelations. In this way, enabled by cameras and microphones, we aimed to figure through a mix of virtual and actual space the play's dramaturgical structuring, whereby the

courtiers approach ever closer to the centre of Prospero's domain prior to the denouement of revelation and release.

This scene was staged by way of a sequence developed by movement director Ayse Tashkiran, in which the courtiers entered the space trance-like (under Ariel's spell). Whilst they were in a sort of hallucinatory fug, Prospero moved among them with a camcorder, whose live feed showed the men still under a mediated form of surveillance (by way of large-screen projection showing the actors in unusual close-ups from Prospero's perspective), but a scrutiny that was now intense and overt, both personal and public as befits the quasi-judicial reckoning that Prospero effects.

Dislocation was a trope for the experience of the characters in the play; a function of digital mediation; and a choice in relation to *mise en scène* – a matter of relocating scenes and actions outside the performance space in order to remediate them inside it, shifted spatially and sometimes temporally, and in some instances physically. Caliban's bindings – the rope tying his wrists and ankles – meant that he had freedom of movement but could not stand straight, a visceral figure of containment developed with Rogers by Tashkiran, resonating the dis-locational theme of bodies out of kilter.

The actor Scott Handy, meanwhile, developed the notion that his character, Prospero, could be yet more graphically fixed in his nerve-centre cell by way of being wheelchair-bound.⁵ A good deal of discussion ensued as to the sorts of representation (of disability, of the ethical place of an able-bodied actor) this entailed. But for the purposes of the experiment we pursued the idea. Prospero, then, was both radically severed from his usual home location, and emphatically constrained, a reading that slightly cut against what

might otherwise appear to be the blithe progress of the character through the piece.

We were particularly interested in Ariel's paradoxical circumstances – a spirit who had freedom of movement throughout the island, who was nonetheless in thrall to his master. Prospero talks of the moment (prior to the action of the play) when he released Ariel from his imprisonment in by the witch Sycorax in 'a cloven pine'. Ariel often appears in productions of the play as a relatively airy fairy, already part-liberated. We were interested in the part that wasn't quite so free, but also in the freedom conveyed by virtual transmission. We decided to fix Ariel in a single location, and ask the actor always to perform to a microphone and camera. If new media technologies allow different spaces to be kept under surveillance, they also allow for broadcast *to* remote locations. This was Ariel's metaphoric mode. He never moved, and at the same time he could be (virtually) anywhere. We compounded the effect by keeping the corporeal actor from view – albeit that his performance station was located within Prospero's cell, a few feet behind a large sailcloth that served as a screen in both senses (Figure 1). Co-present with the spectators in the space, he appeared live to them by way of digital mediation and his shadow on the cloth (a lower-tech rendition). His release at the end of the play allowed us a theatrical moment, of sorts. Prospero freed his servant; the sailcloth fell, and out stepped an actor playing Ariel, free to walk slowly across the space and go to exit, in a sort of Deleuzean line of flight from imprisonment, location, character.

We explored disturbing spatial relations using the properties of video space and three-dimensional theatrical space, coloured by what McGrath

calls 'the distortions of normative space enacted by surveillance technologies' (141). In the scene in which Ferdinand first meets Miranda, for instance, we showed Prospero watching on his monitor in his cell (Figure 3). When he confronts the couple later in the scene, Handy's image appears on a large screen adjacent to the couple (Figure 4). In the ensuing conversation, the couple make an eyeline match with the figure of Prospero on the large screen, whilst Handy makes an eyeline match with the couple as they appear to him on his monitor. The audience, then, watches an encounter designed to be productively doubled and split, where a single exchange takes place in two separate spaces, each nonetheless coherently arranged. The actors found this scene challenging to play, as it required initial experiment to find the correct angles for the cameras, close observation of marks (as on a film set), and the sorts of responsive cut and thrust of exchange that usually come with close physical proximity and real eye contact. My view is that the audience understands – *reads in* – such commitment and directness, whilst deriving pleasure from the *verfremdungseffekt* of the accompanying spatial disturbance. Presence, meanwhile, is a more notable commodity when it is simultaneously doubled and denied. We exploited this relationship further in the scene in which Prospero in effect gives Miranda to Ferdinand, which we played by way of a mobile phone call between Prospero and the couple, whom Prospero can nonetheless see from his omniscient perspective, as is quickly made clear to Ferdinand ('O Ferdinand, / Do not smile at me that I boast her off').

In his 1978 production of the play the Italian director Giorgio Strehler contrived a *coup de théâtre* at the play's epilogue. At the point when Prospero

renounces his magic ('Now my charms are all o'erthrown, / And what strength I have's mine own') part of the set collapses. The paraphernalia of the theatre – of organised fabrication and pretence – is done away with, to the delight of the audience. At the end of the epilogue ('Let your indulgence set me free'), as the audience begins to applaud, the set springs up into place again.

Our denouement performed an oblique homage to Strehler. Sound designer Gregg Fisher arranged for a digital hum, the sort that accompanies devices such as computers, speakers and projectors, to grow imperceptibly through the exchange during which Prospero frees Ariel. This formed a subliminally sonorous accompaniment to this scene of release, but more particularly allowed for a moment of punctuation. Handy, as Prospero, unclipped the battery pack of his radio microphone and turned it off. As he did so Fisher stopped the digital hum, the video image went to black and the lighting state changed to suggest a flat, untheatrical space. The epilogue was delivered without sound reinforcement, the actor's voice differently human as a consequence of being unmediated. On the audience's applause, the digital hum cut in again, as did the video projection, now showing the audience itself in a spectatorial feedback loop. If the ending of Strehler's production suggested that theatricality is always with us, ours attempted a similar gesture towards the presence of digital mediation, refiguring us along with the spaces that we inhabit.

What did we discover from our workshop exploration? The surveillance modes and habits of the twenty-first century do not quite match with those employed by Prospero, so we should be careful to claim that Shakespeare

straightforwardly pre-figures contemporary surveillance society. Prospero's panopticism depends upon a single controlling presence, whereas we experience surveillance now as something more ubiquitous, distributed and peculiarly participatory. Nonetheless, the spaces of surveillance manifested by *The Tempest* have immediate resonance with those familiar to us today, ranging from closed places of containment to open sites of transit, along with a home that is also a nerve centre. Space, here, is always suggestive of *situation* – the constraining nature of the space rhymes with the dis-located and transient circumstance of its inhabitants. We discovered that in our view the devices of contemporary surveillance (concealed cameras and microphones, multiscreen monitors, editing consoles) readily lent themselves to further aestheticizing of what McGrath describes as 'the spatial nature of the surveillance experience' (2004: 133). In any future iteration of this project, however, it would be fruitful to explore more diverse means of capturing, tracking and figuring the human bodies in the piece in order to 'stage' surveillance with greater nuance whilst developing further its aesthetic disposition.

Travelogue 2

In Gdansk we were visitors, temporarily located in a studio that could have been anywhere but that also (through the nitty-gritty of our journey to the venue on the tram in the morning, our dealings with resident technicians, our lunches in the local shopping centre) could only have been in the place where it exists. We were fleetingly rooted, and always only passing through, visitors during a brief excursion that manifested for an ephemeral moment (doubled

by our capture on the surveillance systems of shopping malls and transport facilities), to remain only in archive records and memory. Perhaps this is the more lasting fact of transit, and its places and experiences. It is fixed only in impermanence, and yet it is also and always of the moment – an emblem, however mundane, for the theatricality of presence. Presence, moreover, is doubled and confirmed by the technologies and observational tropes of surveillance. This quivering of certainty and deferral, gathering and decentring, capture and loss, seems beguilingly Shakespearean even as it feels like the affect of production in a digital culture.

REFERENCES

- Augé, Marc (2008), *Non-Place: An Introduction to Supermodernity* (trans. John Howe), London and New York: Verso.
- Castles, Stephen, and Mark J. Miller (2009), *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan (4th edition; 1st edition 1993).
- Esman, Milton J. (2009), *Diasporas in the Contemporary World*, Cambridge (UK) and Malden MA: Polity Press.
- Foucault, Michel (1991), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (trans. Alan Sheridan), Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1991 (first published in French as *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison*, Éditions Gallimard, 1975).
- Gherab-Martín, Kharim (2011), 'Mapping Emerging Digital Spaces in Contemporary Society' 365-68, in Phillip Kalantzis-Cope and Karim

- Gherab-Martín (eds.), *Emerging Digital Spaces in Contemporary Society: Properties of Technology*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 365-68.
- Greenhill, Kelly M. (2010), *Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion, and Foreign Policy*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Gurr, Andrew and Mariko Ichikawa (2000), *Staging in Shakespeare's Theatres*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaplan, Caren (1996), *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Klinenberg, Eric, and Claudio Benzecry (2005), 'Introduction: Cultural Production in a Digital Age', in Eric Klinenberg (ed.), *Cultural Production in a Digital Age* (The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, v. 597, Jan 2005), Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Larsen, Jonas, John Urry and Kay Axhausen (2006), *Mobilities, Networks, Geographies*, Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate.
- Lavender, Andy (2001), *Hamlet in Pieces: Shakespeare reworked by Peter Brook, Robert Lepage and Robert Wilson*, London and New York: Nick Hern Books/Continuum.
- Lyon, David (2009), 'An Electronic Panopticon? A sociological critique of surveillance theory' (366-387) in Robin Mansell (ed.), *The Information Society: Critical Concepts in Sociology (Volume IV: Everyday Life)*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 368-72.

- (2011), 'Surveillance, Power and Everyday Life', in Phillip Kalantzis-Cope and Karim Gherab-Martín (eds.), *Emerging Digital Spaces in Contemporary Society: Properties of Technology*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 107-120.
- , Aaron Doyle and Randy Lippert (2012), 'Introduction', in Aaron Doyle, Randy Lippert and David Lyon (eds.), *Eyes Everywhere: The global growth of camera surveillance*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-19.
- Malecki, Edward J., and Bruno Moriset (2008), *The Digital Economy: Business organization, production processes, and regional developments*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Mattelart, Armand (2010), *The Globalization of Surveillance: the origin of the securitarian order* (trans. Susan Gruenheck Taponier and James A. Cohen), Cambridge (UK) and Malden MA: Polity Press (first published in French as *La globalisation de la surveillance*, Paris: Editions La Découverte, 2007).
- McGrath, John E. (2004), *Loving Big Brother: Performance, Privacy and Surveillance Space*, London and New York: Routledge.

FIGURES

IMG_7963.jpg

Figure 1: Prospero (Scott Handy) in his cell. Ariel (David Monteith) at his performance station behind the sailcloth, and screened on Prospero's easel.

Miranda (Bryony Hannah) sleeps in the foreground. Photo: Wiesław Czerniawski.

IMG_8004.jpg

Figure 2: Caliban (David Rogers) carries wood. Photo: Wiesław Czerniawski.

IMG_7985.jpg

Figure 3: Prospero (Scott Handy) watches Ferdinand (Brett Brown) and Miranda (Bryony Hannah). Photo: Wiesław Czerniawski.

IMG_7981.jpg

Figure 4: Ferdinand (Brett Brown) and Miranda (Bryony Hannah) speak with Prospero (Scott Handy). Photo: Wiesław Czerniawski.

¹ The production took place on 2, 3 and 4 August 2009.

² For an overview see Lyon, 2011; Mattelart, 2010; and Lyon, Doyle and Lippert, 2012.

³ For an account of Bentham's plan and Foucault's reflections on this in relation to his analysis of knowledge formation and social ordering, see Lyon, 2009: 368-72.

⁴ The intention here was to respond to the integral dramaturgical arrangement of *The Tempest*, but not to its original conditions of staging. See Gurr and Ichikawa, 2000: 111-12, for a brief account of entrances and exits in *The Tempest* in relation to the spatial arrangement of the theatre in Shakespeare's time.

⁵ I first saw Scott Handy onstage as Horatio in Peter Brook's production of *Hamlet* (2000). Handy played the role with studied impassivity, the sort of restraint and focus that, nearly ten years later, seemed apposite for playing a Prospero who was a meticulous observer whilst ostensibly engineering the

events that take place. For a brief note of Handy's acting style in Brook's *Hamlet*, see Lavender, 2001: 233.