

# 11

## On Collaborating with Shakespeare's Globe: Reflections on the Future of Postgraduate English

*Gordon McMullan*

In this chapter, I will offer an account of the history of a taught postgraduate degree—the MA in Shakespeare Studies that has been offered jointly for over a decade by the Department of English at King's College London and Globe Education, the teaching and research wing of Shakespeare's Globe.<sup>1</sup> This case study is designed to illuminate a range of issues about the pedagogical possibilities of collaboration at Master's level between universities and cultural/creative organisations, as well as some of the challenges associated with such partnerships, and I hope it will be of interest to everyone with an interest in the future of postgraduate study in the arts and humanities. Citing interviews with former students and with employees of Globe Education, I will consider the experience of the students taking the degree, studying as they are in the context of a university on the one hand and of a theatre on the other, a theatre that is in multiple ways remarkable—for its extraordinary level of educational activity, for its status as a major London creative organisation operating independently of public funding and for the postmodern 'early modern' building that is both the basis of its attraction for the public and the ongoing object of scholarly debate. Ten years is a lengthy period for a taught Master's degree to survive—enough time, I hope, to enable me to do three things in this chapter: to reflect in as unbiased a way as I can manage (within the limits of such a claim) on the value and impact of a degree taught collaboratively by a university and a theatre, on the intersection it represents between higher education and the cultural industries, on the global nature of the annual cohort it attracts, on the extent to which the collaboration might or might not be replicated or adapted for other institutional and geographical conditions, and on the implications of the collaboration

for the definition of English as a university subject, particularly in the context of the limited definition of 'impact' that determines an increasing proportion of access to public funding for UK higher education institutions.

## Shakespeare's Globe

Shakespeare's Globe is no ordinary theatre and responses to it are rarely, if ever, straightforward. How could they be, when its focus is a postmodern building created as a 'reconstruction' (*not* a 'replica', note—Globe employees never use the word) of an early modern building that has not existed for 400 years but is not in any reasonable sense either that building or 'Shakespeare's'? Critically speaking, the reconstructed Globe is not so much a theatre as an incitement to riot—but it is also, happily, an incitement to a wide array of more constructive activities, of exploration, experiment and education. It is crucial to remember that the Globe project began as an educational as much as a theatrical project, and it was for a long while *only* an educational project. As its longstanding director Patrick Spottiswoode points out, 'Globe Education was founded in 1989, eight years before the theatre opened, but Sam Wanamaker had experimented with theatre, education and exhibitions on Bankside since 1972'.<sup>2</sup> It was from the determination of Wanamaker—a visionary American actor and director whose persistent belief in the idea of reconstructing the Globe drove the project to a fruition he would, sadly, not (quite) live to see, and after whom the Globe's indoor theatre, opened in 2014, is named—to build what Spottiswoode calls 'a maverick theatrical experiment with education at its heart' (Carson & Karim-Cooper, 2008, p. 134) that Globe Education emerged; its role was, and is, to create new ways of teaching the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries at primary, secondary and degree level, and it is from this vision that the MA, catalysed by the emerging partnership between Shakespeare's Globe and King's College London, emerged.

I first visited the Globe site in 1986, when I was writing a doctorate on Jacobean theatre and thought that, not being a Londoner by birth or experience, I should go on a field trip to see where it had all happened. So I took the train to the capital and wandered along the South Bank, and I found myself in a sort of wilderness of barbed wire and run-down warehouses with the crumbling remains of a huge power station as backdrop, and I wondered why someone didn't make something desirable out of it all. After all, I thought, the view of St Paul's and the City skyline across the river was truly superb.... A little further along was an

expanse of rubble next to the local council's yard for rubbish trucks, with a chain-link fence around it and a little sign in optimistic felt pen announcing that 'We hope to rebuild the Globe here one day'. And not a soul about, apart from the occasional jogger. It is hard to imagine this now, with Tate Modern firmly established in the rebuilt power station, the offices and restaurants and bars and luxury apartments crammed claustrophobically around the Globe, the dismal alleyways past the former Clink and Winchester House all converted, restored and buffed, and the Shard looming jaggedly over it all. But you have to know what it was like in the Eighties to have any idea of the physical transformation the Globe project has brought in its wake.

The Globe is an institution that rarely produces neutrality in commentators. As Robert Shaughnessy phrases it in his preface to Rob Conkie's *Globe Theatre Project*:

[a]s a cross between theme park, permanent exhibition, monument, and living museum, the Globe is simultaneously an item on any self-respecting tourist's itinerary; [...] a seriously scholarly resource and centre of a busy educational outreach network; [and] finally, [...] a professional theatre that, unlike the other major British Shakespeare-producing organisations located just up the river in London and, further afield, in Stratford, operates entirely without the benefit of state support. (Shaughnessy, 2006, p. iii)

For the academics who have spent time there, the impact of the Globe has been immense and, in some cases, life-changing. For myself, I now know what the tiring-house, the lords' room, the galleries, all looked and felt like—I have a sense of the physical existence of the first Globe theatre—or at least part of me thinks I do, even while the rest of me knows that this simply cannot be true. But I am unlikely ever to shrug off that vision because I have walked in and on it, through and around it, enough times for it ('it'—that is, the reconstruction, the postmodern/early modern performance space) to be ingrained on my mind in scale, dimension, feel, aural quality. As Conkie notes, this is Baudrillard country par excellence—the 'precession of simulacra' with a thatched roof—as the copy is deployed for the complex purpose of 'enabl[ing] understanding (and experience) of the lost original'.<sup>3</sup> The imagining of the relationship of what exists now to the original, long-gone building is simultaneously valuable and fraught, and the questions we need to ask are perhaps more about the 'third kind' of knowledge to be derived from the reconstruction, which might or might not tell us about the original

but which certainly tells us *something* we would not know without it. The King's/Globe MA is inevitably bound up with issues specific to the Globe enterprise—the nature of the collaboration with Shakespeare's Globe is arguably different from a putative equivalent relationship with other theatres—and I want to reflect on why this might be the case and on the possibilities and limits of the programme as a model.

My questions, then, are these. To what extent has this collaboration at taught Master's level been a success? What, if anything, differentiates the MA from other programmes in Shakespeare studies? What, more generally, are the advantages and disadvantages of running an academic programme in collaboration with a theatre? And is the model applicable in other geographical contexts? To help me address these issues, I conducted a number of informal interviews with students who have taken the MA in recent years and with members of Globe Education, including Patrick Spottiswoode, Director of Globe Education; Dr Farah Karim-Cooper, Head of Higher Education & Research; and Madeline Knights, a former student from the early phase of the MA who subsequently became Globe Education's Courses Manager. By way of these interviews I will consider the opportunities offered, and the issues raised, by the MA and what it might tell us about the possibilities for collaborations between universities and cultural organisations elsewhere.

## Creating the degree

I first began to discuss the idea of the MA in Shakespeare Studies with Patrick Spottiswoode in 1999. I had arrived at King's four years earlier and had become a regular attender at Globe events—by which I do not mean the theatre, which was still being built, but rather the range of events created by Globe Education: conferences, visiting speakers, above all the ongoing series of staged readings called 'Read Not Dead', an ambitious project to stage and record rehearsed readings of every extant early modern English play. Getting to know Patrick Spottiswoode was an inevitable result of participating in these events, since he was always there, enthusing, energising, engaging. When I first met him, he was Head of Education and Events at Globe Education's predecessor, the Shakespeare Globe Museum, a tiny education centre consisting of three rooms containing a poster and model exhibition about London theatres from 1576 to 1642, a scale model of an Elizabethan theatre and a life-size prop bear. By the time we started the MA, Globe Education had acquired a permanent staff of six; it now employs more than 35 permanent and over 100 freelance staff, and it teaches at all levels, from

pre-school to doctoral, collaborating with universities to facilitate its work at tertiary level—an extraordinary history of growth. The alliance with King's enabled the Globe to work stably in post-18 education in a way that it had not previously been able to do.

The degree emerged from conversation and a shared educational vision. But with the subsequent governmental emphasis on 'impact'—defined loosely by the UK Research Councils as 'the demonstrable contribution that excellent research makes to society and the economy' and more precisely (in this case by the London School of Economics) as '*a recorded or otherwise auditable occasion of influence from academic research on another actor or organization*'—and on 'knowledge transfer'—defined by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) as 'strengthen[ing] the impact of arts and humanities research by encouraging researchers to disseminate and transfer their knowledge to other areas where it can make a difference'—it turns out to have been something of a prescient move. We could not have known this at the time, however: for us, the primary motivating logic was the pedagogical benefit the collaboration seemed to offer.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, there is a twist: bizarrely, 'impact' and 'knowledge transfer' are not officially considered to happen in the teaching process. Thus, any 'impact' King's may wish to claim in respect of its close relationship with the Globe must stem from something other than the shared MA.

But these were not our concerns at the outset. I had suggested fairly casually to Patrick Spottiswoode that we might think about running a joint MA. He said yes, he had been wondering the same thing and wouldn't it be fine, but he couldn't see how he could afford to employ appropriate staff to teach it. The undergraduate teaching the Globe offered at this stage (mainly to Study Abroad programmes from the United States) was done by himself or freelance tutors and was self-funding, and I said, ah, but think about the potential income of an MA. And what became clear when we sat down and projected figures for fee income was that the programme, if it could bring in ten or so students a year (with a proportion paying the increased fees charged by UK universities to students coming from outside the European Union), would generate enough funds to cover if not all then enough of the salary of an early career lecturer for the risk to be worth taking. Spottiswoode notes that: for Globe Education,

the MA was pragmatically and ideologically a sound idea. Our undergraduate programme was increasing, and Globe Education needed an in-house scholar to develop courses that would incorporate the discoveries that were being made from the newly opened

Globe and its productions. It had also always been our ambition to be a breeding-ground of scholars whose training was imbued with the experience of early-modern playhouse practice. It has been an extraordinarily successful partnership. Jointly-supervised PhDs then followed. None of this could have happened, however, without the seed funding income from the MA. The MA didn't cover the entire salary and overheads of the lecturer post; that came from the other courses that the post-holder was then teaching. The added value of having an in-house scholar that other areas of the department and organisation could turn to was an important additional result. It is impossible to think of the Globe today without a resident scholar—or, in fact, two, as we now have.

The foundational value of the programme, then, for the Globe was the projection of fee-income that would enable Globe Education to appoint a tertiary-level lecturer—someone with the qualifications to be a strong candidate for a university post but who would value the opportunity to work as the in-house academic at this unique theatre. Madeline Knights, former Courses Manager, notes that '[f]inancially, the MA is the highest income provider within the Higher Education area of Globe Education', but she stresses the impact of the programme on several levels: 'It's important to us financially, but it's important to us most of all as our only graduate-level English department programme; and it's our only group of students creating research into the theatre for us'. Of the students, she notes that '[t]hey're part of the texture of the Globe: what the MA has done is join everybody together, create a dialogue between academics and practitioners, and the students feel they're part of that dialogue'. For Farah Karim-Cooper, '[t]he MA is the nucleus that keeps everything going'—quite a role, in other words, for an academic degree in the context of a theatre.

The programme is offered full- and part-time. A full-time student takes two modules, one offered by Globe Education, one by King's, in semester one (late September to Christmas), two King's-taught modules in semester two (mid-January to late March), and he or she then produces a critical survey preliminary to the dissertation in mid-May, writing the dissertation (of 15,000 words) between then and early September. A part-time student takes the first-semester Globe module in the first year, the first-semester King's module in the second, and takes one second-semester optional module at King's per year. In the current model (we are at present embarking on a structural reorganisation of the degree to embrace the new possibilities created by the opening of

the indoor Sam Wanamaker Playhouse), the first-semester modules are compulsory: 'Early Modern Playhouse Practice' is taught at the Globe by Karim-Cooper and team; 'Working with Early Modern Literary Texts' is run at King's and is team-taught by the Shakespearians in the English department. Karim-Cooper's module uses Globe resources to introduce the students to the practicalities of the production of early modern plays and the difference these practicalities might make to interpretation of the texts; the King's module addresses the range of critical approaches to early modern texts and provides an introduction to textual studies, palaeography and the editing of early modern plays. The second-semester optional modules at King's include 'Global and Local Shakespeares', 'Shakespeare on Screen', 'Family Politics in Early Modern Texts' and 'Theatre, Gender and Culture in Jacobean London'; each seeks to develop knowledge acquired both at the Globe and at King's in the first semester. The choice of dissertation is refined by the students' experience in those modules, appropriate supervisors are assigned—at the Globe or at King's, depending on the topic—and dissertation workshops help the students make the transition from essay-writing.

The degree normally accepts 15 or so students a year. We have until recently operated on the basis of a ceiling of 18 for reasons of space and resource but the actual numbers have varied between 10 and 22: a workable number, in other words, if not immense by the standards of some MA programmes in more recent literature (but, I am aware, enviable figures when viewed from other geographies). However, as I write (in mid-2014), for reasons that are unclear, we have had a marked increase in applications—bucking the post-undergraduate-fees trend of declining MA numbers—and we will be running two MA groups for the coming academic year. Whether this increase in numbers is sustainable, given both the impact of fees and of competition in the area of Master's degrees in Shakespeare Studies both locally and elsewhere in the UK, remains to be seen. But the implication would appear to be that a degree that offers a range of career-path possibilities over and above progression to the PhD may be in a position to resist the undermining effect of undergraduate fees (introduced in 2004 and increased by the government from £3000 to £9000 per annum in 2012) on the financial ability of students without independent means to continue to study at postgraduate level.

For the university, the partnership with a renowned non-HEI is crucial in attracting students: the opportunity offered to King's—control of a major segment of the market share in the tertiary study of Shakespeare and his contemporaries in the UK in general and in London in

particular—by our sharing with the Globe brand is considerable, and we should never forget that without the Globe the MA programme would lose much of its appeal, removing our main advantage in relation to other Master's degrees in Shakespeare studies and leaving the long-standing and highly successful collaboration between the University of Birmingham's Shakespeare Institute and the Royal Shakespeare Company in Stratford-upon-Avon as the only Shakespeare-centred non-HEI/university joint project in the UK. The students accepted on our degree are a mix of home and overseas, predominantly women, a blend of those who aim to go on to the PhD, those who want to work in the arts either creatively or administratively, and those who simply wish to develop their knowledge of Shakespeare and early modern English drama. Global applications come, in rough order of numbers, from the United States, Canada, Taiwan, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Korea, Germany, France and Switzerland—and the degree also attracts an unusually wide range of home applicants, including a good proportion of mature students. What attracts them all, of course, is the theatre. 'The Globe was definitely a pull', recalls one of the former students. In fact, the one consistent factor in the admissions process is that applicants invariably say how keen they are to study at Shakespeare's Globe: an English department involved in a programme of this kind necessarily learns a certain humility. The collaborative model has, moreover, subsequently become something of a trademark of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities at King's: the MA in Shakespeare Studies is now only one of several collaborative one-year Master's programmes taught jointly with London's major cultural institutions (e.g. the MA in Early Modern English Literature: Text and Transmission, taught with the British Library, and the MA in Eighteenth Century Studies, taught with the British Museum).

The value of the teaching and learning environment provided by Globe Education must not be underestimated. It would be very difficult indeed for a university to find a partner institution that cares as much as the Globe does about the education of students. One of the key factors is the Globe's treatment of the MA students as important members of the theatre's community, and this is not just fostered as a warm, glowing feeling: the degree is woven into the work of Globe Research and thus into that of Globe Theatre. Not that this is necessarily always as fully appreciated as it might be. The students I interviewed had rather complex reactions to the question: 'Is the teaching element the Globe provides academically valuable?'. Some enthused; others had initially been less certain. Former student Kate Smith noted that the material



about playhouse practice in the first semester, so different from what she had been taught as an undergraduate, had not, to begin with, seemed 'academic enough', but 'later in our written work they had their effect'; 'it took me a little while', she commented, 'to see the intellectual underpinning of what initially just seemed like "Here's a prop"'. 'That', said Sarah Dustagheer:

combined with the first-semester module at King's, was one of the strongest parts of the MA for me, because it radically changed the way I conceived early modern drama, in terms of thinking about the journey from playhouse to printing house, the practicality and materiality of theatre, which I really hadn't looked at as part of my undergraduate degree. It means that now when I sit down to read an early modern play, that's something I can't switch off.

And she added:

While the King's modules were excellent, I think in the end I got more from the Globe simply because in the first semester that was where we bonded as a group and so our identity as a set of students was shaped by that—and then in the summer when I was working on my dissertation it was all at the Globe and I didn't come into King's at all.

Moreover, for many of the students, it is neither King's nor the Globe, but London itself, that makes the difference. For Hayley Jones, a New Zealander, '[t]hat MA year was probably the best year of my life. It was great moving to London: suddenly I was going to parties with all these people who were bright and articulate and wanted to talk about books'.

Still, for all the advantages of London student life, there are certain quite specific aspects of the MA experience that need touching on. One is the research internships offered to the students by Globe Education. This is an element created by Farah Karim-Cooper who, as Head of Higher Education and Research, leads one of three areas, alongside Learning and Public Events, that comprise Globe Education. Karim-Cooper has embedded the MA within Globe Research by creating intern posts each year for which MA students can apply. 'The MA interns work one day a week', she notes:

unless they feel they can provide another day—but as their tutor I keep my eye on dissertations and make sure they're doing

things right. So one of them this year has been research assistant to the designer for one of the productions, and she has pulled that material together. And another got asked a question by one of the directors that's become her dissertation topic, she got so interested as she wrote the report.

Thus the intern work can feed back valuably into the academic experience. For Dustagheer, 'doing an internship as an MA student works to reinforce the teaching in the first semester to get you to think about the text as performance', and she notes the opportunities this provides for the interns to interact with the creative process. 'You're very aware when you're answering directors' questions', she says:

... that question you asked me about Roman government; *here's* the answer; *there's* what Shakespeare would have known about that; so you're doing a kind of double work; you're saying 'look, you've asked me this question, but there's perhaps a more interesting question that you might ask too...'.

And she continues:

Interns do the end-of-season research, the interviews which, for instance, informed the PhD chapter I was writing on plays written for the new Globe space. That's the exchange: interns do the research for the directors during the season and at the end of the season we have access to the cast and directors for interviews. From 2006, we have had end-of-season interviews for most of the actors, all the directors and with the artistic director, which are then available in the archive.

The interns thus provide a valuable role in respect of the theatre's archive as well as its productions. 'Without the MA', I asked, 'could that happen?' 'Well, yes', says Knights, 'because you'd get interns from wherever. But the key thing for us is that it ensures quality control'.

The internships thus offer an advantage for a subset of the students taking the degree—a more focused version of the advantage the programme offers to all the students, that is, the ongoing value of involvement with Shakespeare's Globe for subsequent non-academic employment as much as for academic. Globe Education itself now employs a number of graduates from the MA, and others have worked at the Barbican, Royal Opera House, English National Opera, National

Theatre and other established London cultural organisations. So does the degree make a difference to employment prospects in the arts? I met a former student from the MA at a play and learned what she was now doing—working as an assistant producer at a small theatre in west London—and I asked what difference the MA had made to her in achieving this role. ‘Nothing’, she said, a little crushingly, ‘Absolutely nothing’. Dustagheer, though, sees it differently:

The Globe connection definitely helps. When I went to do bits of work in theatres during my MA year, they let me in the door to an extent because I had the Globe on my cv, and then when I explained what it was they were very surprised, because they don't have that academic model. At one prominent London theatre I was talking to one of the guys in the education department and describing the set-up at the Globe, and he thought it was amazing: he said ‘we would have no way to use an academic’. They can't work out what an academic is doing in a theatre context.

So it helps, and it doesn't help—and it also puzzles people in potentially productive, barrier-removing ways.

The value of the MA can also be measured beyond its impact on the students themselves. The role of Karim-Cooper as an academic who works at the Globe—and whose post would not have existed without the MA—is a fascinating one, and it has made her career very different from what it would have been if she had taken a post instead in a university English department. Her profile is unique, as is that of Dustagheer, who—having gone on from the MA to do a PhD thesis co-supervised by Karim-Cooper and me, funded through the AHRC's Collaborative Doctoral Awards (CDA) scheme—emerged with both a doctorate and a level of theatrical, organisational and educational experience that would be unimaginable for most other PhD students, and it has paid immediate tangible dividends in her recent appointment to a permanent lectureship at the University of Kent. Karim-Cooper, having co-supervised Dustagheer and subsequently other PhD students (including a further AHRC-funded CDA student), is in the position, although she is employed by a theatre, of having co-organised and taught a significant component of an MA programme and having supervised at doctoral level. In other words, the MA has arguably helped develop a particular kind of academic, one equally at home in the context of a university and of a theatre education department—someone who, in UK literary-academic terms, is a hybrid. Both Karim-Cooper and Dustagheer are

embedded in theatrical thinking, even though neither acts nor directs and has had English-department, not Drama-department, training.

I have already slipped over into the other half of the equation: that is, the value of the MA for the theatre. The constitution of Shakespeare's Globe is key—its origins in the desire of a visionary theatre practitioner to create both a reconstructed playhouse and an education centre and thus his need to work with academics, with theatre historians and with archaeologists, in a way that meant that literary- and theatre-historical research and the structures of academic life—seminars, conferences, guest lectures—were intrinsic to the creation of the reconstructed theatre. As Spottiswoode notes:

Education has traditionally been 'tacked on' to arts organisations to attract sponsorship or secure government funding. Sam Wanamaker was ahead of his time in building a Centre that included education, performance and exhibitions. So Education underpinned the work from the get-go. Hence Globe Education was founded eight years before the Globe theatre opened.

To my suggestion that it is obvious what the advantage is for a university in working with a theatre, but less so the other way round, he does not hesitate:

Shakespeare's Globe was constructed out of a series of conversations between theatre and theatre building historians, craftsmen and theatre practitioners. Actors and scholars alike have been eager to test and learn from the architecture. Globe Education has always sought to engage as much as possible with the academy. We also want to involve as many scholars as possible in our work to 'make scholarship public' at the Globe. For Sam it was about sharing, expertise, enthusiasm and passion; today it is called, more prosaically, 'impact'.

However, he adds a warning:

I think it'd be a mistake for an arts organisation to look at a model and say, ah, right, well, let's start an MA programme. That way it'll die within a year, it just won't survive. It's got to grow out of the work they do; it's a slow burner. Globe Ed had existed for ten, fifteen years by the time we started the MA. And we've grown alongside it. There's no point a university approaching an arts organisation and saying let's have an MA or a programme together if education isn't

part of that organisation's mission. We are fortunate that Shakespeare is so widely taught across ages and nationalities. We are fortunate too that our Centre finds itself in a metropolis. Both have helped attract students at all levels. But the MA with King's depends on a shared vision and good working relationship between both organisations.

He sums up: 'It is a happy blend of "gown and clown". Joint MAs between HEIs and cultural institutions are worth exploring, but they depend on the cultural institution having education as part of its DNA.'

### The degree as model

This raises the question of the reproducibility of the experience the MA offers. Is it of any value as a model, or is it simply a one-off? Can this kind of programme exist elsewhere, or does it only work because King's, a university with a strong commitment to cultural partnerships, and the Globe, a unique combination of theatre and educational establishment, are half a mile apart along one of the world's great rivers? Asked if such a degree could exist in, say, Australia, former student Hayley Jones observed that 'what's crucial' about the degree

... is the iconic building. You can imagine an MA, say, that's linked to the Sydney Opera House about opera history because people would go across the world to do an MA run by the University of Sydney music department and the Opera House for the same reason that people come to London to do the King's/Globe degree. It's not so clear there's an equivalently iconic theatre building there [in Australia] or not at least one that would logically have a Shakespeare MA attached to it.

Sarah Dustagheer, however, notes that 'the other model is Blackfriars in Virginia'—that is, the American Shakespeare Center in Staunton, Virginia, with its reconstructed early modern indoor theatre (designed as a reconstruction of Shakespeare's company's indoor theatre space at Blackfriars), which offers an MLitt/MFA programme with nearby Mary Baldwin College. At the same time, she observes that the Virginia Blackfriars, unlike the Globe

is *not* actually site-specific, has no sense that Shakespeare is *down there* somewhere. But they have a reconstructed theatre, and they have great interaction between academics and practitioners because

Ralph Cohen [director of the American Shakespeare Center] is both an academic and a theatre director. So they have their 'Actor's Renaissance Season' where the actors have cue-scripts and put on productions after limited rehearsal, and then every week the people doing the MA meet with the actors so there's more of an interaction between the different sides.<sup>5</sup>

For Knights, too, geography is not really the point: 'What's key for anyone looking to replicate what we do here is the opportunity a programme such as this offers to its students'. And Spottiswoode argues that distance does not have to be destructive:

As for the question of geography, you say that we're very lucky because King's is on the doorstep of the Globe and vice versa, but we're also providing MA modules for the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, and it does work. The students are here for four weeks of tuition prior to a performance on the Globe stage. The Globe also provides distance learning and blended courses, especially at secondary/high school level for teachers. A Globe Education Academy based at UC Davis involving the University's theatre and School of Education is now in its ninth year and involves high school teachers within a hundred-mile radius of Davis attending workshops prior to a summer intensive at the Globe. The teachers return to their classroom and immediately put into practice what they have learned at the Globe, involving their students in a Fall Shakespeare Festival. It's a fabulous model for a blended course and one that could be replicated for HEIs.

Former student Kate Smith, however, makes two key points about the MA as a model for university/theatre interactions. First of all, she notes the advantage inherent in the fact that Shakespeare's Globe, as its name insists, is a *single-playwright* theatre, which makes such a tightly focused MA possible; and, secondly, she notes the size of Globe Education in comparison with other theatres' education sections. Economies of scale operate, very clearly: just as a university department with only one Shakespeare specialist would be unable to run a Shakespeare MA, so a theatre education department needs to be a certain size before it can be an effective collaborator with a university.

The 'single playwright' point is significant, not least because that playwright is Shakespeare, the most canonical figure in the literary and theatrical worlds, the most 'global' of British writers, and the *genius loci* of the Globe. An anthropological reading of the Globe

is always tempting because of the barely submerged ritual/religious qualities of the site, its nature as a locus of cultural pilgrimage and the determination of some of its admirers to insist on its embodiment of 'authenticity'. The Globe itself habitually and understandably sidesteps some of the more limiting implications of these associations, though there have been moments at which the organisation's self-awareness has expressed itself in appropriately tongue-in-cheek ways, notably when a performance of *Henry VIII*, the play that was responsible for the burning-down of the first Globe in 1613 when a blank charge from a prop cannon set the thatch on fire, was preceded by Globe employees dousing the theatre's walls with bottled water. Many of the same issues, of course, apply also to theatrical activity, and to related academic programmes, in Stratford-upon-Avon, locus of the other 'sacred' Shakespearean sites, the birthplace and grave. Yet it is arguable that a simulacrum in a location that cannot claim any 'originality' in relation to Shakespeare—the Virginia Blackfriars being one such instance—has just as much of a right (or absence of right) to construct itself on the basis of 'authenticity' as does the Globe, which is itself a postmodern, not an early modern, structure.

At the same time, there is no question that the specific identity of the King's/Globe MA stems from the reconstructed nature of the theatre, from the debates about the conditions of early modern playing that drove its creation—the desire to reproduce as closely as possible the original physical context for performance in a wood-and-plaster, open-air-and-thatch amphitheatre and thus recreate the experience of seeing and hearing Shakespeare's plays as the Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences would have done. In this sense, the MA is unique because its driving premise—as expressed in the degree's core module, 'Early Modern Playhouse Practice'—is to extend the logic of the reconstructed Globe by introducing the students, as their first graduate-level intellectual engagement, to the evidence for the theatrical conditions and contexts within which the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries were first performed. This is by no means all that the degree offers—the second-semester optional modules are divided between those that focus on early contexts (e.g. 'Theatre, Gender and Culture in Jacobean London') and those that examine more recent phenomena (e.g. 'Global and Local Shakespeares')—but it is the opening gambit of the programme, and it unquestionably provides the motivation for many applicants to choose the MA over its competitors.

Thus it is the cultural partner in this collaboration at least as much as the university that drives the pedagogical agenda: the theatre's

role in the degree is not simply instrumental, an aid to sustaining application numbers; on the contrary, it provides the defining component of the intellectual logic of the degree. This is enhanced, as it happens, by the particular engagements of the Shakespeareans at King's: we belong to an English, not a Drama, department, and only one of us could be considered primarily a theatre historian, which means that the teaching we offer has a usefully complementary relationship with that provided by Globe Education. Moreover, the MA directly addresses the 'third kind of knowledge' with which I began my discussion—the knowledge that the Globe is precisely *not* authentic, that being within it and learning about the logic of its creation gives the students not so much a sense of what it would have been like to attend a theatre in Shakespeare's day as a temporally hybrid sense of then-and-now which is also a sense of neither-then-nor-now and is frequently the impetus for imaginative student metacriticism. Both in the Globe's teaching and in the King's component of the degree, then, the students are challenged to confront the philosophical issues that the existence of the Globe provokes and to reflect on what studying in such a location in the early twenty-first century might mean for the work they produce.

The degree is thus both site-specific and free from site-specificity; it is probably best described as being *in dialogue with* site specificity. It both requires the students to immerse themselves in the Globe ethos and to be aware of the forms of cultural production that have determined that ethos. It encourages them to engage with, to interrogate and to deploy the spaces and working premises of the Globe in practical and intellectual ways (the most straightforwardly practical way stemming from the access the students have to the Globe stage for two often chilly hours on winter Wednesday evenings for whatever exploration they wish to pursue), and it seeks to ensure that students taking the degree emerge with an awareness of the complexities of reimagining and reconstructing a lost past of performance events. Clearly relationships with a certain equivalence exist elsewhere already (most obviously in Stratford-upon-Avon and, at a further remove, in Virginia), and the experience of certain of the challenges and benefits of HEI/cultural organisation collaborations will be shared across these instances.

What matters for the context of this chapter, however, are the implications of the degree for the future shape of English studies. Very clearly, the MA emerges from highly canonical activities—on the one hand, the analysis of the Shakespearean text in the context of an English department with a long history of work in the field and, on



the other, the production of Shakespearean drama in a mainstream London theatrical space—and in this sense it appears, in disciplinary terms, wilfully conservative. Yet for an increasing number of academics in English departments, 'conservative' seems to be less a claim about one or other critical position than a general dismissal of those who seek to sustain the study of pre-Romantic literature in a context in which, increasingly, a false application of the idea of 'student choice' promotes in UK English departments a destructive imbalance towards the contemporary—or at least towards the study of literature from Dickens to the present—at the expense of any coherent sense of the long trajectory of writing in English and its predecessor languages from the early Middle Ages onwards. Increasingly, it seems, it is radical—in the literal sense of going back to the roots of English literature and theatre—to insist on the study of the earlier periods. Thus a degree that could easily be dismissed in a superficial way as conservative or even reactionary in fact has certain radical implications, and not only because of its negotiation with issues of postmodern interest such as site-specificity. It serves as an active reminder that the study of the past is also always the study of the present, it represents new possibilities both for the relationship of English departments to practical theatre and for the future shape of an academic career in English, and it offers one possible template for resisting the undemocratic impact of undergraduate fees on the likelihood that students in the UK—for whom fees, without the prospect of salaries that will enable the repayment of those fees within any reasonable time frame, are an imposition guaranteed to privilege the independently wealthy over those who need to earn a living—will continue to see tangible value, both for education pure and simple and for future employment, in postgraduate taught programmes. I hope that as an example of collaborative pedagogical activity it provokes further developments in contexts as yet unimagined; I also hope that it exemplifies both what is valuable, and what remains to be achieved, in postgraduate taught education in the UK. The discipline of English studies has lately been claimed by some—particularly in the US and, to a lesser extent, the UK—to be in decline, to be past its best—which strikes me, bluntly, as nonsense. The field has a vast amount of scope for new discoveries and new opportunities, not only in the study of emerging fields but in the reimagining of traditional fields and periods. I hope the emergence of new models for pedagogy in the field—such as the collaborative MA in Shakespeare Studies offered by King's College London and Shakespeare's Globe—serves to underline the ability of the discipline both to sustain what it does best and to keep finding

new ways to engage future generations with the critical, and thus the pedagogical, questions that matter.

## Notes

1. This essay is a personal reflection. The views expressed are my own and not necessarily those of the individuals I interviewed in the process of writing the chapter or of the organisations in question. I am very grateful to Patrick Spottiswoode, Farah Karim-Cooper, Madeline Knights, and the former MA students—notably Sarah Dustagheer—who kindly agreed to be interviewed for this essay. I hope they feel I have represented their views fairly. NB ‘Kate Smith’ and ‘Hayley Jones’ are pseudonyms: I interviewed the students when they were completing their degrees but have not subsequently been able to contact them to ask permission to use their actual names. I am also grateful to Clare McManus (her real name!) for reading a draft of this chapter and offering valuable comments.
2. See Carson and Karim-Cooper (2008), Part II, ‘Globe Education and Research’, 127–174. See in particular Chapter 10, ‘Contextualising Globe Education’, by Patrick Spottiswoode, 134–145; see also my ‘Afterword’, 230–233.
3. Conkie, 2006, p. 3; the reference is to Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulations*, trans. Sheila Faria Glaser (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1994).
4. For these definitions, see [www.ahrc.ac.uk/What-We-Do/Build-the-evidence-base/Pages/Pathways-to-Impact.aspx](http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/What-We-Do/Build-the-evidence-base/Pages/Pathways-to-Impact.aspx), [blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/introduction](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/introduction) and [www.ahrc.ac.uk/news-and-events/publications/documents/knowledge-transfer-strategy-2008-2011.pdf](http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/news-and-events/publications/documents/knowledge-transfer-strategy-2008-2011.pdf) (all accessed 29 October 2014).
5. For further information, see [www.kcl.ac.uk/artshums/depts/english/study/pgt/progs/shakespeare/index.aspx](http://www.kcl.ac.uk/artshums/depts/english/study/pgt/progs/shakespeare/index.aspx) (accessed 29 October 2014).

## References

- Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds) (2008) *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Shaughnessy, R. (2006) ‘Foreword’ in Conkie, R. *The Globe Theatre Project: Shakespeare and Authenticity* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press).