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Abstract

The National Training School for Music (NTSM, 1876–1882) was a Victorian-era music education institution situated in South Kensington, directly preceding the Royal College of Music (RCM, established 1883). Perhaps due to the NTSM’s short operational period, it is little-mentioned in academic work on nineteenth-century music education, yet it has a complex history that reveals much about the state of music, education, and the functioning of British society during this time. Giles Brightwell and David Wright have conducted investigations into its history, particularly its relationship with the RCM. This thesis builds on their research and takes inspiration from Erin Johnson-Williams’s work on the imperial history of music education stemming from Britain for a different perspective on the School's existence.

This dissertation analyses the NTSM's existence from an imperial perspective. Chapter 1 uses archival material to outline the School's context, history, and objectives. Chapter 2 establishes a theoretical framework building on ‘domestic colonialism’, which refers to the appearance of policies and tactics used by the British Empire abroad in a home context. Finally, in Chapter 3, I apply this framework to the NTSM’s objectives and administration revealing that the School functioned as a microcosm of the Empire and used these tactics to spread its influence across the country. I suggest that this was part of an attempt by the upper and upper-middle classes to redefine the boundaries of ‘respectable’ music-making as part of broader negotiations of class power. This research primarily contributes to nineteenth-century music studies concerned with the place of education and formalised institutions in Britain and its Empire. Future research might apply the theory of domestic colonialism to explore other institutions concerned with the nation’s music.
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Introduction and Literature Review

Introduction

The National Training School for Music (NTSM) was a Victorian-era musical institution situated in South Kensington, London. Although a relatively short-lived venture, running from 1876 until 1882, it was geographically and culturally at the centre of many crossroads. Emerging from the legacy of the Great Exhibition of 1851 and jointly founded by the Society of Arts at the request of the Prince of Wales, its ties to the upper and upper-middle classes were immediately apparent; despite this, its published aims emphasise its desire to help the working and lower-middle classes of society to access a high-quality music education and contribute to reinvigorating the nation’s music. Although its history has since been subsumed into that of the Royal College of Music (RCM, established in 1883), the NTSM’s own history provides a rich opportunity to explore the British Empire at home, through the interactions between class, gender, and wider developments in British music at the time. This dissertation aims to both draw on, and contribute to, histories of music education in Britain and British musical culture in the nineteenth century, and theories on the impact and nature of the British Empire in a domestic context.

During the nineteenth century, the changing economic and political landscape contributed to Britain having a socially heterogenous population, with social classes each having their own distinct culture; however, these cultures were frequently contested, and questions were posed about the ‘right’ kind of cultural existence. The NTSM operated in this period of renegotiation — whose culture/s were considered representative of the country? Who should oversee creating culture? Which cultures were, and should become, dominant? Whose cultures should be aspired to?

Institutions established during the mid-to-late nineteenth century were often created in pursuit of legitimising upper and upper-middle class cultures and beliefs by educating the masses in these philosophies, with the view that they were the only morally sound beliefs to
have: much of the South Kensington estate was formed with this in mind.¹ Yet, while united in the principles behind such ventures, the upper and upper-middle classes did not always agree on what this ‘respectable’ culture should look like — with the former wishing to push religious education, and the latter preferring scientific knowledge.² In cases such as the NTSM, they joined forces to ‘improve’ the lower-middle and working classes; the School, therefore, was a venue for the performance of debates around class-based culture, of morality, and of cultural philanthropy by those involved in its establishment. However, the musical success of the RCM has overwritten much of this context, as well as knowledge of the NTSM itself. Surveying the field on formal musical education in the nineteenth century, focusing on the RCM and the NTSM, is the first step to unpicking such a complex history.

Literature Review

Literature on the NTSM and RCM can be roughly divided into three chronological periods: contemporary reports which re-wrote the history of the NTSM and its relationship to the RCM; late twentieth-century histories of the ‘English Musical Renaissance’ which attempted to re-orientate British musicology to include social context in its discussions; and recent work which focuses more on institutions, shifting towards interdisciplinary theories to interrogate received knowledge. In this review, the works of a few significant authors who focus on South Kensington’s musical institutions will be used for each period:

1. c.1880s: George Grove
2. c.1980s–1990s: Meirion Hughes and Robert Stradling; Cyril Ehrlich
3. Post-2000: David Wright; Giles Brightwell; Erin Johnson-Williams; Anna Bull

Using this structure, the review will plot references to the RCM and NTSM over time, highlighting room for further research.

² Ibid., p. 43.
1. A Phoenix from the Ashes

The first posthumous account of the National Training School for Music was given by George Grove — the first Director of the Royal College of Music — in his *Dictionary of Music*. Published as part of fourth volume of the first edition of the *Dictionary*, Grove wrote that the School was a successful teaching institution:

> The instruction in the Training School was systematic and thorough, and in proof of its efficiency during the short period of its existence it is sufficient to name Eugene D’Albert *[sic]* [and] Frederick Cliffe [...] as having received their education there.³

Though brief, such a statement communicates that, while the NTSM only operated for a short time, at least one leading contemporary regarded it in a positive light due to the students it produced. It being written by the first Director of the RCM added weight to its veracity. Significantly, Grove updated the article himself (published in Volume IV, 1890) and added judgements as to its operation, whereas the original (in Volume II, published in 1880), written by J. A. Fuller-Maitland, was more factual in its assessment.⁴ The opening of the RCM a year after the NTSM’s closure, and in the same purpose-built building, led to the impression that the RCM emerged from the NTSM like a sort of phoenix — as if the potential for brilliance was always there, it just required some redirection. This narrative was easy to convey when the initial intention of the Royal College of Music as documented in 1878 (then named the ‘Royal and National College of Music’ or ‘Royal Musical Corporation of Music’ *[sic]*) was to be an amalgamation between the NTSM and the Royal Academy of Music (RAM); this was widely reported in contemporary newspapers,

---


suggesting that Grove was capitalising on established intentions for there to be smooth continuance to the RCM.\(^5\)

Yet interrogating this with contemporary evidence tells a different story, leading David Wright to describe the NTSM as ‘more of an impediment to the establishment of the RCM than otherwise’.\(^6\) The aforementioned Eugène d’Albert had a far more complex relationship with the School than Grove’s Dictionary entry suggests. To start, Cyril Ehrlich has stated that d’Albert received compositional training prior to starting at the NTSM, and my own research in the archives has confirmed that he came from a musical family, his father being a teacher of music and dance: these were additional factors that also would have contributed to his musical ability aside from the NTSM.\(^7\) Additionally, d’Albert’s testimony gives reason to question Grove’s assertion, once stating ‘had I remained there much longer, I should have gone to utter ruin’.\(^8\) While d’Albert may have had other reasons for distancing himself from the NTSM, including wanting to disengage from British musical culture more generally, his personal testimony and previous training suggest that the School was neither solely responsible for his success, nor – if d’Albert is to be believed – at all a positive influence.\(^9\) While it is futile to entertain questions of ‘what if’ regarding whether d’Albert’s success was due to the NTSM, Fuller Maitland, writing in 1929, suggested that d’Albert was well known despite the School:

> The National Training School was in some measure the nucleus from which the new school [the Royal College of Music] was developed; but I do not think it had many claims to immortality, beyond the fact that Eugene [sic] d’Albert was one of its pupils; its deficiencies had probably something to do with his abandonment of the English nationality.\(^{10}\)

---


8 Eugène d’Albert [source unlisted], quoted in Ehrlich, p. 107.

9 Ehrlich, p. 107.

The circumstances around d’Albert, therefore, provide evidence to question Grove’s narrative.

Beyond student case studies, Examiners’ Reports dating from 1880 state that the quality of education at the School was deficient.\(^{11}\) These exams were attended by the wider public and the Reports were published, meaning that they were readily available for Grove to have read: given this, Grove’s account of the NTSM was, at the very least, dismissive of alternative evidence. Indeed, those involved in the RCM were careful to minimise its associations with the NTSM. Henry Thring – a long-serving member of the Royal Commission for the 1851 Exhibition – did not want ex-NTSM President, Arthur Sullivan, to join fundraising ventures in Manchester on behalf of the RCM.\(^ {12}\) As Giles Brightwell writes, Thring ‘felt any overt association with the NTSM would undermine their objective. [....] “[Sullivan] can do us no good, might do us harm and I have no particular desire to give him a special glorification”’.\(^ {13}\) Finally, as Wright further points out, the RCM being awarded a Royal Charter – something that was so crucial to its existence that its opening was delayed by a year to ensure that it possessed one – further ‘underline[d] the conceptual division between the NTSM and the RCM’.\(^ {14}\) So, how, and why, were perceptions of this history altered?

Wright has suggested that Grove might have been keen to re-write the history of the NTSM for two reasons: one being loyalty to his close friend Sullivan and the Royal Family; the other, to help legitimise the RCM and gain sufficient funding.\(^ {15}\) Grove’s actions can be deemed a success, as subsequent histories have treated the National Training School as a mere footnote to the story of the RCM, as though the latter emerged from it organically; even Fuller Maitland’s negative assessment of the NTSM’s ‘deficiencies’ still cites it as the place from which the RCM grew.\(^ {16}\) It is only more recent work that has drawn on the


\(^{13}\) Henry Thring, private papers, Royal College of Music Archives, Box 171, quoted in Brightwell, p. 76.

\(^{14}\) Wright, ‘The South Kensington Music Schools’, p. 257. See also pp. 249–252 for Wright’s discussion of evidence suggesting the NTSM’s inadequacy.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., p. 276.

School’s archives and shown the hidden schism between the two conservatoires which undermines Grove’s written assessments.  

2. ‘Das Land ohne Musik’

During the 1980s and 1990s, a significant amount of research was dedicated to examining the quip that nineteenth-century Britain was a ‘land without music’, indirectly responding to an assessment made by German critic, Oscar A. H. Schmitz, in 1914. Briefly summarised, this narrative puts forward that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Britain was experiencing a crisis of musical legitimacy due to its lack of compositional output in comparison to other European nations. However, as the theory also suggests, musical life in Britain underwent a radical shift through the century and was in a vastly different position by the commencement of the First World War, with a Great Composer to its name (Elgar), a thriving compositional life supported by educational institutions, and a wealth of professional musicians. Studies of this period of growth — which often refer to it as the ‘English Musical Renaissance’ (EMR) — frequently place George Grove and the academic institutions of South Kensington and universities of Oxford and Cambridge (Oxbridge) at the centre of this change, which some writers credit with institutionally legitimising, supporting, and (later) producing a group of English composers who could finally live up to Handel’s legacy, restoring Britain’s place in the Western European musical canon. While many of these pieces of research focused on the country’s compositional output alone, neglecting the metamorphosis of the NTS[M] into a new existence as a Royal College of Music; Fuller Maitland, The Door-Keeper of Music, pp. 91–92, quoted in Wright, ‘The South Kensington Music Schools’, p. 245: ‘[t]he National Training School was in some measure the nucleus from which the new school [the Royal College of Music] was developed’. 

Wright, ‘The South Kensington Music Schools’; Brightwell.


other forms of music-making, two significant pieces of work which did engage with the institutional side of Britain’s changing musical life were not conducted by musicologists, but cultural historians.

Meirion Hughes and Robert Stradling’s *The English Musical Renaissance, 1840–1940: Constructing a National Music* is one such example. They published two editions: the first in 1993 and the second in 2001, with both receiving a mixed reception among the musicological community. Little changes between the two editions’ arguments; however, the second begins earlier in the nineteenth century, arguing that Felix Mendelssohn’s arrival(s) in the UK (1829 onwards) were a precursor to an English musical revival. They define the EMR as ‘a conscious and official project, with a finite and defined content, and often (though not always) with a local habitation and a name — the area of South Kensington which embraces the Royal College of Music and the Albert Hall, resting on the foundations (as it were) of the Great Exhibition of 1851’. With this definition, they centre South Kensington in their narrative; this accords with them referring to the EMR as the ‘South Kensington Renaissance’ on occasion. Their emphasis on the movement’s geography, however, fails to properly account for the power held by the institutions themselves. Their analysis of Grove’s contributions to the so-called EMR is initially promising — specifically, they describe the *Dictionary* as ‘nothing less than the first “manifesto” of the English Musical Renaissance’, including its justification of the RCM. Yet, although their thesis is centred on the Renaissance being enabled by the existence of the RCM (and, vice versa, the RCM being symptomatic of the existence of the EMR), their work is still rooted in a composer-centric model. They acknowledge this bias, writing that:

> The almost frenetic atmosphere of the early English Musical Renaissance constructed and mediated a national need for Great Composers. From the physical resources it created, it launched a search which placed enormous emphasis on the transcendental promotion of being which society would accord to those who pleased and served it in this capacity.

---

20 Hughes and Stradling, p. xiii.
21 Ibid., p. 39.
22 Ibid., p. 24.
23 Ibid., p. xviii.
Despite Hughes and Stradling claiming that they ‘remain convinced an English music history that is anchored in the “life and works” paradigm is intellectually exhausted’, as Wright points out in his review, they fail to move their focus sufficiently and explicitly away from this model, and so their work continues the musicological legacy of privileging compositional practises in music history.\textsuperscript{24} While they did make use of wider political and cultural trends in some of their argument — and (inaccurately) claimed to be among the first to do so for the period, causing uproar among musicologists — their work’s impact is limited by their argument not adequately considering other forms of musical activity.\textsuperscript{25} Their work, therefore, occupies an important place in British musical studies: it drew attention to the need to broaden the discipline’s methodological approaches away from composer-centric models but also highlighted the potential for further exploration of educational institutions. They were part of a growing movement which used non-musical approaches, such as social history, to write music histories. Theirs, however, was not the only approach available.

In the 1980s, prior to the first edition of Hughes and Stradling’s work, other research was eschewing composer-centric narratives in favour of more holistic approaches. Cyril Ehrlich was not a musicologist but an economic historian, and produced a seminal text examining changes in the British music industry over several centuries. \textit{The Music Profession in Britain since the Eighteenth Century: A Social History} relies heavily on archival material to trace changes to the profession, such as newly emerging roles, and the increasing number of performers and teachers in the country. Ehrlich argues that, beginning in the 1870s and 1880s, the number of musicians in Britain rapidly increased until it reached a watershed (which he terms ‘The Flood’) in the first part of the twentieth century (1900–1930), when the number of musicians vastly outstripped the jobs available.\textsuperscript{26} His contention aligns with claims that a changed environment and status for music professionals helps explain why the


\textsuperscript{26} Ehrlich, p. 100.
RCM was more successful than the NTSM. Ehrlich suggests that reasons for the Flood included cheaper availability of instruments and tuition, South Kensington’s ‘national conservatoires’, and the qualifications they subsequently made available. Ehrlich’s methodology moves away from composition, towards an assessment of musical life in this period; his analysis of educational institutions indicates that they directly contributed to a raised professional status for musicians, allowing the numbers of performers and teachers to increase.

Ehrlich’s account does, however, highlight a common trend when considering the growth of musical institutions in the nineteenth century — a tendency to focus on the origin of successful bodies, like the RCM. Although the relatively short time in which the NTSM was active (only five years) explains some of this, there is a gap in this research regarding the School’s place beyond its status as a ‘national institution’.

3. Institutional Studies

By 2000, there was increased interest in studying conservatoires such as the RCM and NTSM in their own right, rather than using them as evidence for broader historical narratives about the developments of the music profession and industry in Britain. Such studies were explicitly focused on the institutions’ circumstances; however, approaches differed from focusing on the institution itself and the individuals who played a key role in running them (for example, Grove), to positioning them alongside other methods of music education (such as Tonic Sol-fa). Such studies highlight the potential of archival research for illuminating the previously unmentioned histories of these institutions, and such work holds a significant place in the field of the history of music education. By consciously eschewing discussions of Great Composers, and often even performance practices, they also pay greater attention to concepts of power on a broader level across society.

---

28 Ehrlich, pp. 100—107.
29 Ibid., p. 107.
Some of the first work in this area was published in *George Grove, Music, and Victorian Culture*, a collection of essays, edited by Michael Musgrave, by scholars who discussed different aspect of Grove’s life, role, and contributions to the British music. The chapters vary in their approaches but collectively trace Grove’s extensive involvement with British musical life during this time from his role at the *Macmillan Magazine*, to the Crystal Palace Concerts (of which he was secretary) and the history of the programme note (to which he has been credited as the creator of their modern guise), to his creation of *A Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, and finally his time as Director of the RCM. This collection’s broader impact shows that composers were not the sole important players during this period, and the significant players were not even necessarily musicians – it was socio-cultural power that was the most important factor in these developments. Leanne Langley and Christina Bashford, respectively, highlight the importance of personal connections being used to establish and maintain these institutions and networks. Grove being socially well-situated and respected enabled the success of his various projects: Musgrave has noted the commonalities between the staff bodies at the RCM and at the Crystal Palace as evidence for the importance of his social networks. Given Wright’s assertion that ‘[t]he role of an individual in bringing about a profound change of attitude can soon be hidden as the products of these changes themselves become culturally assimilated’, it is work such as this that can uncover a more accurate discussion of the relationship between the NTSM and RCM among the upper and upper-middle classes, as Grove’s motives can be discerned rather than accepted as part of College history. Taken as a whole, the book highlights the importance of networks and social standing for the upper and upper-middle classes in Victorian-era Britain and, more importantly, how they established, maintained, and interacted with new musical institutions, such as the RCM.

---

34 Wright, ‘Grove’s Role in the Founding of the RCM’, p. 233.
Giles Brightwell has conducted extensive research drawing from the NTSM’s and RCM’s archives to construct a detailed history of their nineteenth-century circumstances and offer new emphases on their intentions and trajectories. His 1998 master’s thesis, ‘The National Training School of Music, 1873-1882: catalyst or cul-de-sac? : a critical analysis of the circumstances leading to the rise and fall of Sir Henry Cole’s music school at South Kensington’, was the starting place for this analysis, which he then developed in more detail in his 2007 PhD dissertation, entitled “‘One Equal Music”: The Royal College of Music, its inception and the Legacy of Sir George Grove 1883–1895’. By plotting the complex history of the two institutions, he points out where previous histories have mischaracterised their relationship. He argues that the circumstances of the NTSM’s failure — that is, its (mis)management via the committee and financial instability — hindered and delayed the establishment of the RCM; but equally, these blunders informed the RCM’s founders’ administrative decisions. This contrasts with Grove’s assertion that the NTSM’s success gave room for the RCM. Brightwell’s interpretation means that approaching the two institutions as separate entities is an important goal for further research, rather than treating the NTSM as the natural precursor to the RCM.

Brightwell’s 2007 work situates the institutions in the wider cultural backdrop of British society; during this, he notes the RCM’s desire for international expansion. His characterisation of the RCM as an ‘imperial institution’ with the intent of establishing a set of ‘satellite schools’ around the British Empire leads to his assertion that the RCM was ‘imbued with an imperial philosophy from the start’. Exploring the RCM’s relationship to another major element of British society at the time is a realisation of the cultural historian’s aim of integrating musical studies into wider themes. Brightwell was by no means the first musicologist to do so, but his work constitutes an important step towards integrating studies of musical institutions with wider social histories.

35 Giles William Edward Brightwell, ‘The National Training School for Music: catalyst or cul-de-sac? A critical analysis of the circumstances leading to the rise and fall of Sir Henry Cole’s music school at South Kensington’ (unpublished master’s thesis, Durham University, 1998); Brightwell, “‘One Equal Music”’. References to ‘Brightwell’ in both the main text and the footnotes of this thesis will be in reference to his 2007 work, on advice from Dr Brightwell, who pointed out to me that his doctoral work contained revisions of arguments made in his master’s.

36 Brightwell, pp. 89–90.
David Wright’s article, ‘The South Kensington Music Schools and the Development of the British Conservatoire in the Late Nineteenth Century’, considered the NTSM’s relationship with the RCM, drawing on Ehrlich’s work into social and cultural developments during the institutions’ operational periods. Wright argues that it was the contrast in the pragmaticism of leadership by Grove and Sullivan that caused one institution to fail while the other thrived. Wright’s intentions in this article were twofold, and like those in Brightwell’s initial chapters: to identify the problems with the NTSM, and to use these to explain why the RCM was the more successful institution. Wright identifies two primary reasons for the School’s struggle. One was Arthur Sullivan as its Principal, something he names the ‘Sullivan Problem’: he argues that Sullivan not being fully supportive of the institution’s intentions resulted in an ideological division at the heart of the School. Secondly, building on Ehrlich’s assessments of the enlargement of the music profession during this period, Wright suggests that changes in societal values (orchestral musicians being increasingly valued, music’s improved social image) between the establishment of both institutions meant that the RCM was considered more viable by the time of its establishment than the NTSM was at the time of its foundation, and based its aims on societal demands for the music profession, thus capturing the mood of the age. Between them, Brightwell and Wright suggest that Cole — who was primarily responsible for establishing the NTSM — and Sullivan were equally to blame for the failures of their institution, whereas (as both Wright and Brightwell agree) Grove was a far more adept leader and so had more success with the RCM. Cole was an inadequate figure in this first instance, but even once his power was limited by 1878, Sullivan did not use his newfound responsibility to better adapt the institution.

Having established the NTSM’s failure, Wright considers how perceptions of its legacy were altered by Grove in the Dictionary among other situations, and why this happened. Wright first suggests Grove’s personal loyalty to his friend Sullivan, and patriotic loyalty to the Royal Family and their involvement in establishing both institutions, as reasons for saving the NTSM’s reputation. Additionally, there were pragmatic reasons for presenting the School as a success: potential donors had to have faith in the RCM to give money, so stating that the

38 Ibid., p. 254.
NTSM had achieved its aims would validate the College venture.\(^{39}\) In many ways, the NTSM was naive in how realistic it considered its objectives and aims. Grove, by contrast, was far more business-like when thinking of how to run the RCM, and — among financially pragmatic measures such as taking fee-paying students from the outset — knew that curating the belief that it had the potential to succeed was crucial to the RCM’s outcome. Wright, therefore, demonstrates the interrelated conditions for institutions, and how they relied on one another’s image. Alongside enabling a greater understanding of the origin of the RCM, Wright’s work also reveals Grove’s power to alter the perceptions of the musical public in his Dictionary, thus contributing an alternative perspective to discourse on institutions and power more generally.

In addition to exploring the historical origins of these institutions, recent work has begun to investigate cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary themes which account for the conservatoires’ positions within, and interactions with, wider British society. Much of this is related to the RCM. As discussed, Brightwell has described the RCM as an ‘imperial institution’, referring to its intention to establish subsidiary (‘satellite’) institutions across the Empire.\(^{40}\) Wright, in his monograph entitled The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music: A Social and Cultural History, spends a chapter considering the Board’s place in the so-called ‘British World’, arguing that the RCM’s charter ensured that the ABRSM was also part of Britain’s imperial expansion.\(^{41}\) He argues that the ABRSM was part of the ‘cultural exchange’ which occurred between Britain and its colonies, particularly by instilling aspects of British culture — such as its musical pedagogies — among the non-ruling classes, which is where much of the Empire was maintained on a day-to-day basis; the exchange was through the networks built as examiners travelled overseas.\(^{42}\) His argument highlights that the ABRSM was part of the imperial mission abroad and used to expand the remit of ‘Britishness’ in musical terms. Erin Johnson-Williams agrees with this assessment, and further suggests that the ABRSM ‘examinations were one attempt to map the Victorian

\(^{39}\) Ibid., p. 276.
\(^{40}\) Brightwell, pp. xxxix, 89–90.
\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 92.

A thorough examination of the place of nineteenth-century musical-pedagogical trends within the Empire has been conducted by Johnson-Williams, where she proposes that research has been disproportionately enthralled with the South Kensington institutions. While she acknowledges that they offer a rich source for considering the links between the Empire and those governing the country, she suggests that, by sheer numbers alone, they were not the most significant musical development during this period and that this over-emphasis on South Kensington has been at the expense of other working-class forms of music-making that existed entirely separately from the Royal Schools; although working class musical cultures, including brass bands and the Tonic Sol-fa system, have been studied separately, research on South Kensington has neglected the working classes.\footnote{44 Ibid., pp. 5, 15.} Due to their nature as a communal activity, systems such as Tonic Sol-fa posed a more effective tool of colonisation (as evidenced by it still being in place in former colonies today).\footnote{45 Ibid., p. 47} By tracing the complexity of Britain’s musical interactions with its Empire, Johnson-Williams highlights the importance of this context in understanding the impulses of the South Kensington institutions. Today, however, there has been no such study of the relationship between the NTSM and the British Empire, which would enable further discussion of the issues that arise, such as class and gender.

More recently, Anna Bull has reflected on the broader importance of contextualising institutions’ intentions in her work on classical music practices among young classical musicians today.\footnote{46 Anna Bull, Class, Control, and Classical Music (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).} She shows the importance of these Victorian-era institutions in musical education today, and points to their potential lasting influence: ‘[t]he ethics and politics of classical music, while contested, are shaped by institutions and practices developed in the nineteenth century and retain traces of the ideals and the class politics of that era’.\footnote{47 Ibid., pp. xxiv–xxv.}
Although classical music institutions have had to change over time to satisfy the demands of their shifting musical-cultural environments, Bull argues that there are parallels with Victorian values that remain today in matters such as class and boundary-drawing around ‘serious’ music, despite other periods (such as between the Second World War and the 1988 Education Reform Act) presenting differently. She points out that further institutional research is required, to better comprehend the gaps in their legacy since the nineteenth century.

This Project

Having traced the trends in literature on the NTSM, the RCM, and their relationship in the nineteenth century, several gaps in research have emerged in my narrative. Although a lot of work has considered the NTSM and its relationship to the RCM – positive or negative – far less has been conducted into the NTSM alone. Another gap is the School’s place within British context where, although several writers, such as Ehrlich and Wright, have accounted for broader political and social themes, the Empire has remained largely neglected. While both Wright and Johnson-Williams considered the ABRSM and Empire, in addition to Johnson-Williams’s focus on Tonic Sol-fa, they only focus a little on the RCM, and not at all on the NTSM in this respect. Furthermore, Johnson-Williams focused on the late nineteenth-century, leaving the middle of the century relatively untouched, and largely concentrated on the interactions between British musical systems with the Empire on a global stage, rather than at home.

Jeffrey Richards has shown that the Empire also played an important part in the lives of most social classes in Britain in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Building on these gaps, therefore, this project will consider the National Training School for Music through the lens of the British Empire, leaving room to elucidate further discussion on gender and, most significantly, class power and networks. It will explore the NTSM’s interactions with British socio-educational networks and the Empire, as archival material reveals that the NTSM was
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more focused on expanding within the UK than the RCM. The intention to colonise and shape the experience of music education among the working classes by the ruling classes has parallels with the aims of Empire: therefore, deploying the term ‘domestic colonialism’, I will explore articulations of imperial ideology in the administration and objectives of the School to better locate its aims within wider society. One of the critiques levelled in Johnson-Williams’s work was that focusing on South Kensington’s institutions has frequently meant that discussions of working-class cultures are neglected— although my research does focus on these institutions, using the lens of Empire will facilitate an in-depth discussion of class structures and power during this period, and how they attempted to shape British culture. Due to the depth of this discussion, working-class traditions of musicking will not be neglected, and will instead be situated among, and in contrast to, middle- and upper-class musical intentions and traditions. Domestic colonialism in the NTSM shows not only the networks of class-power in Britain during this period and the extent to which the upper and middle classes intended to colonise British culture, including claiming culture power and influence back from the Tonic Sol-fa movement, but also reveals some of the rationale behind decisions made by those in charge of the School. In addition to musicology, my approach will draw inspiration and data from the work of social historians and sociological work (employing mesosociology) on class to best integrate the thesis with more recent interdisciplinary work in examining the impact of the Empire.

Chapter 1 traces the history of the National Training School for Music, firstly by establishing the historical and musical contexts for the creation of the School – including class-based musical traditions. Movements such as rational recreation exemplify the prevalence of top-down class-based distinction in British society, also observed in the prevalence of the upper- and upper-middle classes in the creation of the NTSM. The language used in establishing the School’s aims leaves room to interrogate these class relations in the context of the British Empire. Following this, Chapter 2 traces studies on the impact of imperialism in Britain to make room for the concept of ‘domestic colonialism’, a theoretical framework that can be used to describe the imposition of upper and upper-middle class culture onto the lower-middle and working classes using, among other means, soft techniques such as education. Links to Empire are apparent because the same techniques of cultural influence used to shape the values of the colonised abroad and were also used to influence the working and
lower-middle classes at home. Finally, Chapter 3 returns to the NTSM through the frame of domestic colonialism, arguing that the administration of the School – ranging from its recruitment of students to the curriculum implied by the instruments taught – functioned following the principles of domestic colonialism, as a microcosm for the Empire; the NTSM, therefore, just like other institutions during this period, was an example of social infrastructure shaped by the pervasiveness of the British Empire’s ideology.

Methodological Considerations

The most significant underlying theme throughout this dissertation is social class and inter-class relationships. However, as has been pointed out in almost all literature on the subject, discussions of class are methodologically diverse, terminologically pluralistic, and historiographically reflexive. There are several approaches that have been consistently used in such discussions – primarily either Marxist conceptions of class as relational, or class as a hierarchical descriptor. Yet even within these spheres, terms can be ill-defined. Recognising the trajectories that have shaped socio-historical work on class is crucial to this dissertation, as they are value-laden terms, often encoded with charges of morality. I will be relying primarily on descriptive terminologies of class as a hierarchical descriptor – following David Cannadine’s example – to facilitate discussion, as it also allows for empirical measurements such as the kind that take place in Chapter 3. I have aimed to justify these terms early on (Chapter 1) by relying on historical context to exemplify their places. However, to make matters easier, some very brief, very broad, definitions will be outlined here.
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Previous work has noted that class definitions have relied on perceptions of inequality, meaning that classes are defined through their differences from surrounding classes: Beverley Skeggs has written that ‘[t]he concept working class was initially developed through terms of exclusion – that which was not middle class – and the term middle class was made from the distance drawn from the aristocracy and the urban mass’. This idea of difference has also been emphasised by Simon Gunn, who posited that ‘[t]he middle class was differentiated from the aristocracy and gentry by active participation in the productive economy and from the working class by ownership of property and abstention from manual wage labour’. Gunn’s summary of class difference functions well for the purposes of this dissertation, and should underlie all subsequent descriptions. I refer to the middle class mainly as two distinct groups – the lower-middle class, who were closer to the working classes, and the upper-middle, who were closer to the upper-classes. The upper-middle class, who are central to subsequent discussions, refers to the group who capitalised on and contributed to the economic gains of the British Empire (particularly in terms of infrastructure), and are also referred to as the newly enriched bourgeoisie.
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Chapter 1: Origins and Objectives of the National Training School for Music

This chapter traces the NTSM’s history, from the context of its creation to its establishment, the path it took in its six years of activity, and its transition into inactivity as it was supplanted by the Royal College of Music in 1883. As one of this thesis’s secondary aims is to situate the NTSM within wider socio-political events, this background is vital for subsequent discussions. The institution’s history is largely constructed from archival material — I have seen much of this myself but also make use of assessments provided in secondary accounts by Wright and Brightwell. After establishing the School’s history, I will use archival material to discern the objectives of its foundation, which evidence the imperial markers of its administration.

Historical Background

Towards the dawn of the twentieth century, Britain was deeply conscious of being examined. In turn, Britain was examining the world — the cosmopolis of the city of London, the immigrants and traders who came to this heaving imperial city, the heart of empire, the hub of all the ambiguity, loss, gain and anxiety associated with the late Victorians, their government, and their changing environment. London was the capital of an empire growing at an uncontainable rate.

Johnson-Williams’s description of London and Britain in the late-nineteenth century suggests a powerful state which — though rife with insecurities — was playing on an international stage: it was suddenly aware that individual military wins were insufficient, and that its cultural influence was just as important as its exertion of hard power. Some of this insecurity echoes that of the mid-nineteenth century, when Britain was becoming increasingly aware that it possessed neither as much hard (militaristic, economic) or soft (cultural) power as it wished. A combination of the Crimean War (1854–56) and the Great Exhibition of 1851 had highlighted the weak points of Britain’s military organisation and its lack of arts culture, both of which were exacerbated by comparison with the country’s main

55 Johnson-Williams, p. 9–10.
rival, France, which was seemingly thriving; this was particularly important context in the decades following the Napoleonic Wars, as both countries were resettling their interactions. As such, although this period has been described as Britain’s ‘Golden Years’, during the early-to-middle period of Queen Victoria’s reign (1837–1901), Britain was approaching a crisis of confidence. Considering two contemporary exemplifications of Britain’s hard and soft power — the Crimean War and the Great Exhibition, respectively — highlights the nation’s insecurities over its identity.56

Responses to British actions in Crimea were divided.57 On the one hand, the British (combined with France and the Ottoman Empire) defeated Russia in Crimea, meaning they succeeded in their aims — this is something that the government were keen to emphasise. Russia threatened to disrupt the Concert of Europe equilibrium and Britain’s territory in India, so Britain was able to show its ability to counter any challenges to its dominance.58 When the Black Sea was declared neutral territory with the Treaty of Paris (1856) — thus preventing the passage of Russian warships and their ability to threaten British territory in India — the conflict ended, and the war was regarded a military victory, showcasing the UK’s ability to work alongside its Concert of Europe allies for the good of its Empire.59

Yet this ignored the mass of administrative failures that came alongside victory in Crimea. Of the 50,000 British casualties, Trudi Tate asserts, many were the result of ‘disease and neglect rather than [...] active combat’: poor hygiene and medical treatment, combined with supply-line delays to Crimea in the harsh winter periods, had a greater role in excess deaths than fighting.60 This failure was not only apparent to those involved, but also to the wider public. The presence of the journalistic press meant that the British public were aware of military realities for the first time, including the Charge of the Light Brigade which was

58 Ibid., p. 290.
59 Ibid., p. 291.
reported by William Howard Russell for *The Times* and later became immortalised in culture by Alfred Tennyson’s poem of the same name.\(^6^1\)

Although poor literacy rates among the working classes meant that they were unlikely to read the written reports published in newspapers, other technological developments meant information was still conveyed to the wider public. The invention of the camera in 1816 meant that the war in Crimea was the first to be photographed; furthermore, it was the first to utilise telegraph technology, meaning that the British public could visualise certain aspects of war, enabled by photographers such as Roger Fenton (*Valley of the Shadow of Death*), in a timely manner, though not immediately.\(^6^2\) One of the results of this was, as Peter Frankopan explains, ‘widespread disillusionment’ from the British public, which led to the resignation of Prime Minister Lord Aberdeen in 1855.\(^6^3\) The mixed results of the war — territorial defence at the expense of unnecessary rates of casualty causing public backlash — contributed to a fluctuation in British (imperial) confidence. Despite the territorial victory, therefore, the Crimean War highlighted a lack of unity at home, and the fact that its military ‘prowess’ was unsustainable. Tate asserts that:

> In Britain, alongside the realities of mid-Victorian prosperity and peace, there were serious problems. Vast numbers of industrial workers shared too little of the nation’s wealth. Other nations were starting to challenge Britain’s naval power, its empire, its share of world markets.\(^6^4\)

Tate argues that politically and economically, the government reporting success was used to conceal a deeper anxiety about British (imperial) dominance.\(^6^5\) Adding insult to injury in this crisis of legitimacy, there was a concern that while Britain’s imperial mission could be regarded as a success in terms of acquisition of land, it had over-extended and neglected its domestic culture; while this could be overlooked when its Empire was unquestioningly dominant, Britain had no cultural security to bolster its ego in periods of unrest.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., p. 4; From Our Special Correspondent (William Howard Russell), ‘The Cavalry Action at Balaclava’, *The Times*, 14 November 1854, p. 7.

\(^{62}\) Tate, p. 4; See: Roger Fenton, *Valley of the Shadow of Death* (1855)

\(^{63}\) Frankopan, p. 291.

\(^{64}\) Tate, p. 8.

\(^{65}\) Ibid., p. 8.
As the Crimean War occurred only three years after the Great Exhibition of 1851, the two could be used to suggest that, in the 1850s, the country was at the height of its imperial — and, therefore, political and cultural — confidence. The aim of the Exhibition’s section on ‘Britain and the Empire’ was to present technological and industrial development in four areas, supposedly emphasising Britain’s superiority in all: machinery, raw materials, manufactures and arts. However, Jeffrey Auerbach argues that the Exhibition mostly developed as an attempt to revitalise Britain’s perceived economic shortcomings, including in areas such as industrialisation. It is this fact, he posits, that explains the Exhibition’s aim of ‘industrial education’, and the rationale of provoking ‘exhibition, competition, [and] encouragement’ — ultimately, the 1851 display was intended to re-ignite the nation’s spluttering industrial flame. The contrast between the rapid industrialisation and technological advances presented to the public, versus the poor infrastructure and management of the conflict in Crimea highlights the discrepancies at play in Britain. This, compounded by the close occurrence of the War and the Great Exhibition, fuelled its inferiority complex. Britain’s concerns about its inferiority ran deeper than just industrial concerns; in addition to the shares of hard power that Britain was having to share with its continental rivals, it was also increasingly aware that its arts culture had not been able to compete for a long time. Britain’s exhibits were presented alongside those from its colonies and other countries, but Britain’s contributions were noticeably less ““artistic”, according to contemporary reviews. The Great Exhibition showcased this more than ever before; but it also produced the circumstances which would lead to altering this trajectory. The Exhibition made £180,000 in profits, which the Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851 ploughed into stimulating Britain’s arts culture, aiming to raise it to compete with its European contemporaries. The location for this venture? South Kensington, London — an area later known as Albertopolis.

66 Ibid., p. 4.
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69 Ibid., p. 23.
Albertopolis became a cultural hub of artistic and scientific development, formed of institutions funded by the profits of the Great Exhibition. The site, established and managed by the 1851 Commission, continued the Exhibition’s aims of educating the wider public (including the lower-middle and working classes), increasing international relations, and showcasing and investing in modernity, be it artistic or scientific.\(^\text{72}\) The 1851 Commission was itself established by the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce in 1850. As Hermione Hobhouse writes, founded in 1754, the Society of Arts was originated by a group of ‘Noblemen, Gentlemen, Clergymen and Merchants’; however, its purpose and membership changed over time, especially following the end of the Napoleonic Wars.\(^\text{73}\) Although its founders were of the upper and upper-middle classes, and while it continued to benefit from royal and upper-class patronage in the form of its presidents, the Society’s everyday management was increasingly conducted by the middle, professional classes.\(^\text{74}\) This is all the more true from c. 1850 onwards, when middle-class Henry Cole – whom Derek Hudson and Kenneth Luckhurst note was described by Trueman Wood as ‘the second founder of the Society’ – became its Chairman and was instrumental in rescuing the Society from near collapse, emphasising the Society’s progression into middle-class hands.\(^\text{75}\)

The Society’s interests were wide-ranging, as a glance at the list of reports and publications they commissioned goes to show: *Report of the Committee of the Society of Arts [...] relative to the Mode of Preventing the Forgery of Bank Notes* (1819), *Middle Class Education and Class Instruction in Mechanics’ Institutions* (1857), the *Report on [...] Street-paving and Street-cleansing of the Metropolis* (1875), and the *Report of the Committee on Saving Life at Sea* (1879) are all examples of the Society’s concerns.\(^\text{76}\) Such research was commissioned

\(^{72}\) Burton, *Vision and Accident*, pp. 47, 54.


\(^{76}\) Ibid., pp. 377–384.
based on the Society of Arts wanting to progress and benefit life in Britain at large — in this way, it acted as a nineteenth-century think-tank for societal advancement.

A recurring theme in the list of publications compiled by Hudson and Luckhurst includes education in some form, such as \textit{The consideration of an improved national system of education} (1869) and a number of location-specific reports (for example, the \textit{Inquiry into the Existing State of Education in Richmond, Twickenham, Mortlake, and neighbourhood} (1870)).\textsuperscript{77} Class-focused reports also comprise a number of these commissions, such as \textit{Suggestions for the Competition in the Sanitation of the Dwellings of the Wage Classes} (1877), the aforementioned 1857 report on middle-class education, and the \textit{Report of the Committee on Dwellings for the Labouring Classes} (1866). Music, too, appeared in several reports, including reports on \textit{Uniform Musical Pitch} (1859) and \textit{Musical Pitch in Continental Cities} (1869), in addition to the \textit{State of Musical Education at Home and Abroad} (1865), which will be discussed in more detail later.

Education and class, too, were concerns of the Great Exhibition: to provide grounds for self-improvement to which the working classes could aspire to achieve, including embracing modern technology and education.\textsuperscript{78} This didactic concern with class betterment was common to the Society of Arts and the 1851 Commission’s vision for the Great Exhibition, as highlighted by Burton.\textsuperscript{79} Despite not being part of the Exhibition’s original aims, music held an important place in this rebranding of Britain, reflected in the number of buildings dedicated to its cause throughout the nineteenth century: the Royal Albert Hall, the National Training School for Music and the Royal College of Music. With the Prince Consort as the Society of Arts’ President (1843–1861), there was a particular emphasis on musical culture; as John Skidmore writes, ‘[i]t was well known that the Prince Consort was anxious to include the promotion of music in his grand design for educational institutions in South Kensington’.\textsuperscript{80} Therefore, there was a certain pressure on the Society and its Commission to fulfil the will of its President.

\textsuperscript{77} Hudson and Luckhurst, pp. 377–384.
\textsuperscript{78} Burton, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid, pp. 45–48.
Placing the developing hub for music in Albertopolis, a symbolic location — one which was intent on rivalling other imperial powers such as France, and with the direct endorsement of the Prince Consort himself — implies the level of concern for music and its importance. The emphasis on moral didacticism and societal improvement, in addition to the Prince Consort’s desire for music to take a central role in the artistic development of the site following the Exhibition’s closure, explain the Society of Arts’ interest in founding the NTSM and its eventual aims.

Musical Context

While other nineteenth-century European countries were celebrating their ‘national heritage’ through music, often written by a Great Composer, Britain felt that it was unable to compete with this tradition, lacking both a national music and a high-status composer. Although more recent research has questioned the genre of national music, instead suggesting that it was an ideological construct more than it was a definable musical style, there was a strong sense that Britain’s musical culture was lacking compared to its contemporaries; as Nicholas Temperley has discussed, Britain felt that it was going through a musical ‘dark age’ — being described as ‘Das Land ohne Musik’. While this view originated in Britain, other countries were willing to take this perspective without further questioning: testament to this fact is that it was a German writer, Schmitz, who is credited with this quip. The Victorian’s view of their musical (or, more specifically, compositional) culture was that it was inferior compared to its European counterparts. Temperley quotes F. J. Crowest: ‘[w]e have the continental reputation of being the Great Unmusical Power of Europe — strong enough in commerce and steam, but devoid of musical talent, invention, and discrimination’. Such a quote is an example of a frequent commonplace discussed in

82 Temperley, pp. 3–5; Schmitz, Das Land ohne Musik.
83 Temperley, p. 5 [source uncited]. However, I have found a similar phrase in Frederick J. Crowest, Phases of Musical England (London: Remington, 1881), p. 157.
studies of nineteenth-century Britain that emphasised the prevalence of technology and industry in the list of the country’s successes, but the equal lack of a ‘national culture’ (of which music was an important constitutive element).  

As the story goes, however, out of this ‘dark’ period, there grew a ‘light’ one. As Temperley’s research indicates, although there has been a consensus that each existed, there is a historical discrepancy about the point where one changed to the other: Temperley observes that earlier writers believed that the ‘light’ period of British music occurred earlier — often around c.1850 — whereas later writers tended towards a later assessment of ‘improvement’, frequently coinciding around c.1880 and described with the term ‘R/renaissance’.  

Since the expansion in work on this period, the premise of the ‘land without music’ quip and its implications have been questioned, with many suggesting that it ignores other forms of musical practices that happened; in other words, it was just canonical compositions that were ‘missing’ during this period. Ruth Solie quotes Theodore Hoppen’s assertion that “the Victorians, it seemed, could do anything with music – except compose it”. Indeed, even the underlying charge in Schmitz’s work was that, although the British were far more adept at consuming music than they were composing it, that did not mean that there was no compositional culture in Britain; he contended that the difference in compositional activity was that Britain did not have a national music. Solie’s work looks at the performance culture present in Britain, exemplified by the Crystal Palace Concerts which aimed to encourage all social classes to attend and listen to music by renowned European composers, such as Beethoven and Schubert, and draw internationally-renowned performers, such as
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85 Temperley, p. 7. There is a historiographical context for whether the term is capitalised, as discussed in Sophie Iddles, “I am folk music”: Aesthetics of Englishness in the Music of Edward Elgar’ (unpublished undergraduate dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2021) – in this sentence I have recognised both trajectories but will henceforth refer to the movement in its capitalised form for the sake of consistency both in this writing, and in the meaning implied.
Clara Schumann. Temperley takes a different route, suggesting that it was a lack of interest in the music industry – caused by upper-class distaste for music, and the upward-reaching middle classes following suit – which meant that an internal inadequacy was felt, even though it was not grounded in reality. If there were no prominent, upper-class musical leaders, then it was felt that there was no musical culture by all; in other words, it was the dominant class’s crisis of confidence in their musical culture which was at the root of this problem. As there was a lack of upper-class taste for art music, composers tended to write music to secure an income, such as that for the church (e.g., Parry, Stanford) or for light operas (e.g., Sullivan) rather pursuing national art music like other European composers: as, in Britain, art music did not guarantee pay. Both interpretations are valid and point towards other forms of music being present in the country. But the upper-class crisis reported in many histories conceals the thriving musical life found elsewhere in the country for, as Dave Russell points out, ‘English musical life, particularly at institutional level, was organised broadly along class lines’.

In a report conducted by the Society of Arts in 1865, it was pointed out that music was held in lower esteem by the upper classes, with John Hullah separately arguing that the British upper-class sometimes went as far as to ‘proclaim their ignorance of music as though expecting admiration’; this had a large impact on the progression of the music profession. The bourgeoisie had similar cultural interests: sometimes because they were sponsored into power by the aristocracy, meaning that they had a vested interest in promoting this culture. In terms of music, Temperley has posited that the British aristocracy had little interest in music-making and so, given the bourgeoisie’s cultural deference to the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie had to present a lack of interest in music, too. Up until the 1860s, this meant that there was a strict division in the types of musicians who operated within Britain; those who achieved success, Ehrlich has argued, had ‘a liberal education [...] [and] access to polite
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society’, whereas those without this social background had more difficulty gaining traction in the industry.\(^{94}\) In other words, support (or sponsorship) from the aristocracy and bourgeoisie was essential to legitimising musicians, but this support was hard to come by due to upper and upper-middle class cultural politics. Chamber music was more valued by the upper-middle and upper classes and included drawing-room cultures of private performance. Although Temperley has discussed the disregard for music in the minds of the upper classes (and how the upper-middle classes strived to emulate this ambivalence), more recent research now points towards a private culture of drawing-room music performance not just among upper-class women, but also upper-class men. Christina Bashford has conducted valuable research showing that there was a tradition of domestic, amateur music-making among upper-class men during the 1800s but that this was not openly talked about.\(^ {95}\) Russell has also pointed out that although ‘the sexual divide was greater than the class divide in Victorian and Edwardian popular music [...] a greater range of opportunities [were] provided for women by music than by most other leisure forms’.\(^ {96}\) This is particularly true in the upper and upper-middle classes, where the types of instruments that were permissible for women (for example, piano and voice) were also valued as a musical form by the upper social classes — by contrast, the wind instruments associated with the lower social classes were by far more associated with men.\(^ {97}\)

In the lower-middle and working classes, different musical activities were present. For example, the skilled-working class and lower-middle classes were interested in the choral society; and it was the skilled and semi-skilled working class who had — or created — the tradition of competitive brass banding, which became an increasingly prominent part of musical life through the latter half of the nineteenth century to the start of the twentieth.\(^ {98}\) But these musical activities, among others including ‘popular music’, were devalued by the upper-middle and upper classes, who considered the musical cultures of the lower-middle

\(^{94}\) Quote from Temperley, p. 13. Argument from Ehrlich, pp. 31–32.
\(^{96}\) Russell, p. 8.
\(^{97}\) Ibid., p. 8.
\(^{98}\) Russell, pp. 4, 1.
and working classes to be unrespectable and evidence of their lack of cultural taste.\textsuperscript{99} Russell cites brass bands being absent from Grove’s \textit{Dictionary} until after 1928 as an example of this.\textsuperscript{100} Creating working-class interest in certain forms of music deemed respectable by the aristocracy and newly-enriched bourgeoisie became a shared agenda. On one level, there was a mutual appetite for the art music of other European counties among the working, middle, and upper classes. Wright has presented evidence that arrangements of Wagner’s music were popular among brass bands, such as those made by Alexander Owen for Besses o’ th’ Barn, based in Lancashire.\textsuperscript{101} The overlap in the musical tastes of Britain’s social classes nuances discussions of musical taste: although the upper and upper-middle classes may have been concerned with the musical activities of the working classes, the musical tradition they fostered was familiar to the musical working class. However, while this shared musical culture was orchestral, Bashford’s research suggests the upper classes were more greatly associated with the drawing-room tradition, and that this was not shared with the working and lower-middle classes.\textsuperscript{102}

As the working classes gained more leisure time, a result of the movement away from agriculture (long hours) brought about by the industrial revolution, the bourgeoisie — who were primarily advancing industry — became increasingly concerned with the ways that their employees spent their time away from work. Peter Bailey writes that, ‘[v]iewed from above, leisure constituted a problem whose solution required the building of a new social conformity — a play discipline to complement the work discipline that was the principal means of social control in an industrial capitalist society’.\textsuperscript{103} Given that the working classes were subject to greater social control due to their work being increasingly valued for economic gains, their leisure time became more of a concern for their employers: the bourgeoisie wanted to ensure that the working class could work to their maximum potential, and were not inhibited by their recreational activities. As such, pastimes deemed

\begin{footnotes}
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immoral by the upper-middle class, such as social drinking, were discouraged, and employers organised and funded more ‘appropriate’ activities to enhance industrial productivity (rather than only to take a virtuous stand against these pastimes). Bailey terms this ‘rational recreation’, which he defines as:

[The preserve of] the middle-class activists who sought to shape working-class choice by providing an alternative world of reformed recreations which would immunise workers against the alleged degenerations of their own culture and counter the more corrupt appeals of an embryonic leisure industry.\(^{104}\)

Bailey describes that this was part of a wider movement to implement more formal means of improving education and increasing sobriety across society, the former of which was a core cause in this period: hence it also being referred to as ‘moral education’.\(^{105}\) Another implication of this is that stereotypical working-class forms of leisure activities were somehow of lower cultural value because the activities, and therefore those who partook in them, were thought of as uneducated by the upper and upper-middle classes. Bull has described rational recreation contributing to part of a wider movement which drew boundaries around what constituted high art (or ‘serious’) music, run by the middle classes who were:

acting as cultural entrepreneurs to set up institutions that served their interests or reflected their morality and world view. [...] When working classes were recruited into this project, it was often in order to inculcate them into practices of ‘rational recreation’: ‘improved recreations’ as an instrument for ‘educating the working classes in the social values of middle-class orthodoxy’, that is, engaging working-class people in morally improving activities that would keep them out of the pub.\(^{106}\)

Bailey goes as far as to state that ‘whatever its accessories, rational recreation was basically and relentlessly didactic’.\(^{107}\) It was the process of changing the leisure activities of the working classes to more closely align with upper- and upper-middle-class values of respectability which often — though not always — contributed to distinctions between

\(^{104}\) Ibid., p. 6.  
\(^{105}\) Ibid., pp. 6, 37.  
\(^{106}\) Bull, pp. 34–35, also citing Bailey, p. 35.  
\(^{107}\) Bailey, p. 54.
what was considered ‘high’ (i.e., desired, valued, respectable) culture and ‘low’ (i.e., immoral, popular) culture.

One of the activities that was considered morally uplifting — and therefore was pushed by the bourgeoisie as a suitable activity for the working classes — was music. Russell notes that ‘middle-class concern about the political and social problems generated by the emergence of distinctive and, to many minds, suspect working-class cultural patterns led to a major expansion of musical provision expressly for the working class’. However, not all music was considered respectable — for example, while choral singing was particularly valued and due to the morality and virtuousness of the text that was sung, brass bands, where music outside of the Western art canon could not be redeemed with words, were met with scepticism. Additionally, the emphasis on group music-making (such as choral singing) led by another person increased the potential for social control, in contrast to music-making in a private (often domestic) setting.

Educationally, developments such as establishing a compulsory school leaving age meant that when music was included in the curriculum, it became possible to roll out its influence on a mass scale. Primarily, two different pedagogical practices were used for mass music teaching: the Tonic Sol-fa system, and the singing-class method. The latter system, attributed to John Hullah at the behest of James Kay-Shuttleworth — a politician with an interest in education — was first used at Exeter Hall in 1841 which was described as a ‘singing school for schoolmasters’. Kay-Shuttleworth was a proponent of European educational models, and the result was Hullah’s Wilhem’s Method of Teaching Singing adapted to English Use (1836). However, criticism of the fixed ‘doh’ (with the system only working in the key of C) meant that, although still learnt by teachers during training, the Tonic Sol-fa method became increasingly popular. This method was invented by Sarah Ann Glover in 1812 and written up in the Manual of the Norwich Sol-fa System (1845), though is
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commonly attributed to John Curwen. Curwen popularised it on a national scale, establishing the Tonic Sol-Fa Association in 1853 and writing _The Standard Course of Lessons on the Tonic Sol-fa Method of Teaching to Sing_ (1858). This method, like that of Hullah’s, was popular enough to warrant an educational institution being dedicated to it: the Tonic Sol-fa College, established in 1869 and given a permanent building in 1879. While this was to be short-lived, the Tonic Sol-fa system was incredibly popular across Britain, partially enabled through articles written by Curwen in _Popular Educator_ (1852) which capitalised on the rational recreation movement’s emphasis on self-improvement through respectable activities. Tonic Sol-fa was more pervasive than Hullah’s system, and was used in amateur choral societies, school settings, and in missionary work abroad. Furthermore, its legacy was engrained by John Spencer Curwen (John Curwen’s son), who sought to establish the method among the musical profession in Britain — previously, it had been ignored as it was closely associated with the working class and therefore not considered intellectual. Spencer Curwen’s interest in the education of the working classes was also built on conceptions of what was considered to be respectable music, condemning the brass bands as evidence of the ‘British love of noise’ in their lack of additional and, implicitly, more refined instruments such as ‘flutes, clarionets, [and] oboes’.

As it did not require instruments or participants to learn sheet music, the Tonic Sol-fa method became a core element of the music curriculum both at home and abroad, something that has been discussed by Johnson-Williams. The system was exported abroad as a method of ‘colonial conversion’, suggesting the extent to which it was regarded as a tool for co-opting those who learned this method into a ‘British’ culture; the fact that the same tool was used within Britain strengthens the contemporary perception that the
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working classes were a problem to be solved by upper and upper-middle class actions.\textsuperscript{121} Given that both Tonic Sol-fa and Hullah’s method were supported by the Educational Department, the extent to which music was aligned with state interest at home and abroad is apparent.

The involvement of almost all classes in the rational recreation movement and music’s place within it shows that there are ample reasons to question the sweeping validity of the ‘land without music’ narrative. However, it remains that some felt it was not the British people who could continue the legacies of Handel and Purcell, but that the environment was stifling potential talent or causing many to emigrate: the issue lay at an institutional level.\textsuperscript{122} As such, creating more educational opportunities was thought to be a solution. Establishing the Royal Academy of Music was intended to be a step towards rectifying this problem — if composition students had opportunity to hone their skills on native soil, there would be no need for them to train abroad, and so there was an increased likelihood that they would use their abilities at home. However, this was not to be. Reviews of the RAM were inconsistent at best: with some complimenting the quality of performances and compositions, but others regarding it as an elitist failure (to be discussed later).\textsuperscript{123} A more accessible school of music was required, with affordable fees and the intention of producing Great Composers for the future and sufficiently stimulating musical life in Britain to create a culture worth investing in.

And so, the 1851 Commissioners, led by the Prince of Wales and Henry Cole, went about creating such a school. First opened in 1876, the NTSM was evidence of this felt inadequacy about the state of British musical life and was established as part of the larger effort to rectify and restore Britain (and its Empire) to a cultural greatness matching its colonial triumphs. However, as the following will outline, the history of the NTSM was by no means linear or straightforward, even if the hole it needed to fill was acutely felt.
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Pre-History

The NTSM’s establishment was informed by pre-existing institutions. This pre-history largely comprises educational precedents that gave arise to the NTSM’s conception and administration.

The UK had several specialist musical institutions already in existence, including those associated with the church and the Royal Military School for Music at Kneller Hall. Established in 1857, perhaps the most notable part of Kneller Hall’s existence was its ‘prescriptive’ curriculum, which had a set length and course of study; this was well-known in musical circles, as pointed out by Wright, because it was detailed in one of the Appendices to the 1865 Report by the Society of Arts. Furthermore, Kneller Hall placed an emphasis on training its pupils to teach professionally – something that was crucial to the intentions of the NTSM and the eventual aims of the RCM. Although Kneller Hall’s output was specific to producing military musicians, the methods used in its training (such as a set curriculum) went on to have a significant impact to other training colleges in Britain.

Regarding instrumental training, the earliest relevant precedent – and one that is frequently referenced in these histories – was the Paris Conservatoire (Conservatoire de Musique), established in 1795. Paris’s institution marked an influential change in the provision of music education in Europe – prior to its establishment, the best-known conservatories were in Italy, and mainly catered for vocal training. Therefore, the Paris Conservatoire’s move to include instrumental tuition in its curriculum (in addition to vocal lessons and techniques which would prepare students for careers in Paris’s theatre scene) indicated an alternative approach to music education. Administratively, one of the key elements of the Paris Conservatoire was that it was completely government-funded, meaning that students were
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not required to pay for their education. Brightwell notes that the Conservatoire had a significant impact on the history of music education in the UK, stating that it ‘influenced the philosophy behind the foundation of every school of music in Britain from 1822 onwards’. How institutions responded, however, differed significantly. The RAM focused on orchestral instruments; by contrast, the NTSM copied the Conservatoire’s model for gratuitous fees. Yet, while the NTSM ensured (at least initially) that its fees were free, it was funded by private donors rather than the state, marking a deviation from the Paris Conservatoire. Cole’s intention was for the government to eventually fund the School, reducing the requirement for private donors — this was a misjudgement of the government’s interest in musical education during this period.

The establishment of the RAM in 1822 was also significant in the history of British musical education. It was established to try and compete with European standards of education in the musical culture of Britain and was subject to mixed reviews throughout the first thirty years of its existence, as shown through articles in The Times. Basing their reviews on concerts staged by the Academy, although some writers state that pupils were good for their age and concert programming showcased their abilities, others were more critical. Indeed, even those who praised the Academy could not claim that its compositional output was sufficient to restore faith in British musical culture, with one writing that ‘only one of three new compositions submitted gave evidence of more than ordinary talent’; others criticised some compositions for having ‘too great a leaning to the French school of instrumentation’. Over time, although outright criticism was rare (at least in The Times), the RAM was consistently noted as having fallen short of expectations at various points: ‘with few exceptions [the solo vocal exhibitions] did not say much for the progress of the
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Royal Academy in that important department of musical education’. Vague reference was made to the Academy’s ‘shortcomings’ on various occasions, although by the 1850s these were described as historical facts rather than current critique. Only in very rare situations was the institution subjected to direct criticism – but when it was, the accusations were damning. Collet Dobson, writing in the *Musical World* (republished in *The Times*) having completed three-quarters of a year of study there, made accusations depicting the Academy as an elitist failure: he argued that the institution did not live up to its claims for tuition structure, meaning that the result was unsatisfactory, and pupils were vastly overpaying for service. He also suggested, despite the RAM’s claims to only admit those in possession of musical talent, that:

[T]he education of those within is unimportant [to the RAM]; nor is it necessary very closely to scrutinize the abilities of candidates for admission, or question their industry when admitted, 30 golden guineas a-year, and 5 guineas entrance, being talents not to be overlooked. [...] The receipt of cash is the principal inducement to accept a pupil.

If Collet’s account has even some veracity, it implies that the RAM was not solely committed to the pursuit of enhancing British musical talent but was instead having to compromise by also taking pupils who could pay, to keep the institution open. It had not produced any composers (nor, really, performers) of note since its establishment, did not employ many notable composers, and had a limited number of students registered. Some cited expensive tuition fees as one reason for its inability to attract students as it precluded those below the upper-middle classes from enrolling. Collet believed that fault was squarely at the door of Lord Burghersh (John Fane, Earl of Westmorland), the founder of the RAM, for his mismanagement.

Either way, at the point of debate regarding the future of British music, the RAM was considered inadequate in its current state, due its lack of resources (staff, financial, physical
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building) and curriculum.\textsuperscript{140} The precariousness of its financial existence was due to it being ‘entirely reliant’ on student tuition to pay for itself; the high prices of attendance meant that it did not have many pupils (only fifty or sixty in 1837).\textsuperscript{141} Moreover, it was deemed ineligible for government support and was unsuccessful in its application for funding from the 1851 Commission as it did not possess the financial resources to make the adjustments necessary to fulfil the Commission’s criteria.\textsuperscript{142} There was thus room for a new national musical institution in Britain’s musical education scene.

The final related institution to the NTSM’s founding was Dr Bertram Mark’s two Royal Colleges of Music in Manchester, founded in 1858, as part of what he described as his ‘Great National Enterprise’.\textsuperscript{143} The Colleges were established following the principles of the Paris Conservatoire according to Brightwell, though – like the NTSM – were ‘funded by a list of subscribers headed by the Queen, the Prince Consort and the Prince of Wales’.\textsuperscript{144} Although there is no record of these continuing past the 1860s, Mark’s cause inspired the Prince of Wales to continue the aims and found a national school of music based in London.\textsuperscript{145} The Prince of Wales placed Henry Cole in charge of realising this idea in 1861.

History of the National Training School for Music

The Great Exhibition of 1851 both highlighted the country’s lack of musical culture and produced the funds which were intentioned to change this. However, the NTSM was not the first musical institution in Britain which aimed to shape the course of musical education on a national basis. Cole (then Chairman of the Society of Arts Council) was already playing an active role in shaping conservatoire music at this point; in 1861, he released a report to the RAM dictating that they needed to implement several changes to their administration for the 1851 Commissioners (of which he was administrator) to grant it land in South
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At first, it seemed as though the RAM might fulfil the Prince of Wales’s ideas, should the suggestions be implemented. As Brightwell writes, the proposed alterations ‘were designed to transform it into an effective national institution, assured of the approbation of the music profession’. Yet this was not to be: the RAM’s location restricted sufficient expansion, financial circumstances prohibited it from implementing the Society of Arts’ suggested amendments, and it was conflicted on re-locating so far outside London as South Kensington from its central Hanover Square location.

In 1865, Cole established a committee – of which the newly-appointed Prince of Wales, later Edward VII, was made nominal chair – to investigate the state of musical education in England compared with that available in Europe, the results of which were published in 1866 by the Society of Arts, under the title *First report of the committee appointed to inquire into and report on the state of musical education, at home and abroad*. The findings of the *Report* indicated that Britain’s musical provision — namely, the RAM — was woefully inadequate compared to that available on the Continent; moreover, that which was available required fees to be paid by the individuals attending, making such an education inaccessible to poorer people in Britain. While the findings from this *Report* were hoped to be implemented in the RAM under the guidance of Michael Costa, complications at a government level meant that this was never followed through; even more importantly, the Department of Science and Art then denied the RAM land in South Kensington once and for all, a step which Brightwell argues was made to avoid the RAM’s substandard prospects reflecting poorly on the government. And so, once again, Cole reluctantly took the first steps towards establishing a state-funded musical institution independent of the RAM, believing that this was part of the government’s intention.
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At the end of 1871, the Society of Arts submitted a proposal regarding the provision of scholarships to fund a new National Training School for Music, pointing out the lack of available musical education, particularly for those who could not afford to pay for their own tuition, and went on to suggest that a new school should be established by means of competitive scholarship, the availability of which should be for all in the UK and its colonies. After this there was a period of preparation. Various fundraising events were held, though not all successfully: the concerts at the Royal Albert Hall between 1871 and 1872 operated at a loss of £100. In May 1873, a meeting established the core aims of the NTSM which explicitly acknowledged its independence from the RAM and made clear that its primary aim was free education for all. Cole first announced that the NTSM was a five-year experiment in January 1876, but with the expectation that the government would take over its funding after this period.

Arrangements progressed and by 1875, the NTSM Committee of Management were ready to start appointing a Principal Chairman. Lord Clarence Paget suggested Arthur Sullivan for the post of Chairman of the Board of Principal Professors in November 1875, but Sullivan declined on the terms dictated. In January 1876, he wrote to say that he could not accept the post due to his current position as head of composition at the RAM but stated that if he were to become Director, be paid £1000 per year, and be able to choose the remainder of the Board of Professors, he might reconsider. The period surrounding his appointment was full of controversy: Costa wrote to the Duke of Edinburgh personally to express his reservations of Sullivan as Director, and Cole argued that Sullivan had ‘no personal desire whatever to be connected with the National Training School’. However, despite these reservations, Sullivan was formally appointed Director. Finally, on 17 May 1876, the NTSM officially opened its doors.
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Problems created before the School formally opened came to the fore almost immediately. The NTSM had failed to gain the 300 scholarships it required prior to opening, instead settling at just under 100; this lack of funding meant that by 1877, the NTSM’s financial situation was precarious enough that some of the members of the Committee of Management — including the Duke of Edinburgh — became financial guarantors.\textsuperscript{160} By November, already-strained relations between Cole and Sullivan worsened considerably, with Sullivan’s temper about his lack of control finally seeming to snap; Sullivan wrote to the Committee of Management in November 1877, pertaining that Cole had aired private discussions between the two in a meeting, which Sullivan deemed unacceptable.\textsuperscript{161} The result of this was that the 1851 Commission sent a memorandum to the NTSM adjusting the internal structure, which effectively gave Cole less power and Sullivan more; this was realised in the New Executive Committee in July 1878.\textsuperscript{162} Thring was the representative for this action and while they contemplated removing Cole, shifting the management was deemed more diplomatic. The memorandum once again suggested merging with the RAM to stabilise the NTSM’s finances.\textsuperscript{163} By July 1878, a special committee, chaired by Prince Christian of Schleswig-Holstein, was created for the establishment of the Royal College of Music — at the time, this was conceived of as an amalgamation between the RAM and the NTSM.\textsuperscript{164} However, this ultimately fell through as the RAM was unwilling to relinquish its Royal Charter.

Following the continued financial difficulties faced by the NTSM, the decision to take fee-paying students in addition to scholarship students was made in February 1880.\textsuperscript{165} In July of the same year, after the School’s public examinations, a negative examiners report was published. As summarised by Brightwell, ‘[t]he examiners […] questioned both the veracity and the validity of the examinations; in short, they claimed to be unconvinced of the progress of the institution as a whole and the quality of instruction received by the
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students’. While Sullivan disputed these claims as ‘incomplete’, ‘inaccurate’, and ‘unjust’ — and, since, claims have been made that Costa and Charles Hallé might have acted from a personal vendetta against Sullivan — the fact that the report was published (and thus visible to those outside of the institution) had a negative impact on the institution’s image. Sullivan attempted to resign but was refused on the grounds that it would only compound the NTSM’s failure, and so he was forced to remain, at least for the time being.

These infamous examinations acted as the final nail in the NTSM’s coffin. Although plans had fallen through for an amalgamation between the School and the RAM, the Royal College of Music was still being created. By November 1880, plans were sufficiently consolidated for the RCM but the failed merger with the RAM meant that a longer period was required for raising sufficient scholarship capital to fully establish the College. However, the NTSM was approaching the end of its five years in 1881, and the RCM wished to possess a royal charter before formally opening, leaving Britain without a ‘national’ musical institution in this period. As such, to bridge the gap between the closure of the former and the inauguration of the latter, the Duke of Edinburgh wrote to those who were funding NTSM scholarships and asked them to extend their contributions, and so the School’s operation, by one more year to allow the majority of students to complete their studies.

However much the Duke and Sullivan underplayed the significance of the previous year’s examiners report, by March 1881 it was clear that damage control was required. While the end was in sight for the NTSM, the RCM was being deliberately shaped in public opinion to be an outgrowth of the senior institution. The NTSM needed to be regarded as a success — only this would ensure that the RCM would gain support from funding figures and the public more generally, which were essential to its success. Therefore, the School held some exams in March and April 1881 with the hope that they would be more positive than the
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previous year’s, and so overturn negative public perceptions which resulted from the report’s publication and subsequent discourse.\textsuperscript{171} To an extent, they did. Although there was constructive criticism — particularly surrounding composition and stylised composition such as fugue — the perceived standard of the students was far higher than previously, and went some way to counter the claims of the 1880 examinations.\textsuperscript{172} Following this success, when Sullivan submitted his resignation for approval by the Committee of Management in May 1881, they accepted; John Stainer was appointed his replacement and remained the Director of the School until its closure.\textsuperscript{173} When the School did shut, on 12 March 1882, its remaining funds were used to continue private instruction for those scholars caught between the closing of the NTSM and the opening of the RCM, and then added to George Grove’s Capital Fund, which helped the fundraising effort of the RCM.\textsuperscript{174} The Royal College of Music was officially opened a little over a year later, on 7 May 1883, in the same premises purpose-designed by Charles Freake for the NTSM.\textsuperscript{175}

One of the themes that comes across most strongly in the NTSM’s troubled history is that it was hoped to be part of a broader, national movement funded by the government. The operation of the RAM had not proved that such a cause was worthy of state support. The NTSM was established with the intention of providing free education (i.e., scholarships) to students who could not otherwise access it; and it was hoped that the government would eventually take over the management of the NTSM and implement music as a national cause, once the School had shown the value of the project. These themes in its history are brought out even more strongly in its objectives — an overview of which will form the final part of this chapter.

\textsuperscript{171} Brightwell, p. 69.
\textsuperscript{172} Ibid., p. 70.
\textsuperscript{173} Ibid., pp. 72–73.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., p. xxxii.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., p. xxxiv.
Objectives

Despite the Society of Arts Music Committee’s First report into the state of music education at home and abroad strongly advocating for the re-purposing the RAM into a national musical institution, and many of the testimonies within doing the same, this was not to be. However, the RAM remained an unfortunate leitmotif in the progression of the NTSM. In other ways, too, the NTSM deviated from the recommendations made in the Report: its intentions were more liberal but were implemented less pragmatically. The result of this was that it was never going to be a long-lasting project — despite the extensive research that was carried out, it was unlikely to outlive its initial purpose as a five-year experiment. As its Constitution shows, financial mismanagement in its failure to raise funds for a sufficient number of scholarships lay at the core of its issues, as well as Cole’s inability to move on from the possibility of amalgamating with the RAM, meaning that the NTSM was never given the opportunity to stand alone.

Generally, the NTSM had three intentions: to improve access to musical education for all, to improve British musical culture, and to improve Britain’s international reputation. Therefore, the following section will discuss where these objectives are found in the archives. First, however, I consider the report that informed these intentions.

Society of Arts’ Report (1865)

The Society of Arts’ committee established to report on Britain’s education was convened in 1865. The Report is dated 1866, and the British Library catalogue states its publication was in 1867; however, to be consistent with previous literature, I will refer to this as the 1865 Report. This research was vital to the creation of the NTSM in that it evaluated the education present in the country, compared it to the potential found in Europe, and drew up a series of aims that a new national institution should fill.
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**Scope**

The *Report* listed several different forms of music education covered in its investigation—such as church music — in addition to colleges such as the London Academy of Music and the National College of Music, and military training at Kneller Hall.\(^{177}\) However, the primary focus of the *Report* was on the Royal Academy of Music and how it compared on an international scale to those such as in Paris, Munich, Vienna, and Leipzig.\(^{178}\) While the Committee did not provide specifics behind its rationale for focusing on the RAM, they describe it as ‘the institution best calculated to serve as the basis for any enlarged National Institution for promoting Musical Education’.\(^{179}\) Potential reasons include the RAM already having a Royal Charter and received a small Treasury Grant, had been established for over 40 years at the point of publication (unlike the short-lived basis of most musical institutions in London, as indicated by Wright), and had applied for ground on South Kensington, suggesting its amenability to being ‘enlarged’.\(^{180}\) Therefore, although it was regarded as inefficient, it became the focus of an investigation into its suitability and was a preferable option to creating a new institution from the beginning. The *Journal of the Society of Arts* announced the establishment of this committee in 1865, and posed as series of questions to its readers, including:

1. What are the essential differences between the plan of the Royal Academy of Music in London, and the Conservatoires of the Continent, with regard to —
   a. Their constitution and management;
   b. Their revenues as derived from the State

   [...] 

3. The expediency or otherwise of taking the present Royal Academy of Music as the basis of any enlarged Institution in this country.

4. What improvements might be effected in the Royal Academy of Music?

---
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5. Is any union between the Royal Academy and similar Schools, Cathedral Choirs, or Local Institutions desirable or otherwise?  

Although these were preliminary questions intended to get a sense of the professions’ thoughts on the matter, and were not the official questions in the final Report, they are indicative of the investigation’s premises, and the central place of the RAM in this. However, as question three indicates, the Academy’s place as a national institution was to be explored rather than assumed, due in part to Parliament’s involvement in funding the institution’s grant.

The final, published Report was understated in its findings, considering the scope of its research; yet it made the state of the RAM clear. There was a lack of provision for quality, accessible, music education in Britain, and the Academy’s lack of support from the music profession was at the crux of this issue. Specifically, it revealed that conservatories abroad enjoyed a vastly different approach with regard to who funded music education: whereas conservatoires such as the one in Paris were funded by the state, the RAM relied on a ‘hand-to-mouth existence’ of fee-paying pupils to survive, largely without state support. Access to such an education was a preserve of the elite, inaccessible to the vast majority of a country — the Report’s General Conclusions and testimonies within made clear that this needed to change if Britain truly wanted to raise its musical attainment: they needed to establish scholarships. The apparent inclusivity of this conclusion — and the notion that unequal access to a quality education was unacceptable — was part of a growing belief in the importance of education for all, regardless of background; this included those in government, as proved by the 1870 Forster’s Act a mere five years after this Report was commissioned. Particularly when the Liberal Party were a prominent force in politics, such an acknowledgment of the disparity in educational opportunity was a grave matter. This political leaning was furthered by the age where the morality of music was being discussed, such as in H. R. Haweis’s Music and Morals (1871); although this text, when analysed by those such as Wright, is found to be rife with contradictions, it does point towards music by
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'Great Composers’ and the act of amateur music-making to be morally sound — and, therefore, a worthy object of study.\textsuperscript{184} For the sake of the British people on two different levels, a need for music education was felt. The Report was clear in the requirement for a well-resourced national institution to service both the moral and musical needs of the country, and that the RAM was not currently fulfilling these requirements.

General Conclusions

The Report begins with a summary of its findings. The remaining pages are primarily evidence from a variety of individuals in the music profession speaking in a personal or institutional capacity and are structured in a question-and-answer style. Additionally, there is an appendix which details further information for select institutions, such as Kneller Hall. There are relatively few firm conclusions, and most of them are related to financial aspects of any such institution — instead, the testimonies serve as evidence for the recommendations at the beginning of the Report. As the Report aimed to act as a catalyst for increased state involvement in music education, the importance of government involvement was one of the few conclusions it drew: as the Liberal Government was ideologically against state control, the Committee had to present strong evidence to support this particular recommendation.

The Report’s primary conclusion was that state funding was ‘essential’ for any successful national college of music, following the example of European institutions.\textsuperscript{185} Employing this model would mean that the Academy could educate all who were musically capable, regardless of their financial background: it would allow an egalitarian model of musical education and increase the number of potential pupils. The Report suggested that students who were talented enough to attend but required financial support would achieve their places via government-sponsored scholarship, and then pay back this opportunity in turn by progressing to teach music.\textsuperscript{186} The exact nature of their employment was not discussed and
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was left deliberately ambiguous as the Report was written before the British music profession’s status was raised, meaning that it could not be too progressive in its recommendations; however, it can be assumed that the intention was for those who had their fees paid to were intended to be part of a self-perpetuating system, increasing the institution’s cultural viability.

Despite this, the Report was keen to ensure there were other forms of income: state-funded scholarships were but one of the proposed ways of admitting students. They also suggested that fees might be charged to students, with the amount depending on their degree of talent. The Report therefore suggests that, though the primary aim of the establishment would be to educate those of the highest musical talent for free, others who had an interest in furthering their musical education could be admitted, which would increase financial stability. While they hoped that, once the conservatoire was established, local musical authorities such as churches would send students that they deemed worthy of training to do so at the Academy, this pragmatism would ensure that — especially in the first couple of years, while it (re-)gained its reputation — the institution would not be solely reliant on scholarship students to fill its classes, and would additionally help to fund certain aspects of its running. Such a pragmatic recommendation shows lessons being learned from both Paris and the RAM.

While re-purposing the RAM was felt to be the best course of action for creating a national institution for music, there was a clear consensus that it could not do so in its current state. The Report states that it required larger and better-maintained premises if it were to take on this role; such an ambitious institution needed ample facilities. They note that the RAM had previously applied for ground at South Kensington and say that ‘no decision respecting [the application] was then arrived at’. However, this is misleading: in 1861, Cole — who organised the 1865 Report — replied to the RAM on behalf of the 1851 Commission, stating that access was conditional on several changes which were designed to
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make the RAM a national institution. The RAM had neither the financial resources nor physical space to implement the changes and so was forced to remain at Hanover Square. This episode was unmentioned in the 1865 Report, but the Committee urge the RAM’s application to be reconsidered under the justification that it was ‘entering upon a more extended sphere of usefulness’, and such a decision should be made quickly. Highlighting the importance they placed on a new site for the RAM, they suggest that interim accommodation should also be found while the new premises at South Kensington was built. The potential for the RAM’s impact to be improved was also felt by its Principal, Charles Lucas. This statement also shows that the Society of Arts were keen for any such institution to be housed in South Kensington, suggesting that its eventual aims would be in line with the rest of the site.

When the focus of the investigation was moved to foreign institutions, the conclusion on how the institution should be run was clear: the state had to be involved. A wide-ranging exploration was conducted, and research was conducted into schools in ‘Paris, Munich, Vienna, Prague, Leipzig, Milan, Naples, [and] Berlin’. Approaches abroad ranged from the government only funding the conservatoires (for example, Paris) to it being involved with the administrative duties (for example, Brussels). It was noted that state support meant that these conservatoires were well-resourced – they were not reliant on fees from pupils to continue running. Paris’s resources were thought to be of particularly high quality and size, including access to a theatre, and its clear course of study was felt to be important; the RAM had none of these merits.

Research on the Paris Conservatoire shows that while it was based in the capital, it had subsidiary schools established throughout France, in Lille, Toulouse, Marseilles, Metz, and Nantes; however, the relationship these had with the capital is unclear, as it was noted in
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the Report that Toulouse was the only one that still sent its pupils to the central institution in Paris, while the rest were apparently independent. But this model — with a central institution and several periphery ones under its control — is one that those writing the Report seemed to have taken inspiration from. The Report’s writers hoped that once the RAM was established as a national institution, smaller institutional bodies such as churches and local authorities would send their most promising pupils to train at the Academy. This centre-periphery model was also one that was familiar to Cole through the Art Training School, which also had satellite influences that were affiliated with South Kensington’s centre, with teaching playing an important role in forming this network.

Finally, the Report was also building on South Kensington’s desire for international co-operation, with the Society of Arts thanking foreign governments and their conservatoires for their help in the process of gathering research for the Report, indicating increased international co-operation and an overlap between the intentions of the Society of Arts and the 1851 Commission.

The conclusions all point towards the Royal Academy’s potential for becoming a national centre of music, but that to do so it would require significantly more support from the ‘highest authorit[ies]’ — i.e., both government funding for running costs, and the 1851 Commission for granting the land required to build such an institution. Therefore, the Report suggests that the RAM’s failure to that point had not been solely its own doing and was instead more indicative of it being totally unsupported by external bodies, although it emphasised that the RAM also needed to improve its administrative structure. The Report’s recommendations seem to attempt to alter this trajectory and bring the RAM more in-line with the levels of support afforded to institutions in Europe. However, the Report is reserved in the conclusions it presents. Indeed, its final point reads: ‘[t]he Committee abstain from offering any further suggestions in detail until they find that the principles they
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have ventured to lay down are generally approved’. They do not state who they hope the Report will be approved by, but it can be assumed that the government was one of the intended audiences. However, although they do not explicitly draw any further conclusions, the remainder of the testimonies point towards certain aspects of a national institution. By and large, these testimonies support the RAM becoming the national institution; but such statements are often qualified by acknowledging that many changes would be required for it to be serviceable. While there are some notable exceptions who argue that the Academy’s scope is overestimated and that it was not the failure described by others, the majority of those giving testimony suggested there was drastic room for improvement.

**Cole’s Testimony**

The individual testimony given by Henry Cole is insightful. His testimony in the Report summarises a lot of the points made by others about a new school, and many of his aims which were later integral to the NTSM, behind which he was the main driving force. He did not suggest any points that did not appear elsewhere in the Report, but his testimony went into more detail about the rationale behind them and their relationship to other institutions on the South Kensington site, meaning that it has analytical use as a tool for exploring the expectations of the institution.

Proceeding on the basis that the government should take responsibility for the RAM as a national institution, he suggested three streams of revenue: scholarship places funded by the state, fee-paying students, and ‘annual subscriptions and endowments from members’. He does not define what he means by ‘members’, but might suggest that he had certain wealthy contacts who were willing to privately fund the venture. However, his main emphasis was still on the government, strongly arguing the need for them to intervene: ‘[i]t is not a question that can be looked at from the laissez faire or the mere breeches-pocket point of view’.
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On the topic of finance, his suggestions point towards alleviating the financial burden on the RAM in any form. He discusses that, in the cases where students are brought from throughout the UK to attend the Academy under scholarship competition, local authorities become the first assessors of whether a student is suitable, minimising the requirement (and cost) of the RAM’s representatives travelling out to conduct competitions and assessments themselves.\textsuperscript{207} Cole’s belief that local authorities would be keen to facilitate this suggests his intention for the ‘national’ aims of any institution, and that its location in London should not preclude the rest of the UK; but others on the Committee were concerned that South Kensington was not central enough to encourage people to travel to it.\textsuperscript{208} This division in views is also evidence of a paradox in priorities as, although encouraging students from all around the UK was a key part of any national institution’s premise, the organisers were seemingly focused on South Kensington’s location on London’s terms, rather than the bigger picture. No matter how much the centre welcomed the peripheries, these dichotomies were always reinforced on some level.

One of the most significant parts of Cole’s testimony, given its implications for the school’s purpose, was his use of the Art Training School as a potential model: his explanation of its relevance as a model shows some of the values which were considered important to both the South Kensington site and for the future musical institution. The National Art Training School was first founded in 1837 as the Government School of Design, later the Central School of Practical Art in 1852 (following the Great Exhibition), and finally the Royal College of Art from 1896.\textsuperscript{209} As he points out, the Art Training School (referred to as ATS from here onwards) was partially funded by the government and situated in South Kensington. According to Cole, from 1852 onwards it specifically trained arts teachers, with 200-300 teachers trained between 1853 and 1865, at the cost of roughly £200 each.\textsuperscript{210} Cole argued that the ATS’s training of teachers provided a prime model for a national school of music —

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{207} Ibid., p. 25.  \\
\textsuperscript{208} Ibid., p. 24.  \\
\textsuperscript{209} ‘Royal College of Art (including National Art Training School)’, \textit{Mapping the Practice and Profession of Sculpture in Britain and Ireland 1851-1951}, University of Glasgow History of Art and HATII, online database 2011 <http://sculpture.gla.ac.uk/view/organization.php?id=msib4_1222355292> [accessed 5 June 2022].  \\
\textsuperscript{210} Society of Arts, \textit{First report}, p. 24.
\end{flushright}
and, although he did not go as far as to suggest that such an institution should only train teachers, he suggested it as a secondary aim, and noted that the RAM likely produced many provincial teachers whose names remain unknown to the public at large. He argued that teachers had the greatest potential for influencing the country on the broadest possible scale, and acknowledging this from the outset would provide the best ground for a truly national aim.

The reality of the ATS, however, tells a different story. It originally moved to South Kensington in temporary accommodation in 1857 and only gained permanent residence in 1863. Given Cole was interviewed in 1865, this does suggest that his perspective on the activities of the ATS were mostly on its concept rather than its reality: perhaps this is why he was seemingly confused by the period in which teachers had been trained there, initially suggesting twenty years and later amending his answer to reflect the actual total of twelve years. Had this interview taken place at a later period, when the fortunes of the ATS had had time to play out, it is unlikely he would have cited it as a model — in an 1881 Report into the School, its Principal John Sparkes was critical of the facilities available, describing the buildings as “ill planned”, “badly lighted”, “badly ventilated”, and “insufficient”. This reflection on the quality of facilities available in South Kensington might suggest that the strength of conviction in the process of establishing an institution of this sort was stronger than the administration required to maintain it, also reflected in the NTSM’s history.

Cole’s final point was to stress the importance of the RAM’s administration being conducted by non-musicians – instead, those who were business-minded. The only compromise on this should be the Director, who ought to be both a highly regarded musician and have a sound business-mind, as Cole regarded both qualities as integral to running the RAM.
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Cole’s testimony further details the circumstances under which the RAM would operate: not as a money-making venture, but one with the explicit purpose of fulfilling a national duty in improving the standard of musical education available, using a range of means to achieve its goal. It is also clear that the educational focus of the institution was going to be supported by similarly-orientated South Kensington sites. Yet notably absent from his testimony is any discussion of the musical objectives of such an institution. There is no mention of the types of instruments that should be catered for, which indicates a more significant flaw in the RAM/NTSM project: its projected impact was its role in sharing national socio-culture, rather than benefitting the music profession. In fact, the musical role of the institution was so relegated that, as Wright has discussed, the Registrar (in charge of the finances) had ‘final control’ over the NTSM, rather than its Principal. Compounding the financial impact of the NTSM, this lack of musical objective meant that its role was unclear and ultimately led to its failure. Grove was well-aware of this when he came to found the RCM, hence his emphasis on the training of orchestral musicians in a manner similar to Leipzig and Paris.

Aims of the National Training School for Music

Much to the dismay of Cole and others who advocated for the repurposing of the RAM, the national conservatoire was instead established a separate institution: the National Training School for Music. In the end, it had three primary aims: improving Britain’s international musical reputation; improving British musical culture; and providing musical education to all in Britain.

*International Reputation*

By being located in Albertopolis, the NTSM was implicitly concerned with Britain’s place internationally and continuing the aims of the Great Exhibition. It was fundamental to the School that it encourage students with talent from the UK to remain rather than attend
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alternatives abroad, an aim that was used to justify a request for additional funding from the 1851 Commission in 1877, where the Committee of Management wrote that the School’s aim was to ‘take rank with the State Conservatoires of Milan, Paris, Vienna, Leipsic, Brussels, and Berlin,—a School in which the musical talent of this country may be fostered and completely developed’. As this part of the NTSM’s Constitution shows, its close accordance with the intentions of the 1865 Report, it can also be suggested that the foreign conservatoires were vital to the NTSM’s aims – in this way, it indicates a paradox at the heart of the institution where, despite its aims to compete with European conservatoires, the School is equally concerned with them and took inspiration from their didactic models.

Learning from this research, it was considered vital to provide facilities that would rival those available in Paris’ Conservatoire. This was noted in 1875, in a document submitted attached to a meeting of the Committee of Management; notably, this document is titled ‘National Training School for Music, Kensington Gore, in connection with the Royal Albert Hall’ [my italics]. The document suggests their keenness to associate the two institutions:

> When all the local arrangements of the School are completed, it will have premises positively unrivalled by those of any School in Europe. It will have the use of the great Amphitheatre and of an adjacent moderate sized Theatre; it will have libraies [sic] and professors’ rooms, and a multitude of small rooms for instruction.

To achieve this, they were keen to link the School to the prestigious institutions already in South Kensington, particularly the Royal Albert Hall. Indeed, there were intentions to ‘connect the building with the Albert Hall, by means of a bridge’, physically symbolising and strengthening the ideological link to an internationally renowned performance venue. By coupling the new School with a well-established institution such as the Royal Albert Hall, on well-regarded lands bought with profits from the 1851 Great Exhibition, the NTSM’s founders were utilising aesthetic connections to provide the School with a positive reputation without building the years of experience which other conservatoires had.
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The School also intended to involve the rest of the British Empire in its running. It was hoped that some of the scholarships would be funded from the Empire’s dependencies. In the first meeting of the Committee of Management in 1873, the Minute Book contains a document which states: ‘it is intended to establish scholarships, about 300, for which the most influential support from all classes in every part of the Empire has already been promised’. While this number of Scholarships was never achieved, the suggestion that this was to become an international venture through the Empire indicates that the School’s objectives were beginning to integrate it with some of the wider concerns of the country using imperial networks.

Musical Culture

While its international reputation might have been one of the factors that led to the NTSM being created, and a secondary concern of its existence, it had more pressing goals which were related to the UK’s long-term cultural aims. One of these was to produce a Great Composer that could write music to better the country’s musical scene. While this is related to the quest for Britain to become well-regarded in the international musical scene, the NTSM’s focus was on the creation of this culture rather than the way the culture interacted with others.

Fundamentally, they wanted to provide opportunity for future composers to train completely on British soil, ensuring that they were not trained to proficiency in other countries’ cultures (a critique of the RAM). It was the NTSM’s aim that it provided an education which would mean that ‘the musical talent of this country may be fostered and completely developed’. This aspect is strongly linked to the international reputation of the School, and its desire to provide an education that would encourage students with talent to remain in Britain rather than move abroad. However, there was also an intention to improve Britain’s musical skills base to avoid students needing or desiring to migrate in
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the first place — this could only be case if the teachers available in Britain were of a sufficient standard to engage and train students to a high level of musicianship.

Yet the School was not just concerned with producing performers and composers — as Cole discussed in his testimony in the 1865 Report, there were clear merits to training teachers. By doing so, the NTSM could create and be part of a sustainable national system of musical ‘improvement’ (linked to the idea of rational recreation and concern about musical taste) which would spread more efficiently throughout the country. It acknowledged this aim in 1877, when requesting funds from the 1851 Commission, stating that the NTSM aimed:

To be the centre whence may be drawn a large proportion of the Teachers and the Artists to whom the nation must look for the instruction of its young and for the general elevation of its musical taste.224

By using teachers, as previously discussed, the NTSM would not rely on the country’s musical culture being led by famous composers or performers, but on small-scale, local influencers which would gently permeate the musical tastes of those from all around the country. The focus of such change would be on encouraging an appreciation of what the Committee felt was ‘high art’ music; while not explicitly using this term, the use of ‘elevate’ as a verb demonstrates the ideal of musical taste as a form of social improvement. This draws on similar aims to the rational recreation music and suggests a class-based mission as one of the School’s undertones, where the upper and upper-middle classes (who were inevitably in charge of its creation) were attempting to ‘elevate’ the tastes of the lower-middle and working classes through this School.

This potentially also explains why there was an emphasis on encouraging students from throughout the country, as suggested in the 1865 Report, and not just London.225 Upon completion of their period of study at the institution, they would return home and teach, starting the spread of influence in areas that were not otherwise likely to encounter the School. A related intention of the School – though it was, once again, never realised – was to establish ‘provincial branch schools’ throughout the country that would make the NTSM the
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centre of a ‘National System’.\textsuperscript{226} Little information is available on these schools, but their purpose was briefly described as a place where ‘students may be prepared for competing for admission to the Training School’.\textsuperscript{227} Given their similarity to the subsidiary institutions once connected to the Paris Conservatoire throughout France, it is reasonable to assume that they would have had a dual purpose of providing local education under the instruction of the London centre, and highlighting particularly talented pupils to continue their education in London. As such, I suggest that these also indicate a concern with altering the country’s musical culture by establishing local agents to extend the will of the central power. This centre-periphery model has interesting implications — if it were to have followed Paris’s model, rather than destabilising London as the centre of musical opportunity, the NTSM’s provincial schools might well have strengthened London’s power by encouraging pupils to aspire to achieve results ‘worthy’ of continuing their education in the nation’s capital.

\textit{Musical Education}

As an educational institution, the case for the NTSM’s primary intention being to provide education for its students is not a difficult one to make. Deviating explicitly from the RAM, however, the NTSM wanted to provide gratuitous scholarships so students from all financial backgrounds could attend, instead of its student body only being formed of those who could afford its fees, as was the case with the RAM. Yet archival evidence more frequently references that the act of \textit{providing} the education to the less fortunate than it does the actual education being proposed.

While the 1865 \textit{Report} strongly stated that government funding was integral to any such institution, the NTSM was founded without any such support. Instead, one of its aims (as summarised by Cole in a Memorandum to the Committee in 1876) was to act as a five-year experiment to prove to the government the potential for the institution, and for it to take
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over the financial burden after five years. Cole was explicit about the pressure on the School to prove this, writing:

The National Training School for Music has been started as an experiment for five years only, to demonstrate, at the expiration of that period, that such a School is worthy of being supported by the State. A failure will put back Musical Education in the Country and will reflect disgrace on the management.\(^{228}\)

Those in charge of the School were made acutely aware of the School’s intended role as a catalyst for furthering musical education in the UK. Although the government had, until this point, showed little interest in establishing a national institution for music, the Society of Arts had undertaken the project with the intention of showing the viability of such an action, capitalising on the apparent amenability to music of the Liberal government, who had recently established the Elementary Education Act (Forster’s Education Act of 1870) which provided funds to teach children in elementary education to sing, increased the age at which children could leave formal education, and what was taught while they were in it.\(^{229}\) Therefore, the Society of Arts were latching onto aims that were already there but attempting to expand them, musically. Yet there was already musical provision for mass-education across the country, in the form of Hullah’s community singing movement and Curwen’s Tonic Sol-fa system, the latter of which was explicitly funded by the government. This suggests that the NTSM believed a different kind of music should become the country’s national taste, rather than one built on working-class traditions. The instruments taught at the School all accorded with drawing room culture (piano, singing, violin); the lack of brass or woodwind instruments, too, indicates that the NTSM did not have orchestral intentions. Additionally, students undertook two hours of Solfeggio, an hour of harmony, and eight students had an additional hour of counterpoint and compositional teaching per week.\(^{230}\) This curriculum was far less established than the RCM’s. Its lack of orchestral emphasis also indicates the extent to which the NTSM was not integrated into the music profession, nor indeed the musical requirements of the country at large. It does, however, align with the
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drawing room music of the upper classes; it can, therefore, be argued that the NTSM was advocating for more of the ‘elevated’ upper-class musical traditions to be imposed upon the country’s musical taste.

The School’s main focus was providing musical education to those with talent, regardless of their ability to pay, by admitting students through private scholarship competitions — this is different to the government-sponsored European conservatoires, which could provide gratuitous education to their pupils. Providing free education was meant to eradicate financial barriers and, theoretically, enable more students to attend the institution than would otherwise have been managed. Emphasising the importance of all classes being able to attend is more evidence to suggest a moralising intention to the School, whereby they were attempting to instil a certain type of culture among all in society. The provincial branch schools mentioned above were likely intended to be an example of this.

The version of the Constitution published in 1878 showed the extent to which scholarship founders were expected to organise their own competitions: they were in charge of deciding ‘a) The area from which competitors shall be drawn; b) The number of competitors to be nominated; c) Whom they will appoint as examiners; d) The examination fee to be paid by each competitor; e) The time, place, and conditions of the competition’. It is unclear whether this rubric was in place from the outset of the NTSM, but goes to show that merely two years into its operation, the organisation and implementation of scholarship competitions had been outsourced. While this could suggest the NTSM moving away from a core part of its identity by not being the ones to run the competitions, it was building on Cole’s suggestion in the 1865 Report that any scholarship competitions should not come at the expense of the RAM. Additionally, by enabling local donors to establish their own Scholarship competitions, the School also attempted to increase access by allowing students from across the country to apply for admission to the NTSM without the need to travel to London, which might have acted as a financial barrier to some. The reality of this will be
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discussed in Chapter 3, but such intentions reflect the School’s aims were initially focused on removing as many of the social barriers as possible so as to encourage a diverse student body.

Conclusion

The School aspired to influence the country’s musical taste, implicitly focusing on the lower-middle and working classes, by creating a new musical culture and finding ways to disseminate this throughout Britain. It identified teaching as the most effective way of dispersing this culture throughout the nation, even though this was a slow process and would take years for the end goal to come to fruition. The class-based conceptions of what constitutes ‘high art’ — i.e., the Austro-German musical tradition, with a focus on morally respectable string instruments, the voice, and the piano — and the way that they are approached, bear, on some level, the markings of the British Empire. The next chapter, therefore, will discuss the relationship between class and Empire.
Chapter 2: Domestic Colonialism

Studies of the British Empire and its impact are ongoing and hold an increasingly prominent place in academia. While much of this field focuses on the Empire’s impact abroad, a comparatively smaller — yet still significant — subset of the discipline studies the Empire’s impact on Britain. Much of this research points to class being a crucial backbone to any such discussions, as class-relations were shaped by, and responsible for shaping, the Empire. However, this discussion also sparks much debate regarding the extent of such impact.234 Despite such controversy, there is an agreement that the Empire’s impact was greatest upon the dominant classes i.e., the aristocracy and the newly-enriched bourgeoisie: they oversaw the Empire’s administration, and/or capitalised on the economic benefits it reaped. Given that it was their elevated social position at home which meant they could exert this influence abroad, examining their domestic influence also questions the relationship between the Empire and life at home. I explore this by invoking the concept of ‘domestic colonialism’, referring to the imposition of upper-class culture onto the lower-middle and working classes in Britain, in a similar manner to the imposition of ‘British’ culture abroad. This argument builds on and contributes to David Cannadine’s work about the replication of British social hierarchies abroad, and Anne McClintock’s use of the same term to emphasise the close definitions between the verbs ‘to domesticate’ and ‘to civilise’ in the context of Empire and its creation of hierarchies.235 This chapter establishes the theoretical framework for domestic colonialism before returning to the NTSM in Chapter 3, where it will be applied to the School’s administration and objectives, as discerned through its archives.

Empire at Home

While the impact of British imperialism abroad is a well-established field, there is less of a consensus regarding the extent to which Britain’s Empire impacted its own society; there


are, however, broader arguments that writers tend to follow. Andrew Thompson has identified three tendencies shown by scholars who venture towards providing assessments on the domestic impact of the Empire upon public life: minimalist, maximalist, and elusivist.

1. Minimalist: ‘British people were relatively unaffected by the empire and cared little about the colonies’.
2. Maximalist: ‘[T]he empire was a fundamental and determining influence on Britain’s past’.
3. Elusivist: ‘[T]he (hidden) history of imperial Britain was more a matter of the empire reflecting and reinforcing existing social, economic and political trends than pushing them in new directions’.

These definitions are important to consider when thinking about arguably the most prominent ideological battle regarding the societal impact of empire — the dialogue between John MacKenzie (maximalist) and Bernard Porter (minimalist). Briefly summarised, while both Porter and MacKenzie agree that the Empire had a large impact on the ruling class because they were directly involved in its administration and governance, they strongly disagree on how, or even whether, the Empire impacted the rest of society. MacKenzie argues that even if the public did not personally care for the imperial project, the essence of the Empire was part of the fabric of the society in which they lived; Porter, however, disagrees, instead suggesting that because ‘Britain did not have single or even a dominant “culture”’ during this period, it could not be considered ‘fundamentally’ imperialist — the country’s pluralistic cultures mean that a fundamental basis was an impossible condition.

One of the biggest critiques of Porter’s argument was that he ignored archival evidence which suggested a wider public engagement with the ongoings of the Empire, such as local newspapers. Due to this criticism, writers who are more concerned with archival evidence, such as Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose, and Jeffrey Richards (among others), tend to align more with MacKenzie’s argument.
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Although this was a famous debate between two well-regarded scholars, most research supports the argument that there was a wider impact of the Empire upon Britain. As P. J. Cain summarised, it is important to remember ‘how deeply Europe’s own history was influenced by empire. Imperialism had a major impact on the structure of European economies, societies and polities, sometimes accelerating the rate of change but in other ways retarding it’.239 Andrew Porter expands this list, adding that the Empire influenced Britain’s cultural (‘that is, social, institutional, religious, and intellectual’) life, with ‘[i]mperial and colonial cultures and institutions constantly play[ing] upon each other’; however, he cautions this response by saying that the extent of this impact is ‘impossible to answer with either precision or confidence’.240 By contrast, Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose state that there was a definitive impact upon Britain but that this influence was ‘undoubtedly uneven. There were times when [the Empire] was simply there, not a subject of popular critical consciousness. At other times it was highly visible, and there was widespread awareness’ in the public mind.241 They agree with Andrew Porter that institutions and culture were part of dynamic imperial interactions, writing that ‘cultural processes and institutions were shaped by and within the context of empire’, meaning that they were also part of the ebb and flow of influence.242 James Epstein also agrees that the Empire’s influence was uneven, and focuses on differences in class identities and experience to qualify his exploration. He argues eras of the Empire could be defined by identifying which class was being the most greatly influenced.243 Theodore Koditschek, when reviewing Epstein’s theory, felt that this class-based conception of the impact of the Empire at home was provocative, writing that such an interpretation ‘has the merit of suggesting that one of the reasons why Britons grew so easily at home with the Empire is that for so many of them the Empire began at home’.244 Koditschek is, therefore, also firmly a believer in the widespread impact of the Empire,
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although he allows that this would not have been consciously noticed by most of the population.

Some writers acknowledge that the difficulty in describing the domestic impact of Empire lies partially in its historiography. Epstein argues that ‘scholarship on the relationship between class and empire is itself fragmented and sometimes inadequate for answering some of the most pressing questions’. 245 Thompson whose work focuses on the impact of the Empire at home, has noted that some methodologies have limited its effectiveness at examining its domestic impact, citing two reasons: ‘the first is the failure to recognise how diverse and pluralistic the empire was. The second is the failure to recognise how diverse and pluralistic Britain was’. 246 Thompson’s statement here can be used in conjunction with Bernard Porter’s suggestion that society’s heterogeneity precludes a simple answer to the question of the Empire’s impact, to launch a wider critique about the state of scholarship.

Although brief, this literature review has presented arguments for the Empire impacting life at home in Victorian Britain; however, it has also shown that this impact was not socially universal, and likely fluctuated with time. Many scholars suggest that this discrepancy could be a product of shifting social patterns and the different lived experiences of social classes. As the aristocracy and bourgeoisie (especially those enriched by the Empire) oversaw its administration, they can hardly have avoided being actively influenced by it — their experience of the impact, therefore, is of no surprise. Knowing this has led many of the above authors, even Bernard Porter, to admit that the Empire had a definitive impact on these classes; it is the other ones which are more contested. 247

David Cannadine, however, has taken arguments regarding the relationship between Britain’s social structure and home and abroad in the Empire even further, stating that ‘the imperial British hierarchy [was] augmented and reinforced in conscious emulation and reinforcement of the metropolitan British hierarchy’. 248 In other words, the social structure
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at home provided a model was implemented abroad. He argues that, by doing so, the dominant classes in charge of the Empire were enforcing their presence in both scenarios; this is also asserted by J. A. Hobson.\footnote{J. A. Hobson, \textit{Imperialism: a study} (New York: Gordon Press, 1975), p. 356.} How did they accomplish both goals? By using tactics which would ensure that they had the most power. Cannadine describes this process, writing that ‘many British settlers overseas sought to create a full-scale replica of the elaborately graded social hierarchy they left behind at home’.\footnote{David Cannadine, \textit{Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 14.} Imperial administrators used the same tactics at home and abroad to ensure their dominance. This became a self-perpetuating cycle, as ruling-class dominance at home enabled their interests to be pursued with more resources, thus increasing the Empire’s status abroad, which then enabled bigger gains (economic and otherwise) by the elite, which fed their power at home and abroad.

This process shaped definitions and perceptions of ‘British culture’. Imperialism, though notoriously difficult to define, expands a country’s (or the country’s elite’s) power and influence — this can be through hard means (military or economic control) or softer ones, such as culture, with the goal of passing on this influence. Hobson writes that ‘aggressive imperialism is an artificial stimulation of nationalism in peoples too foreign to be absorbed and too compact to be permanently crushed’.\footnote{Hobson, pp. 3, 356–357, 11; ‘imperialism, n.’, in \textit{Oxford English Dictionary Online} \url{<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/92285?redirectedFrom=imperialism>} [accessed 19 November 2022].} Hobson references a group of peoples that are both part of the location of this expansion, but sufficiently ‘other’ to the origin culture to ‘receive’ it. In the case of the British Empire, therefore, the spread of British influence also entails the spread of ‘British culture’.

Given the above discussion of social heterogeneity by Thompson and Bernard Porter, what is meant, exactly, by the term ‘British culture’? Cannadine’s work on class power has shown that it was the values of those in charge which were exported abroad and whose values it was attempted to replicate. Therefore, what is referred to as ‘British culture’ in this context actually refers to the culture and values of the aristocracy and newly enriched bourgeoisie. With this contention, the impact of the Empire at home can be interrogated in a different way: given that the British dominant classes were exerting their power over other social...
classes abroad by using the same mechanisms kept them in power at home, did they attempt to exert their cultural influence at home in the same way? If so, this would imply that Empire’s impact at home was through cultural imposition, just as it was abroad.

Acknowledging that those in charge of the Empire’s administration were also those who oversaw the administration of life at home shows the merits of considering the two sets of influences using similar tools. The theory that a colonial power might also exert colonial influence within its own borders is not a new concept — it has been referred to as ‘internal colonialism’, though its name and definitions vary. This iteration of the term is primarily used in economics to explain the process of a state ‘colonising’ some localities for the purpose of providing more resources for other regions, which can cause class and ethnic inequality. However, attempts have also been made to discuss the social implications of this theory. More recent work has also referred to it as ‘domestic imperialism’ or ‘domestic colonialism’.

Defining Domestic Colonialism

I will use the term ‘domestic colonialism’, which I believe is a more appropriate choice than any of the other terms for several reasons. First: the term ‘domestic’ (as opposed to ‘internal’) has connotations with ‘home’. As Amy Kaplan has discussed, ‘domestic has a double meaning that links the space of the familiar household to that of the nation, by imagining both in opposition to everything outside the geographic and conceptual borders of home’ meaning that it ‘relies structurally on its intimate opposition to the notion of the foreign’. Kaplan’s emphasis on home’s ‘conceptual borders’ implies that the idea of home
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could be more flexible than mere geography would allow — ‘conceptual’ suggests that this space was created and altered according to shifting thought patterns. She uses the example of the 1901 US Supreme Court ruling on the domestic status of Puerto Rico, where it was deemed domestic in terms of sovereignty but treated as foreign when it came to export taxation et cetera; she describes Puerto Rico thus being ‘foreign in a “domestic sense”’.

This links with James Trafford’s discussion of racial separation in the US, where ‘the concept of a nation within a nation was mobilised to develop theories of domestic colonialism as a geographically contiguous state whose symbolic form was the ghetto’. By choosing to use ‘domestic’ I am invoking a similar principle with regard to the relationship between the ruling classes in Britain and the lower classes: although they were considered part of Britain, and were subjects of the British monarch, they were far from being part of the joint effort of imperialism and were continually exploited by the ruling classes. The elite conceptual border of ‘home’ (the domestic) effectively occluded the lower classes. Kaplan describes Puerto Rico as being in a ‘state of limbo in space and time, where they were neither citizens at home nor aliens from another nation’; by using ‘domestic’, I intend to suggest that the lower-middle and, particularly, working classes were also in this state of ‘limbo’ with plural identities: British enough to be ruled by the governing classes, but not part of the British culture exported abroad.

Anne McClintock’s use of ‘domestic colonialism’ is intended to not only emphasise that ‘imperialism is not something that happened elsewhere’, but also the supposed ‘moral’ aspects that were central to the Empire’s ideology. She traces the etymology of ‘domestic’ to show that, before 1964, the term was also used to mean ‘to civilise’. She writes that:

In the colonies, the mission station became a threshold institution for transforming domesticity rooted in European gender and class roles into domesticity as controlling a colonized people. Through the rituals of domesticity, increasingly global and more often than not violent, animals,
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women and colonized peoples were wrested from their putatively ‘natural’ yet, ironically, ‘unreasonable’ state of ‘savagery’ and inducted through the domestic progress narrative into a hierarchical relation to white men.\footnote{Ibid., p. 35.}

The use of ‘domestic’ to refer to the practice of colonising and ‘reforming’ the cultures and behaviours of those living in British colonies is equally apparent within Britain, where there was a different, less-racialised, but still keenly felt desire to civilise the working classes. Regarding culture, specifically, using the term ‘domestic’ to also invoke the verb ‘to civilise’, has a lot of advantages.

As a final justification for using ‘domestic’ rather than ‘internal’, Kaplan discusses ‘domestic’s’ capability of boundary-drawing gender roles, as the domestic space is one primarily associated with women.\footnote{Kaplan, p. 25.} Although the Empire was governed by the ruling class for the most part, upper-class women had far less power than upper-class men. Yet examples of governors’ wives abroad show that they could play an important role in enforcing ‘domestic’, such as boundary-drawing ‘acceptable’ etiquette.\footnote{Ashley L. Cohen, ‘The “Aristocratic Imperialists” of Late Georgian and Regency Britain’, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Studies}, 50:1 (2016), 5–26 (p. 7).} These discussions of etiquette contribute to discourse regarding class values and boundary-drawing soft power: within Britain there was a clear divide between what was considered the ‘domestic culture’ (of the elite class, which was used to spread British influence abroad) and the other cultures of Britain, which were deemed as ‘foreign’ to the dominant culture. Therefore, domestic colonialism can be used to consider soft power due to its linguistic connotations, diverging from the hard power (economic) referred to by ‘internal colonialism’.

I also posit that ‘colonialism’ is a more appropriate linguistic choice than ‘imperialism’. Saul Dubow, when defining colonialism and imperialism, places emphasis on geographic distance, arguing that ‘we ought to distinguish between the overt projection of British power from abroad (imperialism) and the assertion of British influence by local actors whose affinities with their new countries of settlement overlapped with their sense of
"home" (colonialism). Hall and Rose agree that imperialism involves a geographic distance between those ruling and those under their rule, writing that ‘[it] is a project that originates in the metropolis and leads to domination and control over the peoples and lands of the periphery’. To argue that the British aristocracy at home was pushing domestic influence means acknowledging the lack of geographic separation, thus making ‘colonialism’ and with its emphasis on local influence, the most appropriate term.

Put together, then, ‘domestic’ and ‘colonialism’ intensify the idea of cultural values and influence being exerted from local actors within the country in which they primarily reside. If we then understand that the British imperialism manifested abroad was the product of and represented the values of the British aristocracy and newly powerful bourgeoisie, it can be understood that the same values were also used to rule within the UK itself. This phenomenon describing the imperial culture also being manifest at home can therefore aptly be described as ‘domestic colonialism’: the imposition of imperial social hierarchy onto British life at home. The ruling classes created and retained their power over the British lower-middle and working classes.

**Domestic Colonialism: How and Why?**

Studies of the nature of the relationship between the British Empire and its colonies have clearly shown that it was not a one-way path of influence: it was a dynamic process with cultural interchange occurring from both directions. As such, domestic colonialism, much like the idea of replicating British cultures perfectly abroad, comes down to a matter of intention rather than the reality of the idea. However, this does not make it less worthy of study: as Chapter 3 will show, just as much can be learned about the ideology underpinning certain actions by considering what was intended as the reality of their imposition.
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From the mid-eighteenth century through to the early-nineteenth century, the aristocracy were becoming increasingly aware of the instability of their dominance of the country. The Napoleonic Wars with France (1803–1815) had a severe economic impact, as well as a social one, with much of a young generation of gentlemen and aristocracy killed. Compounding this, the East India Company was giving middle-class employees unprecedented wealth and, therefore, power; they had the resources to challenge the aristocracy for economic and political dominancy. As such, from this period until the mid-nineteenth century, there was a calculated and concentrated effort from the aristocracy to re-instate the social infrastructure that would boost and bolster their power to prevent it from being usurped by newly wealthy East India Company employees. Cannadine’s examination of this process, identifies key areas in which the ruling classes cemented their dominance: land, peerage, government, education, and religion. He argues that through this targeted approach, ‘the 1780s to the 1820s saw a consolidation of the nation’s top personnel into a new British upper class, with a heightened sense of privilege and extended sense of identity’. The changes that the aristocracy undertook to enhance their power were by all measures successful: uniting England, Scotland and Ireland meant there were increased numbers of aristocracy, also enabled by the increased number of peerages which helped to integrate more of the wealthy into the system of power. Finally, the scope of potential aristocratic power itself was augmented, so there were more arenas in which to exploit this newly found dominance.

According to Cannadine, one of the first decisions which led to the aristocracy’s power being restored was the purchase or consolidation of land within Britain. Capitalising on coal and other resources, as well as agriculture, meant that they could gain wealth to a previously unseen degree. This became a successful approach to land and wealth management and meant that those in possession of well-resourced land had a systematised route to wealth.
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which tied them to the industrial revolution and, therefore, modernity. The same elite began to then make gains in other areas of power, the most pivotal of which was shaping government aims. This process was designed to lead to increased power in shaping the country’s decisions. As Cannadine summarises ‘[w]ith the structure of representation, the personnel of government, and the pattern of legislation so dominated by the British landowners, it almost inevitably followed that they would also control the administration of the state’. This was pivotal in the elite reclaiming power in Britain, for state control meant that other systems of power could be implemented and more closely aligned with their aristocratic ideals.

After this, the aristocracy began to systematise passages to power and consolidate their gains, such as through education and religion. Cannadine states that young aristocratic men now received training ‘to take their place among the ruling elite’, starting at public schools and continuing through to Oxford and Cambridge Universities, which prepared them to take positions in the increasingly expansive offices of government, be it home or colonial. Only those who were from the aristocracy or gentlemanly families were positioned within government, for ‘this enlargement of the government bureaucracy took place within the traditional framework of aristocratic patronage and family connection’. This was a new practice, but one that had significant consequences for the future of Britain’s government: all nineteenth-century prime ministers (aside from Benjamin Disraeli) came from families whose ‘circumstances’ (the implication is financial, but Cannadine does not qualify this description) had changed during the period from c. 1780 to c. 1830. The aristocracy were also successful in creating a greater degree of unity between the state and other institutions which would later become associated with conceptions of ‘high culture’. An example of this was closer links between the aristocracy and the Church of England, where the
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percentage of bishops who were from landed gentry in the period 1791–1830 compared to the period 1660–1790 increased from c. 40% to c. 60%. Cannadine argues that ‘the Church of England [was] newly established as an outwork of the aristocracy’, suggesting that aristocratic bishops bolstered the strength and position of the elite class’s manipulation of societal and cultural norms: in other words, much like missionaries abroad (discussed in Chapter 3), aristocratic bishops were a form of soft power influencing the working classes. By targeting both religious and government outposts through education of their own class, both the aristocracy and the public experienced the upper-class’s increased influence. Aristocrats were expanding and institutionalising themselves, making their culture more socially pervasive.

By contrast, the newly enriched bourgeoisie were already responsible for much of the nation’s economic growth. Those who were employed by the East India Company, or other corporations who capitalised on the economic potential of the Empire, invested their wealth into new business opportunities in Britain. This increased economic clout also led them to employ more of the working class, bringing them into increasingly industrialised cities. To do so, however, meant acquiring land, something that they had to buy off the aristocracy. As such, alliances were formed for mutual benefit between the two classes. The upward-moving middle classes were, on one level, aspiring to the cultural principles held by the aristocracy, to have some power on a governmental level. Equally, the aristocracy also had to forge connections and work alongside the bourgeoisie to ensure their continued relevance and income. The result was an increasingly prominent ‘high culture’, which both classes wanted to formalise to influence the lower-middle and working classes: the aristocracy because it cemented their power, and the bourgeoisie because of an increased concern for making profit, which they could not make from unhealthy employees. Despite tensions between the two classes, such as the bourgeoisie’s attempts to supplant religion — an aristocratic outpost — with science, their aims were united on attempts to ‘reform’ lower-middle and working-class culture.
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This was part of a process of encoding values of worth and what constituted ‘high culture’ into the working of the country. Education (in various guises) was arguably the most influential site for this, of which both classes were aware: the aristocracy had used educational institutions in the colonies as places to teach their influence, and the bourgeoisie used educational foundations for the rational recreation movement. British public schools expanded to the colonies: not only would British influence be exerted in the location where the schools were, but many of the students would become sufficiently taught in British culture that they would then attend Oxbridge, the then-pinnacle of the upper-class path to power. By establishing mutually self-serving networks throughout the country, the elite were encoding domestic colonialism into the fabric of the country’s administration — only being born into a certain type of privilege would allow you a certain type of education; only this education could give you a place in government, and so, in power. As such, it was only the aristocracy who were in these positions of power: they were attempting to keep them as a preserve of their own class to prevent being usurped by the newly wealthy (and, often, wealthier) bourgeoisie. The systems of power were created to benefit the aristocracy (primarily), meaning that this hierarchical difference was maintained, keeping the power with the elite. The aristocracy colonised institutions of potential influence to maintain their dominance but had to work with the bourgeoisie to gain financial capital, meaning that these systems satisfied both their requirements. Wealth could buy some of these benefits, so while the bourgeoisie were not in positions of governmental influence, they were heavily involved in creating domestic educational routes to encode their values.

Geographically speaking, most of domestic colonisation’s administration took place in London, the Empire’s metropole. However, establishing educational and religious institutions throughout the country ensured that the metropole’s influence had local reinforcement, although there was a strong sense of south-east bias: as evidenced by the locations of Oxford and Cambridge Universities, and both Harrow and Eton Schools being in Greater London. A transition zone was required to spread elite/British values and encode
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their conceptions of cultural worth around the country. Abroad, various attempts had been made at this, such as missionary work or establishing schools which taught similar curriculums to the private schools at home. The latter, especially, was used carefully and targeted at those with local influence. Those who undertook the education were often privileged themselves, meaning that they were more likely to continue the system; alternately, their education was focused on making them become cultural agents of the British state. One infamous instance of this is Macaulayism in the British Raj. Based on the thoughts of Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800–1859), who infamously said that he wanted to create:

a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine [...] and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population.  

Macaulayism was an organised attempt to erode Indian culture and replace it with British. He was arguing for a system which would educate a small minority of the Indian population (those with money to afford the private education which would convey such principles) to learn British (or ‘English’) values through British educational systems, and then be tasked with integrating these beliefs throughout the rest of Indian society. In this way, Macaulayism is advocating long-term colonial processes which would result in the permeation of the culture of British high society into Indian society; or, more bluntly, the erosion of Indian culture by British values, taught primarily through Indian citizens.

Though hard to quantify, there are certain cultural traits that were associated with each class; as Gunn has written, ‘culture itself was a crucial domain for the articulation of class in the nineteenth-century industrial city through a series of oppositions between “high” and “low”, the cultured and the culture-less, mental and manual labour’.  

The aristocracy were reverent to the monarchy and a class structure based on hierarchy, hence the system of honours and social structure which the aristocracy attempted to replicate abroad –
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something that Cannadine terms ‘ornamentalism’. Although Cannadine pits his argument against Edward Said’s theory of ‘orientalism’, the gendered implications in Said’s work were also core in the minds of the aristocracy, as Said theorises the colonial project as the masculine West imposing itself on the feminine East. This male dominancy was an aristocratic value, and although aristocratic women were also in possession of some cultural power, as has been discussed by Ashley Cohen in relation to Maria Nugent’s (wife of Lord Nugent) control of etiquette abroad, and her role in preventing ‘sinful’ inter-class and interracial relationships. Cohen’s argument also shows that the role of women was within the home — while they might have had some influence in domestic etiquette, as was the case with Nugent, they was an expectation for the domestic space to be a female one. The bourgeoisie valued philanthropy and self-betterment (either of themselves or others) highly: hence them being the main force behind rational recreation. Respectability was core to both classes; as Kwok Pui-lan has discussed, Jesus was depicted as a ‘bourgeois gentleman, devoid of passion and fully capable of controlling his desires and appetites’, embodying both the Victorian conception of class and of no sexual desire as markers of respectability. Gendered norms were one of the reasons why music was less valued until the end of the Victorian period, when the power was shifting permanently away from aristocracy — they believed music to be a feminine form of art and so had no desire to participate. Yet, as Chapter 3 will show, these upper- and upper-middle-class values were performative; recent research has given evidence to suggest that private spaces undermined some of these performed values.

These values were not just enforced abroad, but also found at home, although they were implemented using significantly less violent means. The integration of private schools and of Oxbridge universities into the aristocratic path to power institutionalised their values. However, these opportunities were mostly only accessible to the wealthy, and so were of little use in influencing the rest of the population. By the middle of the nineteenth century,
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when the aristocracy’s power had been restored through these systems, they started to widen their reach. One such example was the Great Exhibition of 1851. The Exhibition encoded cultural values held by the upper classes, including modernisation and invention; as mentioned previously, these were values held and supported by wealthy landowners. The price of entry (1 shilling) being so low meant that many people could visit at least once and witness the projects of the upper classes put on display. But the links go further — with the profits derived from this project, the Society of Arts (a society created by the middle classes of professionals) created the South Kensington estate and the institutions contained within. These institutions were wide ranging, but all had one thing in common: they were created by the bourgeoisie in pursuit of emulating the aristocracy (in all but their attitudes to religion versus science) and encouraging these values among the lower-middle and working classes. Therefore, establishments such as the Royal College of Science, the Royal School of Mines, the Natural History Museum, and the Science Museum were all part of the project to instil a British culture of exploration and empire into the heart of the metropole. Most were pushing scientific discovery, but the Victoria and Albert Museum served to emphasise the importance of the monarchy, thus strengthening the position of the upper class by associating it with popular figures. However, it was not just scientific advancement that was promoted here. That this exact geographic locale eventually became home to the Royal Albert Hall, the Royal College of Organists, and the National Training School for Music (followed by the Royal College of Music) goes to show the central role that music had to play in shaping this epitome of ‘high culture’. Everything from the choice of institution to the type of building that they occupied was controlled by the Society of Arts (via the Commission of the Great Exhibition of 1851). They were selective over who they let in, with the knowledge that their decisions had the potential to influence the projected image of the land — hence the requirement for the RAM to be in a better financial position before an offer of land was made, and for the NTSM’s failure being overwritten, as discussed in Chapter 1. The South Kensington estate, therefore, was a contentious mix of cultural values: the legacy of the aristocratic imperialists who were proud to exhibit (perform) their colonial gains; and the bourgeoisie, who had been primarily responsible for its establishment and
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made scientific advancement — in opposition to the aristocratic alignment with religion —
central to the site.293

Domestic colonialism was both the product of aristocratic power, and a significant process
in its maintenance. By coding aristocratic (and, in some places, bourgeoisie) values into
conceptions of high culture, it was possible to market this to a wider audience. The
importance of this coding is twofold. On one level, the project of domestic colonialism (as
created by the ruling classes) led to the creation of certain institutions — these then went
on to shape conceptions of culture with the intention to form a ‘national culture’ which then
further consolidated the tastes of the bourgeoisie. Secondly, as Chapter 3 will discuss in the
NTSM, domestic colonialism worked on a smaller scale within these institutions, making
them function as microcosms of wider society.

Music and Imperialism

Imperialism was a constitutive and formative aspect of British society during the nineteenth
century. The desire to spread upper- and upper-middle-class cultural values was a vital part
of the soft element of the Empire abroad and was also found at home (domestic
colonialism) with the intention of improving and legitimising cultural taste and creating
more respectable leisure activities: these largely took place through education and religion.
Education in various guises was an important method for this influence, as it was something
deemed important by the aristocracy and bourgeoisie. Before compulsory education,
informal educational networks were particularly effective in spreading these influences and
held an increasingly important place as working-class leisure time increased in line with
industrialisation. Music’s ability to represent cultural values and be spread through
education meant it was a site for domestic colonialism in Britain.

Rational recreation, as previously discussed, used music as part of its remit — choral singing
such as Curwen (and Glover’s) Tonic Sol-fa movement was an example of music that was
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considered as respectable by the upper and upper-middle classes, and didactic applications of cultural imposition made it an effective way to spread these values. Furthermore, the use of mass-educational methods made it an effective tool of imperial control, referred to as ‘colonial conversion’ to British culture by Johnson-Williams. Its original use at home, therefore, also functions as a tool for cultural conversion — and so, the Tonic Sol-fa system and, I argue, rational recreation more generally can be understood as examples of domestic colonialism.

Music more generally has been theorised as a strong location for empire. In Richards’ study into imperialism and music in the latter half of the nineteenth century, he argues, much like MacKenzie, that imperialism was a fundamental part of British life in this period: he cites the electorate being pro-Empire, proven by no major political party wanting the dissolution of the Empire until the 1940s, as evidence. Given, he argues, that the ‘history of art is the history of the circumstances that produced it’, Richards believes that there is a strong case for domestic music-making being influenced by the Empire. Of particular relevance to this dissertation, he draws on Russell’s work to suggest that musical developments were partially enabled on a national scale due to industrialisation, something that was a product of the Empire; Russell suggested industrialisation as a catalyst for rapid changes to various musical cultures throughout the century. Due to increased investment in transport infrastructure, there was a greater awareness of a shared culture, thus meaning that the kind of national musical presence aimed for by those such as Cole was enabled and funded by the Empire. In this way, music (and other forms of art) and the Empire were mutually constitutive because each was needed to build the presence of the other — music aiding Empire by being part of the ‘British culture’ that was disseminated. The role of industrialisation in this also suggests that the bourgeoisie were, once again, responsible for these changes in musical cultures, as it was their wealth and industry that were pushing much of the industrial developments in this period.
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Music’s strong links to the British Empire, therefore, operate on several levels. On one, industry was something enabled by Empire, which in turn meant musical operations could exist on a national basis. On another, the case for education and Empire has already been made, but when combined with the rational recreation movement at home, this goes to show that domestic colonialism’s principles were highly pervasive, emphasising that the Empire used music education to expand its domestic influence. Not only this, but music’s role in rational recreation was a way of legitimising class hierarchies, which contributed to both a bourgeoisie-dominated industrial society and work environment and strengthened boundaries about what was considered ‘high art’ music. Finally, the Empire required strong cultural support, which music could provide by creating (or implying) a unified ‘British’ musical culture in the shape of upper- and upper-middle-class preferences. As such, tools such as Tonic Sol-fa were part of the Empire’s strategy of cultural expansion, and represented the expansion of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie’s desire to spread rational recreation — even the more progressive members of this class, such as John Spencer Curwen, were valuing community singing above other communal musics such as brass banding, thus enforcing these boundaries again. Rational recreation bears striking links to the missionary work being done as part of the Empire’s expansion, in its emphasis on ‘reforming’ the targeted culture according to the values of the missionaries; this strengthens its imperial associations. Therefore, it adds further weight to the argument that music — especially music education in formal institutions for children — was also a tool used in domestic colonisation.

Considering this, the merits of studying the National Training School for Music as a site for domestic colonisation are clear. Situated in South Kensington, it had direct geographical links to the Empire’s legacy with its attachment to the Great Exhibition of 1851, as well as social links to the parties which were administering this, including the monarchy who represented both the goal of Empire and the will of the colonial aristocracy — it represented cultural loyalty to the upper social classes. Furthermore, given music’s significant role in the colonial project, its institutionalisation as part of a national mission
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offers an interesting chance to explore the colonial links. As will be shown in Chapter 3, many different aspects of the NTSM point towards imperial influence as an important part of its ideological intentions, even if this is not as freely admitted as it was at the RCM.
Chapter 3: A Colonial School?

One of the contradictions of the NTSM was that it existed for longer as an idea than it did as a functioning school of music. The Prince of Wales first placed Henry Cole in charge of founding a national school of music in 1861 — the School opened fifteen years later and lasted for only six. So, although the conduct of the School during this period is of vital interest, the organisational processes which took place before its opening are equally, if not more, vital for understanding the NTSM’s context. Tackling the NTSM as a microcosm of the Empire and a product of domestic colonialism highlights the methods used to spread its influence around the country, as well as the class- and gender-based undertones of its operation. In this chapter, I apply the theoretical framework of domestic colonialism to the National Training School for Music, exemplifying archival evidence which is suggestive of domestic colonial intent.

Discussing class in this manner is inevitably difficult, and analysis must take several forms for discursive use. Later in the chapter, I use the Register General’s system as an empirical measure of class when discussing data; otherwise, I continue using the terminology that I have thus far.300

Upper and Upper-Middle Class Musical Cultures

Domestic colonialism is primarily a theory of class power suggesting that, in a similar relationship to the British colonisers in their territories abroad, the British governing classes (aristocracy and bourgeoisie capitalists) manipulated and administered life at home to spread their respective (and sometimes shared) cultural influence while also strengthening the basis of their power. In this way, there was an implicit sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’ in the ever-socially conscious Victorian period, culminating in such discourse and actions as rational recreation.301 Music has already been highlighted as an important part of the rational recreation movement, and in this capacity acted as a sort of intermediary between
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upper-middle-class and working-class cultures; but, as is shown in the NTSM, music also acted as an intermediary between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. In the NTSM, the founders and Committee of Management were interested in formalising respectable norms of music and spreading these notions among the lower classes.

As Chapter 1 discussed, the aristocracy, for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, had been indifferent to engaging with music, especially when it came to practising it themselves; they were uninterested in personally developing a national musical culture. But amid attempts to revive and/or create an implementable upper-class culture, a public performance of their supposed interest, exemplifying their musical taste, was necessary. With hindsight, it is possible to argue that any new school of music was a veiled attempt to imply that the upper classes had long been proponents of the music profession. It was noted in the 1865 Report that working-class children were often encouraged to partake in musical activities by their parents. By contrast, some upper-class men lamented their lack of musical education. Ehrlich summarises Reverend J. M. Capes’ — one of the witnesses in the Report — opinion that ‘[i]t was now common to hear cultivated men complain that they had not been taught music […] Musical children were often encouraged by working-class parents, simply because they could set up as “professors” cheaply and quickly’. Although ‘popular’ music was regarded as socially inferior by the upper class, the apparent lack of a performance culture in society’s higher echelons at a time when views of the profession were beginning to change may have well resulted in an element of class-based envy. Although Bashford has presented evidence showing a tradition of domestic, amateur music-making among upper-class men during the 1800s, this was not openly talked about; as such, it was working-class music traditions that were well-known and growing through the actions of those such as Hullah and Curwen, rather than the middle and upper classes. The strength of this working-class culture was a threat to establishing an influential upper- and upper-middle-class culture.
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The aristocracy and upper-middle classes jointly enforced the aspects of the NTSM that were equated with domestic colonialism as they offered mutually beneficial results. On the one hand, as discussed, the aristocracy were seeking new ways to ensure they remained in power, which meant establishing their cultural values as the dominant form. The bourgeoisie were intent on ensuring they had the most efficient working class (in the Marxist sense) possible to increase industrial productivity, meaning they had a vested interest in encouraging activities that they deemed respectable and self-improving, such as music. The types of music deemed respectable were aligned with aristocratic musical tastes: the upper-middle class had to pander to these attitudes to gain cultural influence in the first place. For the aristocracy, the next step in this venture was to institutionalise their musical values, in the same way they had institutionalised their political interests in government and other cultural values in religion and education. The bourgeoisie were willing to finance such a venture as it was mutually beneficial to ‘reform’ working-class leisure activities.

Education: Institutionalised Rebranding

Through the findings of the Report, along with Ehrlich’s analysis, I suggest that the NTSM was a way of rectifying this perceived class-based musical imbalance. By establishing ‘respectable’ music as different to the musical activities that the lower-middle and working classes participated in, the upper classes could position themselves to have musical cultural power. The upper and upper-middle classes attempted to displace working-class musical culture by professionalising — and furnishing with professionals — the aristocracy’s current amateur tradition: chamber and drawing-room music. Formalising the music profession could act as another way of curtailing working-class advances into it — potential professionals would be required to either pay for their education (which privileged the aristocracy) or compete for a scholarship to a school that would teach musical literacy in certain forms, which both reduced the number of potential working-class students, and ensured that those trained there conformed to a certain culture. To be culturally dominant, the aristocracy needed a culture to export. One of the NTSM’s aims, therefore, had to be the establishment of upper-class music as a serious and (more importantly) professional form. This has strongly imperial parallels: to export a certain culture to others, the culture
must be considered valuable. But even more than this, this process can be understood as part of the domestic colonial mission of eroding working- and lower-middle-class musical cultures to make way for upper-class ones, as upper- and upper-middle-class music was deemed more morally valuable than lower-middle- and working-class music.

The aristocracy had already successfully implemented educational institutions as sites to redress the nation’s power balance. Public schools were essentially used to train the aristocracy to occupy positions of power in government and otherwise; in this way, certain schools had become part of the landscape for building upper-class power and were effective in maintaining this. Therefore, especially when it was understood that music was a powerful cultural tool, creating a new musical education institution might well have been seen as one of the most effective ways to redress the power imbalance found in musical cultures at the time. By establishing a school of music in the heart of London, a new project could be launched (with the intention of it becoming a national venture) that would both endorse the private music-room performance culture of upper-class men and forcefully encourage the working-class students of the country to conform to this culture; not only this, but the development of such a culture would also be a step towards increasing Britain’s international standing, aiding its imperial mission abroad.

London was the obvious place for such a project, as was South Kensington. Given its indisputable associations with the highest level of society (the monarchy) South Kensington was symbolically perfect; despite the irony of this location for developing British culture also commemorating German-born Prince Albert. Albertopolis represented the height of aristocratic will and culture, and the bourgeoisie’s ‘self-made man’ trope, and it was built from the legacy of the Empire (1851 Exhibition). Even the NTSM’s place within the site can be viewed as furthering these links: it was situated right next to the Royal Albert Hall (the name being as important as the purpose of the building) and so it facilitated the will of the social elite by invoking the memory of a man much-loved by the country and its dominions.305

One of the reasons why educational institutions were so effective at spreading cultural values and influence was because of what Bull terms ‘institutional ecology’: where the cultural values created by an institution become so well engrained that they are regarded as completely ‘natural and eternal, as does any successful invention of tradition’. Although institutional ecology is a convincing theory, such academic work had not been conducted at the time. However, the founders were aware of the potential impact of an educational institution as certain influential members of the NTSM’s administration commented on the achievement of educational institutions in South Kensington. Cole, as has already been discussed, was particularly concerned with the national impact of the School. His testimony in the 1865 Report reveals the depth of his concern about implementing a musical culture that would permeate on a national basis. In his statement, he drew inspiration from the Art Training School due to its focus on training teachers rather than those who would go on to solely create art (professionals). He called for a similar model to be employed by any new school of music, stating that any such institution should bear in mind the ability for teachers to spread the training that they received during their own education around the country, even if their names are unrecognised to the public. Although teachers would exist regardless of the provision of a specific school, Cole argued that establishing an institution to train teachers would enable some control regarding what these teachers-in-training would go on to impart: the values of drawing-room culture. While he would not suggest this be the school’s sole preserve, he recognised that a dual focus (training both professionals and teachers) would have the greatest national impact. Those involved in overhauling musical culture in Britain were therefore aware that an educational institution could be a viable way of spreading cultural influence; Chapter 2 has shown the important role of education in disseminating British influence abroad, and so a similar process was used at home to spread upper-class influence. This, combined with the context of the widely criticised Royal Academy of Music and the Prince of Wales’s decree that a national school of music was required and scholarships being essential, meant that it was possible to construct the NTSM to fulfil two purposes: the one that was admitted to paperwork (creating a self-
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sufficient national musical culture), and an underlying, potentially even subconscious, motive that functioned as another factor for the upper and upper-middle classes who were organising it (to strengthen their cultural dominancy).

The aristocracy and upper-middle class were in charge of creating and administering the School. Those involved in its conception were only of these two classes, often with the bourgeoisie carrying out the will of the aristocracy (especially the monarchy). As Hermione Hobhouse writes, founded in 1754, the Society of Arts — which oversaw the Great Exhibition and almost all of the developments on its land, as discussed in Chapter 1 — was initially founded by a group of “Noblemen, Gentlemen, Clergymen and Merchants”. 309 These types form a mix of aristocracy and upper-middle class, and these groups continued to lead the Society, and thus were involved with the NTSM’s creation. The Prince Consort, for all intents and purposes a member of the aristocracy, was greatly involved in the Society and its subsequent Exhibition. 310 The Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851 was similarly socially placed and went on to have a formative role in the NTSM. Hobhouse lists the full members of the Commission in an appendix to her book. 311 It is impractical to list their names here; however, there was an emphasis on having a representative collection of influential names, including Members of Parliament (e.g. Lord John Russell, and Sir Robert Peel), representatives of the City (Lord Overstone, then Jones Lloyd), the arts (Charles Barry, to be discussed later), and even the Chairman of the East India Company (Sir Archibald Galloway). 312 The East India Company had a massive impact on the development of the British Empire in India, even taking on the role of governing the colony until the British government took over in the 1850s; while it operated under the guise of a trading company, it assumed military control by establishing the Presidency Armies, consisting of 33,970 people in 1844. 313 The City represented the capitalist bourgeoisie, the upper-middle class, who were behind the rapid changes to the British economy in this period. The MPs were primarily the aristocracy, a product of the institutional changes that were made following
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their depletion resulting from the Napoleonic Wars. The positions these men held in society were prominent and are indicative of an alliance of forces for mutually beneficial gain.

The NTSM’s Committee of Management was formed of a similarly classed list of patronage and management, of which collaboration between the aristocracy and the upper-middle class bourgeoisie-capitalists is apparent. By the end of the first term (Christmas 1876), it described itself as containing the following:

The Committee of General Management, under the presidency of His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh, consists of two Members appointed by the Council of the Royal Albert Hall; The Lord Mayor of London (for the time being); three Members appointed by the Society of Arts; two Members appointed by Her Majesty’s Commissioners for the Exhibition of 1851; Mr. C. J. Freake, the munificent donor of the School Buildings; and Representatives of Scholarships at the rate of one for every ten Scholarships founded by any Corporation, School, or Local Committee.  

The names are reproduced in Appendix 1. The list indicates that the NTSM was intended to be fully entrenched in the South Kensington landscape — it had several members of Royalty to give it patronage, in addition to prominent names that had been found elsewhere in South Kensington’s history, including Barry, architect, and Cole. Charles Freake is perhaps the best example of the bourgeoisie — although his father was reportedly a merchant, Freake trained to become a prominent architect, beginning as a carpentry apprentice; the fact that he built and designed the NTSM’s premises free of charge exemplifies the bourgeoisie-capitalist role of providing money. Cole, also a member of the bourgeoisie, can be seen as carrying out the will of the Prince of Wales who initially appointed him to lead the 1865 Report. Meanwhile, members of the aristocracy (which, for this purpose, includes the monarchy) provided their public support and patronage for the venture. While funding was also part of their remit, it was, at least initially, in less significant amounts: such as individual scholarships, rather than the cost of a new building. Therefore, those who were involved in the NTSM were all from the elite classes or bourgeoisie, and so had a stake in reformulating the musical landscape of Britain.

Yet while the management and financing of the NTSM was the preserve of the upper and upper-middle classes, encouraging students from all classes to attend was a priority. It was felt that only by affording the opportunity to an array of students would the influence of the School be felt most closely across the country. Cole envisioned teaching skills would be central to the curriculum, so that the values of what was ‘good’ music would be permeate the working classes across the country via teaching, as pupils returned to their homes.\textsuperscript{315}

When the School first asked for supplementary money from the Royal Commission of 1851 in May 1877, they listed four objectives, of which one was:

To be the centre whence may be drawn a large proportion of the Teachers and the Artists to whom the nation must look for the instruction of its young and for the general elevation of its musical taste.\textsuperscript{316}

Such a statement goes to indicate that Cole’s testimony nearly a decade earlier was part of a widely held interest in permeating wider society’s musical tastes through teaching. Not only did they want to teach upcoming musicians, but the School also wanted to play a role in shaping the general musical taste of the entire country. By pointing towards this being ‘elevated’, those administering the NTSM reveal that they regarded the musical taste of the country at the time as of lower value; that they were willing to commit this belief to writing to gain financial support for their venture implies that this viewpoint was common among their ilk. Although it would likely have been necessary for the administrators of the NTSM to exaggerate the scope of their aims to successfully persuade the 1851 Commissioners of their requirement for additional funding, such a statement points towards the institution’s aim to colonise the musical tastes and practices of the nation.

Implementing scholarship competitions as the only way to become a student in 1876 indicates that making the School financially accessible to anyone who held the potential to benefit the country (either as ‘Teachers or as Artists’) was at its core, at least at the School’s commencement. Three years prior to the School’s opening, the first ‘Report of the Committee’ (29 May 1873) noted that:

\textsuperscript{315} Society of Arts, \textit{First report}, p. 25.
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The fundamental principle and primary object of the school is the cultivation of the highest musical aptitude in the country in whatever station of society it may be found. In order to carry out this principle to the fullest extent, entrance to the school will be obtained by competitive selection alone.\(^{317}\)

And:

As the gift of musical ability is found in all grades of society, frequently among the classes of very limited means, it is evident that in a large number of cases the student must not only receive gratuitous instruction but also be supported.\(^{318}\)

The same sentiment was also reflected in the aforementioned Memorandum to the 1851 Commissioners in 1877, where they wrote that:

The fundamental object of the School is the cultivation of the highest musical talent in the country, in whatever station of society it may be found; such talent being sought for by public competitions throughout the United Kingdom.\(^{319}\)

Such statements emphasise that the official School policy was to create opportunities for the working classes that were otherwise impossible to obtain; while they were not the only target of the School, the Committee of Management were seemingly aware that the lower social classes would require additional support for them to attend, as they lacked the financial privilege of their wealthier contemporaries. This suggests that the Committees in charge of the NTSM were also conscious about the social impact that they were having and were keen to ensure that there was an egalitarian aspect to it.

Yet this egalitarianism was prohibited by their suggestion that musical talent was objectively measurable and only constituted by one culture, dismissing other musical cultures — their efforts were, therefore, only in their interests. Acknowledging that talent existed already among the working classes, but that they were still encouraged to attend the School, implies that the NTSM’s aims were not just about advancing the musical talent of pupils in attendance, but to shape the education of those in possession of such to conform to a certain kind of musical idiom — it was hoped that when their abilities were eventually able

---

\(^{317}\) Ibid., p. 18a.

\(^{318}\) Ibid., p. 18a.

\(^{319}\) Ibid., p. 159.
to benefit the country at large, they would further this upper-/upper-middle-class musical culture rather than their own. A strong case can be made to suggest that the School’s aim, therefore, was not to improve Britain’s musical culture, but to a) help revitalise the aristocracy (and those among upper-middle class with close connections to them) and b) ‘elevate’ the cultural practices of the working classes to conform to upper- and upper-middle-class cultures. The NTSM was not the only institution created with these aims in mind, and future research might continue to consider the relationship between class power and other activities associated with the working classes and rational recreation, such as football, temperance, and brass bands.320

Significantly, although the Prince of Wales was the one to start the process which led to the NTSM, he was not on the Committee of Management, but was on the Committee for Obtaining Free Scholarships. It is not possible to glean the exact reasons for this decision, but as patron, it is likely that while his name would add veracity to the cause of increasing educational access to the underprivileged, he could not not been seen to be working. While the School’s aims were never explicitly associated with rational recreation, the language used in its official documents points towards similar aims: the NTSM was positioned as an important institution for improving the nation’s international standing and its musical outlook, including increasing the available opportunities to the working classes. At the time, Sullivan was an odd fit for the School given these aims. He clearly disagreed with the importance of producing teachers — even before taking up the post he requested that the ‘training’ part of the School be removed from its title, for he had ‘no inclination to become the head of a School for Teachers’.321 However, over time, he became more concerned with the righteousness of music professionalisation, for twenty years later, at an ABRSM Annual Dinner of 1897, Sullivan announced: “Seriously, Gentlemen, we look upon this undertaking in the light of a distinctly moral obligation rather than that of a pleasure”322. This was a similar philosophy to that which underpinned the NTSM, at least at its outset. Its likeness to
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imperial missionaries is highlighted by the mention of ‘moral obligation’, suggesting that the existing musical processes required reformulation for the sake of the working classes.

As has been argued by Carey Watt, the British ‘civilizing mission was about morally and materially “uplifting”, “improving”’ its colonised subjects, working from the principal that their society was otherwise ‘rude’ and ‘backward’ (to quote James Mill’s description of Indian society in 1817).\(^{323}\) Such missions were often undertaken by the British male bourgeoisie, who used pedagogical methods to conduct this societal reformation.\(^{324}\) But to justify this work, the British bourgeoisie had to depict their own societal structure as superior and the opposing society as requiring civil and moral ‘improvement’ — this was the purpose of Mill’s History of British India, which was successful despite his never having visited — something that another author in Watt’s volume (Adam Knowles) discusses.\(^{325}\) However, at the core of these civilising missions in India, there were paradoxes in method and ideology. In Watt’s summaries of the chapters in the book, she writes that attempts to ‘improve’ Indian art show one of the crucial limitations of the civilising mission: they could never be successful in fully ‘civilising’ their subjects, or they would fail, ideologically. Watt writes:

[T]he civilizing project could not succeed because ‘difference’ between the rulers and the ruled had to be maintained, and success of the civilizing mission would mean the end of colonial rule. Without such notions of difference colonialism could not be justified.\(^{326}\)

In other words, there was always a limitation to the extent to which the bourgeoisie civilisers wanted to implement this ‘improvement’. While they were engaged with the moralising influence of their work and believed that Indian culture should be ‘civilised’, they had to limit the extent to which their missions permeated Indian society to ensure that
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British superiority remained. Equally, civilising attempts were also part of negotiating Britain’s culture: as this thesis has justified in Chapter 2, educational methods were used both domestically and abroad as ways to disseminate this ‘British’ (upper- and upper-middle-class) culture. In Jana Tschurenev’s chapter of Watt’s book, it is argued that ‘British educational initiatives in India were part of a wider ‘universal’ effort to ‘improve’ the minds of ‘the rising generation’ throughout the world — including in Britain itself’. However, there was a problem: ‘[i]f the same pedagogical materials and approaches were used to teach young Indians and Britons, what would that say about British claims of civilizational superiority?’ This returns to one of the crucial themes in the cultural expansion of the British Empire, as posited in Chapter 1: British civilising missions were not only attempts to reform Indian culture, but were also used to strengthen the sense of British socio-cultural superiority. As Watt discusses, the concerns that these would be unsuccessful, or that the depicted gulf in moral existences between the British and their colonial subjects was not as large as was required to justify their work, potentially explains ‘recurrent British anxiety and insecurity about their cultural eminence as well as self-conscious efforts to display confidence’. Essentially, to justify their position abroad, the British both needed to create a ‘morally superior’ culture that they could attempt to spread, but also ensure that they maintained (or even created) a gap between the moral status of their own nation, and that of others.

Once again, therefore, the NTSM’s philosophy on improving Britain’s music has parallels with acts of cultural erosion in the imperial mission abroad. On the one hand, the NTSM served to create a British upper- and upper-middle-class culture, strengthening their domestic cultural leverage and power. On the other hand, the School had a moral obligation to improve the culture of the working and lower-middle classes; however, the numbers of those that were taught had to be limited so that, overall, there was still a class-based difference between the two groups. One of the few claims of the 1865 Report was that any school of music should provide scholarships awarded via competitions to allow students

---

328 Ibid., pp. 15–16.
from all classes to attend without a financial barrier; indeed, as its history showed in Chapter 1, the insistence on this came at the expense of its financial stability. The question I now turn to is: how successful were attempts to recruit working-class students?

Archival Evidence of Domestic Colonialism

The conclusions of the 1865 Report and the justification of the School in the official documentation leading up to its establishment, especially found in the earliest meetings documented in the Minute Books of the NTSM, indicate that there was the overarching belief that the next Great Composer could come from any social class, meaning that it was imperative to the School that all social classes were enabled to attend. The NTSM was justified and advertised as a more socially inclusive institution than the RAM, as its model of scholarship provision could give opportunities for students to attend who would otherwise be unable to access the high-class (both in terms of quality and the social class being emulated) education that the NTSM aimed to offer. Two interrelated categories were intended to achieve this — those who were geographically distant from London, and those who lacked the financial resources to attend. Cole made several references in 1865’s Report to ‘the very poorest’ members of society, and the importance of giving opportunities to those who ‘cannot pay for [their] proper teaching’. I suggested in Chapter 1 that critically evaluating the implications of statements made by Cole and others shows that it was also — if not more — important that the working classes attend the School to reinforce the concept of the ‘right’ music, that is, the music that was central to upper-class culture.

One aim of the NTSM was to remove the financial barriers which enforced the elitism associated with conservatoire education and, therefore, enable all classes (but particularly those from the lower classes) to attend the School. However, as the archival data shows, this was not an altogether successful venture. Using the data I have collected from the Scholars’ Register, the following section will discuss the class makeup of students at the NTSM. Each successful scholar (synonymous with pupil) was asked to provide information

about themselves during their scholarship competition, which was later sent to the NTSM upon their point of entry. One of the questions asked for the students’ fathers’ occupations, which I have compiled and attempted to classify according to the Registrar General Social Class Scale (RG, 1911). This register was originally devised to increase life expectancy and decrease health inequality across social classes. Although this scale was not employed until 1911, significantly after the NTSM’s closure, it was formulated towards the end of the nineteenth century and informed by views about class held at this point: its veracity from this perspective is proven by previous academic work having applied the RG scale to occupations as early as 1841. Such a system provides a structured, empirical method for discussing social class during the Victorian era, a topic which has previously been described by Catherine Hall and Leonore Davidoff as a challenging task.

The RG scale does have flaws. Its focus on occupation rather than income means that it cannot comment on familial wealth, so it does not account for the aristocracy. Forcing occupations into a six-part system does not allow for nuance and some jobs will inevitably be miscategorised. It fundamentally relies on subjective assessments (both the comparison of occupation importance, and my own) to classify the data. However, the merits of being able to discuss the class backgrounds of the students in more empirical terms outweighs the disadvantages of such a system and so make it a useful venture in this discussion. Furthermore, while the Scholars’ Register does give the name of each father, these names are, for the most part, untraceable; it is therefore necessary to solely rely on occupation as a measure of class rather than tracking individual circumstances.
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The RG scale has five major occupational groups, with Class III (skilled) being broken down further into manual and non-manual. The following rubric was used to classify each job type:

Class I is professional occupations, typically requiring university-level education, such as physicians, lawyers, ministers of religion, etc.; Class II is described as intermediate professional and managerial occupations, such as bank managers and school teachers; Class III, skilled workers, is divided into skilled clerical and skilled manual workers; Class IV is semiskilled workers, such as bank clerks, farm laborers, and factory assembly line workers; and Class V is unskilled workers (e.g., shop assistants and food servers in fast food establishments).\(^{334}\)

In addition to the above six states, I have added three more: ‘clergy’ because not all those working in religious settings were ministers and therefore do not fit in Class I; ‘aristocracy/gentlemen’ as these were not occupations in the way described by the RG system but were prominent in the NTSM’s data; and ‘unsure’ for where I was unable to come to a suitable conclusion. There are six instances of this and, accordingly, ‘unsure’ data has not formed part of the analysis. Due to the complexity of classifying several jobs, Appendix 2 contains a full breakdown of the fathers’ occupations, their RG class, and commentary for the decisions I made when matching occupation to the RG classification. There were some cases where a student’s father was deceased before they began their education at the School; in such instances, I have included their father’s profession prior to death if it is listed but have left instances of no data out of the analysis.

The results from this analysis indicate that there was a genuine mix in the social classes that attended the School. Figure 1 shows the overall count of each type of class, organised by year of entry.

1876 was the first year of entry for the School, which explains why all totals aside from aristocracy/gentlemen were higher in this year than any other. Each year, there were similar numbers of the top four main classes: I–IV. Notably, I did not find any jobs that could be described as Class V in the dataset. The other categories varied. While in the first year there were no children whose fathers were recorded as part of the aristocracy/a gentleman, this increased over time, with a rapid rise in the final two years of entry: in 1881, the final full year of intake, they formed the highest number of students from any of the class backgrounds. Numbers of students whose fathers were involved in the clergy was relatively consistent, with a few attending in each year.
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Overall, the main social classes were numerically similar. This indicates that the School was successful in encouraging diversity among its student body. However, the lack of Class V does show that this was only successful over a certain point: the lowest class in society was lacking any representation from the School. It is important to note that the numbers of students from elite backgrounds increased from 1880, as this is the first year when fee-paying students were admitted. This can be used as evidence to support the intentions behind the original research and aims of the institution which insisted upon scholarships to ensure that students from less advantaged backgrounds could also attend. While there was a genuine mix of students for the most part, Class III were the most common, followed closely by I then IV. This supports previous research suggesting that the upper- and lower-middle classes used music as a tool for social mobility: they were therefore the classes that were most interested in benefitting from music education that might otherwise be more difficult to access. Although the NTSM’s implicit intentions were to colonise the cultures of the lower classes, they did not ensure proportional representation to support this aim. As time progressed, there was an increased sense of alliance with those more elite occupations (or those with wealth), likely because it started relying on students for financial stability — ironically, much like the ‘hand-to-mouth’ existence of the RAM.

Having said this, anecdotal evidence suggests that the pressure of having so many non-wealthy students was felt by the professorial staff. Sullivan infamously complained ‘my hand was always in my pocket to help some poor student get daily food. Oh, the curse of this free education bringing up a class of educated, helpless paupers!’. Although this cannot be taken as empirical evidence for the success of the NTSM’s focus on students from less wealthy backgrounds, it does suggest a certain level of genuine, paternalistic care towards the School’s charges from its elite executors, akin to the perceived relationship between materialistic Britain (‘the “mother country”’)) and ‘her’ colonies. Sullivan’s choice of words here, too — marking the students out as a ‘class [of] paupers’ — betrays an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ dichotomy in his mentality, suggestive of the class-based discrepancy between some
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of the pupils and the upper-middle class staff. Those in charge of the NTSM can be argued to have been partially successful in encouraging those from the lower-middle and working classes to attend, and therefore gaining cultural power by setting up the networks that would facilitate the imposition of their influence. However, as time wore on, this aim became less important, and fewer people were convinced by it. Correspondence between the 5th Earl (John) Spencer, a Royal 1851 Commissioner and Committee of Management member William Anderson show that there was a division of thought on the matter. 340 While Anderson was attempting to convince Spencer of the NTSM’s unique place in aiding the national music project, and its requirement of funding from the 1851 Commission to continue this (even amalgamating with the RAM if necessary), Spencer was sceptical and did not observe any proof of this. The latter wrote back:

> You will pardon me if I am not convinced by your arguments as to the possibility of uniting the Academy and the School of Music [...] the number of applicants which the School has on its books does not prove that to the extent that Pupils are worthy of Free Education, it only proves that a large number of persons aspire to musical distinction. 341

This scepticism seems to be centred on class-based elitism, implying that there is no proof suggesting that the poorer classes (suggested by Spencer’s reference to ‘Free Education’) are worth funding in musical education; in any case, the NTSM was unequivocally refused 1851 Commission aid. But it also shows that despite attempts made by a certain group to prove the benefits of providing the lower-middle and working classes with an ‘elevated’ (to quote its stated aims) musical culture within the country, the NTSM was unsuccessful in convincing those outside of this circle to the same aim. The Royal College of Music was founded upon far different principles, directly because of the perceived failure of the NTSM. In a draft charter of the ‘New Musical Corporation’ (as it was initially known), its aims were stated as follows:

> The purpose for which the Corporation is founded is the advancement of the art of Music, by the creation of a central representative body charged with the duty of providing musical instruction of the highest class, and having a capacity to exercise a powerful influence on the cultivation,

practice, and regulation of the art and science of Music, and to promote musical instruction in

*elementary schools* [sic].

There is no emphasis on targeting any specific classes in this effort. However, this original draft featured a reference to ‘elementary schools’. This was crossed through during the meeting discussing it but shows that the national aim of focusing on school musical education remained an aim of the RCM, even if the class-based focus seemed to have been negated.

Geographic Recruitment

Geographic inequality was another target for the NTSM and linked to the pursuit of class diversity. Their emphasis on encouraging all classes to attend meant that they had to look beyond London to fulfil the NTSM’s remit, otherwise the very poorest members of society outside of London would have been unlikely to afford the cost of travel fares and thus would have been effectively excluded from applying in the first place. Instead, by encouraging local scholarship competitions across the country, two things could happen: they could increase the number of potential students applying, and start to embed the NTSM’s influence nationally by establishing local networks of support. Table 1 uses data gleaned from the Scholars’ Register’s, which includes the location of Scholarship Competition and the frequency of each; Table 2 condenses this by county.

Data is only shown for students that were admitted by scholarship competition — those admitted by examination are not included because they mark a change in the NTSM’s remit and so are less relevant for this immediate discussion. There were some instances where the place of scholarship competition was not listed. In some of these cases, however, the date of competition and name of scholarship awarded aligned with those students whose record did state the competition’s location; I have used this data to fill in some blanks, where I was
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confident with the results. For example, where four competitions occurred on the same day for the Birmingham scholarship, but only one had a listed location (Birmingham).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of scholarship competition</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London:</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansion House</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Training School for Music</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishmongers’ Hall</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildhall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartshill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Number of scholarship competitions by location*\(^{344}\)

\(^{344}\) Ibid.
Table 2: Number of scholarship competitions by county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Warwickshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that while London hosted the greatest number of scholarship competitions, there were other centres: notably in the industrial cities of Birmingham, Liverpool, and Nottingham. As Cannadine has noted, industrial cities such as these expanded rapidly at the beginning of the nineteenth century mostly with workers, as was suggested by the majority of residents being under 24 years of age. However, these industrial cities were also where many richer families were based, establishing and capitalising on gains from the industrial revolution. As such, several students attended scholarship competitions located in the comparatively poorer Midlands and North but were actually from more professional (in terms of the class system), and therefore wealthier, backgrounds. By contrast, far fewer scholarship competitions took place in the Southwest of England; it is unclear why this was the case. This brings into question the mechanisms underlying the NTSM’s organisation of its scholarship competitions: what were the assumptions regarding wealth distribution in the country, and how did these assumptions shape the decisions being made?

On the one hand, the lack of scholarship opportunities in the South, aside from London and Kent, could imply that there was an assumption that the South contained wealthier families than the North. However, the way that the competitions were organised belies this
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346 Cannadine, *Class in Britain*, p. 23.
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assumption. The scholarships were funded by local donors across the country (and the Empire). Founders of scholarships were expected to be responsible for organising the competitions: they were given a document with some guidance on how this would be set up, as observed in the 1878 Constitution proposed by the Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851. The NTSM exported the organisation of scholarship competitions to the scholarship provider, meaning that they were reliant on donors to provide local premises that would benefit the local children. Theoretically, if no donor in a certain geographic region was available, then that region of the country did not have a scholarship competition in place. The location of the competitions was not the decision of the NTSM; outsourcing their organisation meant that its hands were clean of any assumptions regarding geographical inequality or how to rectify as such.

Yet despite the claim that local donors held the responsibility for organising scholarship competitions, this was not the case in every scenario. Additional data from the first report of the NTSM, published at the close of Michaelmas 1876, shows the location of donors for scholarships — not just where the competitions were held, but where their funding came from. The data is reproduced in Tables 3 and 4.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>England: counties</strong></th>
<th><strong>Towns</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge with Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire with Chester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire with Derby</td>
<td>Bodmin and vicinity; Bristol [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Bournemouth and vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester with Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Canterbury (Dio. of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire with Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>Kensington Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford with City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>Shrewsbury; Ellesmere and vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Dorking &amp; vicinity; Guildford &amp; vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>York; Diocese of Leeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Summary of locations in England which established scholarships*[^349]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Colonies: counties</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglesea [sic]</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyleshire</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayrshire</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnarvonshire [sic. Caernarfonshire in Welsh]</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifeshire [now Fife]</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorganshire</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddingtonshire</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kildare</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaghan</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wales</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perthshire</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross-shire [sic.]</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipperary</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Summary of locations outside of England which established scholarships* [350]

There is a far greater variety of geographic locations for the donors than was reflected in the places of competitions, despite claims that local donors organise their own competitions. There were certain regions that provided a scholarship but did not host a competition for it; while I have found no explanation for this, the most likely reason is that some of the competitions were run centrally — there are far more pupils listed as competing in London than there were donors, and the funding had to have been competed for somewhere. I have not found references to several of the scholarship founders and therefore cannot be completely sure about their geographic locations; however, by comparing the lists of locations of scholarship founders and the locations of competitions in the Scholars’ Register,
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there is enough evidence to indicate a discrepancy between intention and reality. This may have restricted truly working-class students from attending the NTSM than if it had organised scholarship competitions and locations to be spread across Britain, including places such as the Southwest.

The location of birth became less relevant in the latter years of its operation; as previously discussed, more paying pupils were acquired due to the School requiring more funds, and so Scholarship competitions took place centrally, often when an opportunity opened. Otherwise, students were admitted as fee-paying students and therefore came from wealthy families or those with affluent jobs, mostly centred in London. To emphasise the prevalence of London-born students who attended the NTSM compared to other attendees, I plotted their locations of birth (also listed on the Scholars’ Register) on an interactive map — I have included screenshots of British students [Figure 2] and worldwide [Figure 3], but the original map (which allows for interactivity) is included as a link in the footnotes.351

351 RCM00835 National Training School for Music – Scholars’ Register 1876–1882. Interactive version of the map available at: https://datawrapper.dwcdn.net/jLmmh/1/
Figure 2: Geographic distribution of NTSM students (UK)

Figure 3: Geographic distribution of NTSM students (global)

352 RCM00835 National Training School for Music – Scholars' Register 1876–1882.
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Clear conclusions can be drawn from this exercise. Despite claims that the NTSM was part of a ‘national’ project of musical improvement, there is a bias towards English students. There were a few from Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, but most of the students were from England. Once again, because I have not found records of students who applied to scholarships but were unsuccessful, it is impossible to ascertain whether the NTSM had any choice in this matter. However, it does highlight a failure in the NTSM’s attempts to be national, especially given it did not last long enough to establish regional schools around the country. Despite this, there were an unexpected number of international pupils. Students came from India, New Zealand, parts of Africa, various places in Western Europe, and two from the United States. Most of the students came from British colonies which is perhaps less surprising, but it is curious that the reach of the NTSM extended to Europe when it was modelling itself on the musical institutions already in existence there. Even more interestingly, the majority of international students (nine of the thirteen) only started at the School once private pupils were allowed, with eight of these commencing their studies in the final year of the School admitting pupils. This suggests that although the School was less successful nationally that it had hoped — potentially due to a lack of scholarship opportunities, as William Anderson suggested — had it allowed paying pupils from its opening then it might have been far more successful.\footnote{RCM00834 Minute Books 1873–1882, p. 174, points 12 and 13.} It is highly likely that this was one of the reasons why the RCM was ready to take on fee-paying students from its onset.

Another intention of the NTSM was to establish ‘provincial branch schools’ across the country. Assumedly, these were intended to function similarly to the satellite schools of the Paris Conservatoire, which were situated around France to train students to a certain level before they were transferred to the central institution in Paris. This would have extended the reach of the NTSM nationally and drawn more attention to its influence. A branch school would impact upon any locality where it was placed and strengthen its influence by training these musicians to an even higher level of musical standard, in the ‘proper’ ways of the musical culture. Once again, this draws parallels to the tactics of British public schools which expanded to the colonies: not only would British influence be exerted in the location.
where the schools were, but many of the students would become so engrained in British culture that they would then attend Oxbridge, the then-pinnacle of the upper-class path to power. This was discussed in Chapter 2, and such cultural entrenchment would then make these students valuable government assets in engraining the Empire’s cultural power even further. While the NTSM did not ever establish a provincial branch school — neither its status nor its finances could support such a venture — the intention of using this technique once more is an element of domestic colonisation.

This section has shown that the upper and upper-middle classes — who formed the various bodies charged with running the School — attempted to ‘elevate’ the musical standards of the country at large (particularly the working classes) by creating a national school of music that through teaching and performance of upper-class musical taste, would spread its influence nationally. To attract students, it used both class-based and geographical techniques to infiltrate the classes it wanted to target, which were the lower-middle and working classes, represented by Class III and lower on the RG scale. The argument of this thesis is that the intention of the NTSM was to influence the working classes by using techniques otherwise associated with the British Empire; however, because of the venture being so short-lived and poorly managed (as Chapter 1 discussed), most of these were never fully implemented. The following discussion will briefly consider what was taught at the School; there is no record of the curriculum in any detail in the archives, and so much of this section will be speculative, based on the evidence available.

What is Known about these ‘Cultural Values’?

Cole’s focus in the 1865 Report on the way that the School’s culture could spread nationally suggests that he felt that existing forms of music across the country — especially in less well-resourced places where musical names would not necessarily be recognised — were either not sufficient or not the right ones. No curriculum is proposed in the Report, and so it is impossible to comment on the views felt towards types of music. However, there is a sense that Cole regarded formal, institutionalised musical education as superior to that available from domestic instrumental teaching, brass banding, or even the mass choral
education undertaken by those such as Hullah and Curwen. Given that the latter two modes of musical pedagogy were those most associated with the working classes, it is not unreasonable to suggest that, despite Cole’s philanthropic efforts towards the NTSM, these were built on a belief that the type of education he was sketching was inherently better than those already available to the working classes precisely because it was created by their ‘betters’ — it was a top-down model of musical taste.  

The NTSM seems to have focused on drawing-room music, as stated by Wright: ‘[e]ssentially, the NTSM’s operation reflected the current state of affairs, with the emphasis on producing teachers for the drawing-room culture of piano and singing, and amateur rather than professional performers’. Wright’s analysis highlights one contradiction of the NTSM — although its official documents (as previously stated and found in the Minutes Books) suggest that it was intending to produce professional ‘Teachers and [...] Artists’, the actual structure of its curriculum belies this intention, and suggests that it was (almost deliberately) out of step with the emphasis on producing professional orchestral musicians, instead being more interested in upholding drawing-room cultures.

The Board of Professors was assembled before the students underwent a scholarship competition. The first mention of the instruments to be catered for was in an appendix to a meeting conducted on 9 January 1875 (found in the Minutes Book), where the document lists four Principal Professors that had already been employed: Arthur Sullivan for composition; Ernest Pauer for pianoforte; ‘Signor Visetti’ (Alberto Visetti) for singing; ‘Mr Carrodus’ (John Tiplady Carrodus) for violin. Later that year, in June, attention was drawn to the following instruments:

‘1. Pianoforte
2. Organ
3. Violin & other stringed [—]
4. Flute _ Oboe _ Trombone & other wind instruments [sic]
5. Singing
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357 RCM00834 Minute Books 1873–1882, p. 92. Bracketed full names were identified by Brightwell: ‘Appendix 2.0 NTSM Principal Professors, Professors and Examiners’, Appendix 2, p. 16.
6. Harmony
7. Composition

While there does not appear to be any official paperwork prohibiting the types of instruments that were chosen for the institution, the picking of principal professors in these instruments suggests that the School was preparing to cater for a certain kind of music. Admitted students display a clear leaning towards drawing-room instruments, or those associated with religious professions (the organ). The Scholars’ Register lists each student’s primary instrument and, where appropriate, their secondary instrument. Table 5 shows the instrumental breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Piano</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Violin</th>
<th>Organ</th>
<th>Cello</th>
<th>Flute</th>
<th>Oboe</th>
<th>None listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary study</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary study</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Number of students studying each instrument

The types of instruments listed strongly point towards a culture of amateur chamber-music, often associated with a domestic space. Bashford’s work on domestic musical cultures during the Victorian period is valuable to this discussion. She notes that it became more acceptable for women to play string instruments around 1870. At the NTSM, 66.7% of those who listed the violin as their primary study were women, and all of those who listed it as their secondary study. Although these figures are roughly proportional to the gender breakdown of the School, where 72.8% of the students were female, the lack of any students playing the viola, and the fact that all the cello players were men, suggests that the School was not part of this early movement of breaking gendered instrumental norms. Similarly, the voice had an overly female bias according with expectations for the instrument, with 85.3% of the 88 students studying voice as their primary instrument being
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women. Despite the small sample size, it is plausible to suggest that the reverse of this pattern being found in the organ, where 75% of the students listing it as their primary study were male, is because of the organ’s close association with the clergy (something that was solely the preserve of men during this period).  

Women comprised most of the student body, encompassing 72.8% of the 180 students listed in the Scholars’ Register. One of the reasons for this may well have been that teaching was deemed one of the only professions that was culturally acceptable for women to go into. Paula Gillett’s work on women in professional music during this period suggests that single women — whose prime musical instruments were voice, piano, or violin — were able to find employment as teachers, often governesses. Gillett points out that daily governesses, which was what these female teachers were often referred to, were considered to provide poor-quality education, but there was an awareness of their potential to spread these lessons far and wide — she writes that ‘[i]f [the daily governess’s] mastery of music were [sic] poor, then her lessons spread ignorance and she was one of thousands regularly accused of undermining or preventing England’s development as a musical nation’. As such, the NTSM’s efforts to reinvigorate Britain’s musical culture through teachers, and the student body being mainly women, makes sense — despite being scapegoats for the perception of the country’s musical status being poor, there was an overriding awareness that ‘proper’ education gave opportunity to rectify the same issue. But Gillett’s work goes further: it suggests that daily governesses were primarily middle-class women. Therefore, the NTSM being mainly formed of the middle class also accords with the state of musical pedagogies focusing on female teachers at the time.

Using data from the Scholars’ Register, Table 6 breaks down the gender ratios for each class of students. Despite Gillett’s work suggesting that middle-class women were those most interested in going into teaching — something that has been established as the NTSM’s

364 Ibid., pp. 10–11.
365 Ibid., p. 11.
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primary goal — the evidence is less clear on this. Class I has a minimally higher percentage of men than the overall School, as does IIIN and the Clergy; otherwise, however, the individual class ratios remained fairly similar to the overall School ratio. The exception to this is Class II, which has significantly more women than the overall percentage of the School. With the other classes being so close it is difficult to come to any firm conclusions, but the proportion of Class II women could give evidence to supporting Gillett’s work into the middle classes; with this evidence, however, it is hard to say for sure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>72.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Gender breakdown of students of the NTSM, organised by their class background (RG)
Therefore, a school that had branded itself from the beginning as focusing on creating teachers that would go on to influence the country’s musical development would be expected to show evidence of women attending. Drawing-room culture is also associated with concepts of domesticity. Given that Victorian ideology often dictated the place of women was in the home, it is unsurprising that domestic musical practices were closely associated with femininity, and particularly the voice and piano; it is also unsurprising that these were the most studied instruments at the School. The NTSM was established to spread a certain form of domestic culture and while this was primarily musical, previous discussions have already shown the close relationship between upper-class ideals and music: gender was not exempt from this relationship. Gender enforces previous conclusions drawn in this chapter about the School prioritising teaching, and women being the primary agents for this influence. Once again, parallels can be drawn here to the Empire, where women were often used to symbolise domestic British culture, such as depicting a maternalistic Britain and ‘her’ colonies. They were not always disregarded: as Chapter 2 discussed, it was British wives who were used to spread softer forms of British influence, such as domestic etiquette. Drawing on this rich history of women being involved with teaching in a domestic space shows another example of how the NTSM is closely aligned with the ideals of the Empire, further emphasising the case for its influence being found at home: domestic colonialism.

Another contention in Bashford’s thesis is that there was a hidden tradition of upper-class men partaking in drawing-room music; as such, I would expect the gender breakdowns to have more men from the upper social classes, and more women from the middle and lower ones. Yet there is little evidence to support this contention, as the only categories where there were proportionally more men than women in comparison to the rest of the School, were the Clergy, IIIN and I; these are dispersed across the classes and so they do not support any clear conclusions. This both supports Bashford’s observation that there was a tradition of chamber music-making among the higher levels of male society, and suggests that this was a culture that this was a culture that stayed among the amateur regions of musical culture rather than the professional ones.
Such research goes to show that the class-based ideals behind the maintenance of the British Empire were also present in the realm of musical culture. There was a clear expectation of normative gender roles, and the NTSM both upheld such notions and intend to spread them among the lower-middle and working classes. However, it is hard to go much further than this with the information currently available in the archives. For example, it is impossible to tell whether the NTSM and its donors manipulated the types of instrumentalists admitted or whether the Scholars who were admitted were roughly indicative of the rest of the students who auditioned for a place. Students competing on other instruments may well have not been awarded a place, or this could indicate the type of musicians who were interested in the NTSM and at whom it advertised itself. It is unclear how it advertised itself, and this would be intriguing material to discover.367

Conclusion

In 1876, two things happened: Queen Victoria was titled Empress of India in the Royal Titles Act, and the NTSM was opened to its students. Although this is a clearly correlative relationship rather than a causal one, it does go to suggest that the NTSM was operating in the height of Britain’s imperial rule. There are many ways in which the NTSM can be strongly linked to the Empire, yet I am going to finish with a more coincidental one, borrowed from Richards:

It was not only constitutionally that Britain’s monarch became an imperial ruler after 1876 but that the last decades of the nineteenth century saw the final flowering of an imperial ideology which was to find full expression in popular culture. This development coincided exactly with the emergence of the mass market and the English Musical Renaissance, two events which had a profound effect upon the creation, production and dissemination of British music.368

Richards’ contention that music was one of the ways in which the British Empire represented itself was focused upon the compositional practices of the period. Although
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there is some dispute around the concept and manifestation of an English Musical Renaissance, the capitalised use of this term likely refers to the school of composers centred around South Kensington and the RCM, including Hubert Parry and Charles Stanford in the first era, and those such as Ralph Vaughan Williams in the second era. However, by exploring the archives of the National Training School of Music, it is possible to strengthen his assertion — not only was the Empire expressed within the music itself, but it informed the practices of the original musical conservatory in South Kensington, from which the Royal College of Music (which has been cited as the centre of the English Musical Renaissance) would grow, having learned the lessons which led to the failure of its predecessor. To this end, I argue that domestic colonialism can also be linked to the start of what is commonly understood as the EMR. In the same way that the NTSM existed as an idea long before it existed as a physical presence, the building blocks of the Renaissance were started when the NTSM was established. Although it did not take flight, metaphorically speaking, until the 1880s with the founding of the RCM, the processes that led to this institution were directly related to the School and were therefore constitutive to the EMR’s beginning.

369 Iddles, pp. 3–20 for a literature analysis of uses of ‘English Musical Renaissance’ or ‘English musical renaissance’ and their likely meaning.
370 Hughes and Stradling, p. xiii.
Coda

By recapitulating the discussions that have occurred in this dissertation, this Coda aims to recontextualise the NTSM within its wider ideological and institutional context, leading to avenues for further work. Framing the NTSM through domestic colonialism was one of many choices that I could have made when approaching this thesis. Using an imperial backdrop through which to view the School has several advantages, especially by ensuring that the subsequent argument did not isolate music from wider socio-political events. This was particularly important given that links to the Empire formed such a significant part in the NTSM’s history, starting with its location in South Kensington — itself born from the Great Exhibition of 1851, an event devoted to displaying Britain’s imperial prowess. As the School being built in Albertopolis was so integral to its founding and identity, deploying the lens of domestic colonialism offered a way to read between the lines of the official documentation preserved in the NTSM’s archives and observe the agendas that operated within. These were not always coherent, which also betrayed the sub-surface, class-based tensions that, in turn, strengthened the argument towards domestic colonialism. However, more work is yet to be done on this exploration of musical cultures and education in nineteenth-century Britain, and some possible directions for future research will be suggested.

Recap

The National Training School for Music was founded in 1876, the product of nearly twenty years of effort by those who were closely aligned with the Great Exhibition of 1851. By placing Henry Cole in charge of curating a national school of music in 1861, the Prince of Wales started a project that led to significant developments in the structure of musical education in Britain with far-reaching effects: these include the RCM and, therefore, the ABRSM (of which the Prince of Wales was patron).

The NTSM’s remit was supposedly simple: it was to improve the state, and status, of British music to a position where it would rival other European countries. A significant point in this venture was the 1865 Society of Arts’ First report of the committee appointed to inquire into
and report on the state of musical education, at home and abroad, intended to inform the pursuit of a successful institution of musical education. Despite mixed views on the subject, the Report concluded that the Royal Academy of Music should be repurposed to fulfil this role. Another salient point from the Report was that such an institution should target all classes in society by providing gratuitous education in a similar manner to the Paris Conservatoire. Although the Report, and those who were interviewed as part of it, were keen to ensure that gratuitous education was a fundamental element of the School, they stressed the importance of also admitting fee-paying students to provide financial stability. Yet this was not implemented at the commencement of the NTSM. The School instead relied solely on private donors to form and fund scholarships which were awarded by means of local competitions held in the place of their founders. Three hundred scholarships were aimed for, yet only one hundred were created when the School opened with 75 students in 1876. Continuing without securing additional funding was a significant financial faux pas made by the NTSM’s administrators and was a contributing factor to its swift downfall.

The NTSM’s archives record its aims as being to ‘elevate’ the musical status of Britain: to positively influence and shape the nation’s musical culture by educating its most promising students and providing them with the technical tools and resources to positively influence the country at large (‘[t]o be the centre whence may be drawn a large proportion of the Teachers and [...] Artists’). One of the secondary priorities in this venture was to ensure that such opportunities were as equally available to the working classes (the ‘classes of very limited means’) as they were to those who could easily afford to access them. These aims are reminiscent of those of the Empire: the emphasis on cultural improvement heralds certain ways of being above those of others, and — as subsequent discussions showed — there was a sense of duty to impose such ‘high’ values on other cultures, a sentiment also expressed in other artforms, such as Rudyard Kipling’s infamous poem, ‘The White Man’s Burden’.
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Evidence suggesting the NTSM was a product of the Empire’s pervasive ideology is only strengthened when discussed alongside theories of class. As Chapter 2 showed, previous work has theorised a close relationship between class and Empire. The aristocracy were primarily responsible for the Empire’s administration, and it is their values that were imposed onto other societies under the guise of ‘British’ culture as part of the colonial process abroad. Around 1851, the British Empire was formed of multiple impulses: one of these was the belief in the supremacy of British culture (read: British upper-class culture) over any society perceived as markedly different, such as India. Imperialists were convinced of their moral duty to impose their ways of ‘civilisation’ onto their colonies, seen through those such as Thomas Babington Macaulay and the bourgeoisie missionaries. One of the most important, and effective, methods of imposing aristocratic British culture abroad was through education. As it was the upper classes who were fulfilling these aims and whose culture was being spread, one aim of the British Empire’s project abroad can be understood as a class-based cultural agenda. Cannadine has taken this further, suggesting that the concept of the Empire was not based upon racial difference, but class-based difference. Using this notion to explore the socio-cultural structure of the UK, I have argued that the upper and upper-middle classes were equally concerned with the state of the lower-middle and working class’s cultures and values in Britain. Focusing on the use of education to this end, I also argued that they equipped the same tactics at home as they did as part of their imperial expansion: due to these similarities in intent and execution, I drew from previous work to refer to this process as ‘domestic colonialism’.

Returning to the arts culture of Britain in the nineteenth century, I continued by arguing that many of the musical developments which occurred during this century, particularly those concerned with education, were a result of domestic colonialism. Rational recreation, a movement conceived by the upper two classes but carried about by the bourgeoisie, focused on encouraging the working classes to partake in more morally ‘superior’ leisure.
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activities to those that were traditionally pursued, such as drinking at public houses. Instead, ‘better’ activities such as more religious engagement and music-making, particularly singing, were encouraged. An example of these movements includes the Tonic Sol-fa system, something which spread rapidly across the Empire.\textsuperscript{379} Due to the top-down class-based application of the movement, the types of activities that were encouraged, and the tools used to do so (education), I argue that rational recreation can be thought of as another string in the bow of domestic colonialism.

The aristocracy’s and bourgeoisie’s focus on music’s moral value suggests that the aims of the NTSM — its emphasis on being a national project, and its desire to include the working classes — can also be theorised through the lens of domestic colonialism. By returning to its administration and archives in this light, I argue that the NTSM functioned as microcosm of the Empire, capitalising on the nation’s imperial infrastructure to establish itself in South Kensington and using similarly imperial tools to spread its influence nationwide; I then conclude that the NTSM’s Committee of Management were carrying out on a small scale what was happening across the Empire on a larger scale. This argument helps to explain some of the more contradictory decisions made by the School’s administration. For example, it was previously a strange decision to prioritise the inclusion of the working classes at the expense of the School’s financial stability, ignoring advice from the 1865 Report to also include fee-paying students; however, domestic colonialism suggests that elevating the culture of the working classes was a greater priority than creating a national music curriculum, and so decisions were aimed more at this purpose. Wright has previously highlighted contradictions between the physical building by Freake and the aim for the School to be a ‘national’ institution — there were only eighteen practice rooms and no concert hall.\textsuperscript{380} The same argument suggests that the NTSM was less concerned about its ability to cater for national needs. It also goes partway to explaining why teaching was such a fundamental part of its doctrine, despite complaints from the School’s principal — as had been shown in the Empire, pedagogical methods were effective for enabling mass-scale permeation of an ideology. Those in charge of the NTSM hoped that these students would
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go back into their communities and spread the same values, thus establishing a sustainable and indirect way of spreading this ‘civil’, ‘morally-sound’ model of upper- and upper-middle-class influence among the masses. It even goes on to help explain the gender ratio at the School, where over two-thirds of the pupils were women. As women were more likely to go into teaching, they provided the perfect choice for agents of the domestic empire. Even the choice of instruments being taught at the NTSM belies the supposed focus on creating a new national culture (which, as the RCM went to show, was instead borne of orchestral instruments and folk culture), and instead pointed towards the drawing-room practices of the upper class, a private means of musical performance, being taught to all classes in attendance.\(^{381}\)

This class-based, imperial conception of the NTSM gives cause to question the official accounts stored in its archives in light of other happenings in the nineteenth century; doing so helps to theorise why many of its apparent intentions were not supported by its actions. However, these suggestions only further go to show the extent to which the NTSM was a failure, and perhaps an even greater one than previously thought. It not only failed to achieve the aims it officially stated, but also failed to get close to achieving its subsurface intentions — as an analysis of the class of students’ fathers’ professions showed, no students came from a Class V background.

Contrary to the School’s implied aims, therefore, the culture being taught within was not new, but based on the class system that existed in Britain and across the Empire. Instead, the NTSM existed to spread the culture associated with the ruling elite on a national scale.

Tracing Ineffectuality

Reflecting on its history, there is no shortage of possible reasons why the NTSM lasted for such a small amount of time despite the length of research that went into its creation. The first was economic: the School did not acquire enough private donors for scholarships that
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\(^{381}\) Bashford, ‘Historiography and Invisible Musics’, p. 294.
would have made the School financially stable, and their reliance on the government taking over the project after five years proved to be misguided. Compounding this, the School could neither confirm it had satisfied its aims, nor its place being required, to the 1851 Commission, and so was ineligible for additional funding. The School could neither confirm it had satisfied its aims, nor its place being required, to the 1851 Commission, and so was ineligible for additional funding. Contemporary reports of its concerts and exams indicate that the NTSM’s pupils were not considered well-trained, and Sullivan did not implement any major changes to correct this, despite the examiners highlighting this in their 1880 report; although by this point it was known that there were plans to create a new institution.

Although financial difficulties and an overall image of inadequacy were contributing factors, it can be fairly argued that the major, unifying reason behind the NTSM’s failure was that despite nearly two decades of preparation, it was not sufficiently committed to either of its aims to fulfil them in either the long or short term: it neither contributed to the improvement of the nation’s culture nor, overall, the ‘civilisation’ of the working classes. As Wright has discussed, there was a national need for orchestral instrumentalists on a professional basis — and it was orchestral genres which eventually spawned British national music in the English Musical Renaissance. Both Grove’s RCM and even MacKenzie’s once-disparaged RAM tapped into this, yet the archives show that NTSM chose to focus on drawing-room music. While there was a need for teachers, the greater need was undoubtedly orchestral. The focus on drawing-room culture can be understood as reflective of its patron culture, the aristocracy, and an attempt to encourage this ‘respectable’ type of music-making among the working classes. However, by failing to fully account for the circumstances of British society’s poorest members, these aims were never fulfilled either. While there is no explicit evidence suggesting that the complete lack of students from a Class V background was because none applied, the choice of musical genre taught by the School likely played a part in discouraging their attendance, as drawing-room instruments favoured middle-class students with the disposable income to afford these them. Although there has been a lot of research to suggest that the piano was becoming increasingly
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commonplace among working-class families, this was relative — the poorest of the working class (Class V) were still unlikely to have access to such instruments around this time; this supports more recent research by Bull. However, firm conclusions cannot be drawn without additional evidence.

The biggest misjudgement made by the School might have been to completely eradicate working-class culture rather than work alongside it. Private drawing-room musical genres were not remotely similar to the social nature of the leisure activities enjoyed by the working class. Training teachers was a significant part of the NTSM’s remit, but the type of culture it taught also isolated it from the burgeoning world of orchestral musicians. Additionally, whereas the Tonic Sol-fa and singing-class movements made use of community spirit to increase engagement within working-class communities, the NTSM’s solution was to bring select students to London and then train them (with poor-quality education) for five years, before allowing them to return home. The contrast in approaches is palpable, and this focus on the individuals rather than communities — as highlighted by Johnson-Williams — explains why the influence of Tonic Sol-fa was so widespread, while the cultural impact of a small conservatoire in South Kensington was comparatively negligible.

Fundamentally, the NTSM was not sufficiently committed to either of its aims to function in the way it needed to in order to become institutionally and culturally engrained: it neither fully catered to situating its importance among the working classes, nor worked with the music profession to be of use there.

South Kensington

The failure of the NTSM to engage the working classes properly was not a unique phenomenon. In fact, contemporary critics suggest that the entire South Kensington idea —
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which held the improvement of the working classes as core to its founding — failed to achieve working-class visits and sympathies because it was not created in an accessible way.\textsuperscript{388} Geographically it was too far outside of London, and the materials were neither sufficiently engaging nor affordable.\textsuperscript{389} In fact, the whole venture confirmed a widely-held belief that the upper classes were not just unsympathetic to the plights of the working classes, but had no experience or idea whatsoever of their lived experience. Burton, in his discussion about the interactions between the working classes and the South Kensington Museum, implies that, despite the proclaimed efforts and interest by the 1851 Commissioners in ensuring that South Kensington might act as inspiration for self-improvement in the working classes, even contemporary critics disagreed with this premise on accounts that it had not considered the latter’s lived reality. Burton quotes \textit{Building News}, which wrote that ‘only “once in his life” might a workman “make a holiday trip with his wife and children to […] South Kensington, with an outlay of two or three weeks’ savings, but catch him there again you never will; for experience teaches him it is a day’s journey beyond his means or his might”’. \textsuperscript{390} Although \textit{Building News} had a clear agenda against South Kensington and Prince Albert himself on account of his being German, their point that the site did not really take into account the working classes holds true: they also critique the apparent class division, describing Cole and other members of the 1851 Exhibition as ““nondescript clique which […] belongs neither to the Government nor to the opposition, nor to the Court, and which is composed of parasites that cling to all with the tenacity of such foul things, and cannot be shaken off””. \textsuperscript{391}

I have previously discussed the tense alliance of the upper and upper-middle classes (the aristocracy and newly-enriched capitalist bourgeoisie) required to produce the NTSM. As Burton has written, this was even more apparent in the creation of South Kensington:

[\textit{T}here was powerful opposition to education in science. If the Church of England and the Nonconformists were at odds with the Government and with each other over the teaching of
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basic literacy, they were even more resistant to the threat which they believed scientific education levelled against religious belief.\textsuperscript{392}

As Chapter 2 discussed, the Church of England was closely aligned with the aristocracy — indeed, religion was one of the arenas in which the aristocracy sought to reassert their cultural power at the beginning of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{393} Therefore, it seems that, with the exception of Prince Albert who informed much of its direction, South Kensington’s focus on scientific advancement was the directive of male, middle-class bourgeoisie (like Cole) rather than the aristocracy; yet its association with the Prince Consort means it retained close associations with the aristocracy. The government-minded aristocracy shored up religious institutions; yet the bourgeoisie had no such loyalty, and clearly were more interested in establishing scientific and engineering institutions, which were contrary to the aims of the religious aristocracy. However, the NTSM — as with other arts activities such as those encouraged in rational recreation — was concerned with neither science nor religion. As such, it was one of the grounds upon which the two dominant classes could agree to compromise, focusing their collective efforts on bettering the working classes. It was mutually beneficial for them to join forces on this project: the bourgeoisie-capitalists could encourage the development of healthy workers, and the aristocracy further cemented their cultural control both at home and abroad.

Implications

The NTSM did not lead to the RCM — at least not with any ease. Previous work by Brightwell and Wright has concluded that the NTSM was a hinderance to the RCM.\textsuperscript{394} They were, however, part of the same lineage, just travelling different paths. They were a result of the same catalyst — the perception that there was a distinct lack of musical culture in Britain, and that one of the best ways of rectifying this situation would be an institution of musical education which aimed to contribute to a national culture in Britain. While I am not arguing that the curriculums for the two institutions were the same — indeed, as Wright
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and Brightwell have shown, nothing could be further from the truth — the fact remains that the aims of the two conservatoires (though approached in different ways) were to regenerate a British musical culture. This, at its core, was also the aim of the English Musical Renaissance.

As my own previous research has shown, there is a commonly held consensus among music historians who have studied this cultural phenomenon (something that is itself in dispute) that the EMR started in c. 1880. Although there is less of a consensus as to the exact event, there is a sense that either a composition (Hubert Parry’s Scenes from Shelley’s Prometheus Unbound cantata at the Three Choirs Festival of 1880) or the founding of the RCM (1882/3) marks its commencement.\(^{395}\) However, what if, like the NTSM, the EMR existed as an idea before it was made physically manifest? Especially given the RCM is cited as a formative force in the movement, when understood that the NTSM was borne of the same thought processes, there is a strong argument to suggest that the EMR might well have begun earlier than has traditionally been theorised. The NTSM was a false start: it did not encourage the right kinds of nationalist music, or from the right people, to have been successful in the way that the RCM was. The shift away from involving the working classes to exploiting their musical forms (for example, folk music) was a far more culturally lucrative option.

The musical culture at the RCM involved orchestral instruments and would later be considered the centre of the EMR. EMR compositions fitted Matthew Riley and Anthony Smith’s categories of national musical style: ‘modes, dance rhythms and textures borrowed from vernacular sources (“folk music”), special effects to evoke homeland landscapes, and by musical illustration borrowed from national history and legend’, and ‘re-discover[y]’ of earlier concepts.\(^ {396}\) With regard to England, specifically, this was formed through folk music, revival of past musical traditions (especially Medieval and Tudor music), and depictions of the English landscape.\(^ {397}\) One of the peculiarities of the Renaissance compositions was that two of their focuses — folk music and the English pastoral landscape (associated with the ‘little England’ stereotype) — were closely aligned with working-class rural culture. Yet the
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EMR composers involved in depicting these tropes (Parry, Charles Villiers Stanford, Ralph Vaughan Williams, and Gustav Holst) were universally middle-class, well-educated, city-dwelling composers. Their compositions therefore capitalised on the perceived products of working-class culture — the folk vernacular was felt to represent the ‘true’ England, which romanticised the pastoral landscape and agricultural labour. Given that this is the culture from which English music was considered ‘reborn’, this suggests that capitalising on working-class musical culture was more culturally influential than attempts to conform the working classes to ‘high’ artistic cultures.

If the thought-processes behind the EMR did commence prior to the c. 1880s, then it might help to clarify the divergence Temperley found between contemporary and modern writers when discussing the start of the ‘light age’ of British music: the earlier the writer, the earlier they defined the commencement of the light age. By considering contemporary views on the Renaissance, it can be understood as a more nuanced occurrence than previous research might have thought.

Limitations and Future Research

While I have chosen to analyse the NTSM through the lens of domestic colonialism because it provides a valuable framework to reconcile the domestic impact of the British Empire with musical education in Britain, the model has limitations. Its main restrictions are due to two reasons: its meso-level (institutional level) application, and being based on intention rather than reality.

Working at the meso-level for this project offered an important way to mediate institutional inputs — the top-down approach to the influence of the Empire on institutions. However, this meant that the analysis could not account for the individuals who also had an important role in the creation of the NTSM; for example, Cole’s testimonies and prominent place in many of the bodies involved (such as the 1851 Commissioners) suggests he had a greater role in the formation of the institution than this thesis has discussed. Although I maintain
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that using mesosociology for domestic colonialism was the most appropriate starting point, future research would benefit from combining this with microsociology to also account for the role of individuals in this process. This way, conclusions regarding the impact of the Empire could be tempered with individual agendas, and any exceptions could be noted to the generalisations that I have had to rely on throughout this thesis. While general theories of class provide a valuable backdrop to such work, micro-level work would be equally beneficial.

Another limitation of domestic colonialism is that, as mentioned throughout Chapter 2, it refers to the intention of upper- and upper-middle-class cultural imposition; as was the case with the Empire at large, these impositions rarely functioned as directly as intended, and were frequently mediated, reversed, or subtly adapted by the colonised group in a process of cultural exchange in the so-called ‘British World’. Potentially, this is why the archival work on gender did not confirm the hypotheses that would make the most sense given the intentions of the School. To recap: the NTSM neither fitted the expectations for middle-class women being prominent, nor upper-class men — instead, the gender divides for all classes were either as expected or did not show any clear results. Upper-class men may well have been privately educated within their own domestic space, as it was their musical tradition that was being taught in the NTSM; as such, they might well not be expected to appear in the context of the/a S/school. However, the lack of clear evidence to suggest that middle-class women were in more proportional attendance than any other class is perplexing. As much of the class-based and gender-based cultural imposition intended by the Empire was unsuccessful, it failed to account for resistance among the peoples it was intending to influence; as a microcosm of the Empire, the same could well be argued for the NTSM.

By using a theoretical model for approaching this research, I was also limited in the depth to which I could pursue archival research, and the methods used to collect some of the data. The Scholars’ Register, for example, also listed the first professional position of some of the students. Of those whose professions were recorded, all but three went into music. It is significant that most of the students whose first professions were listed went on to become

---

399 Dubow, p. 19.
teachers or organists. However, only thirty-nine of the students' first jobs were recorded (the rest were blank) and so, due to the small sample size and lack of information about data collection, I have chosen not to include it in this dissertation. Future research might conduct a wider archival investigation of the methods used to follow up on its pupils and how the scholarships were advertised. Much of the data found in the NTSM's archives could be combined with evidence suggesting the ways that the NTSM advertised scholarship competitions, and how far across the UK they spread — their choice of communication and which publications would reveal much about their attempts to encourage a diverse student body. While I focused on The Times in my own methodology, constrains over the scope of this project meant that it was infeasible to investigate many newspapers to the scale that would be required to build on such research; however, this is another route for further study.

Finally, there are things that domestic colonialism does not explain. One of the major questions left unanswered — or, perhaps, that must be asked in light of such an exploration — is why the NTSM suggested that its aims were twofold (to produce a legitimate compositional culture; to ‘elevate’ the country’s musical tastes and practices) when most of its energies only went into the latter? Wright, in his work on the RCM, suggests that there was a ‘contradiction between the social and educational rationales for conservatoire education and some of the economic realities of the music profession’. Applying this to the NTSM also suggests that the School was of its era, and perhaps the School’s administrators were aware that they had to capitalise upon the national sentiment (which was to create a British musical culture to rival its European contemporaries) to make their proposal viable; however, their intention all along was the ‘elevation’ of working-class culture. Without further evidence, it is impossible to firmly conclude that this was the case, but this dissertation acts as a placeholder along the journey of reflecting on the NTSM’s legacy. Further study could also conduct a wider-scale investigation into the class makeup and intentions of other schools of music founded in this period, including the Trinity College of Music (established in 1872) and the Royal Manchester College of Music (established 1893), and how they interacted with the actions found within the NTSM.

Given the multitude of topics broached in this dissertation, there are many directions for future research. However, a particularly interesting avenue would be to explore the changes in Britain’s culture in comparison to another major empire in the mid-late nineteenth century: France. I have postulated here that one of the ways in which the NTSM imposed its influence was using tactics associated with the Empire. The fact that these were used at home — more widely than just the NTSM — suggests that this was a national, cultural phenomena, which I have identified as domestic colonialism. Given that these tactics are based on the British Empire, it would be plausible to stop here, and accept that as a British institution closely aligned with the axes of power that are also controlling the Empire, the NTSM can be understood under the banner of the British Empire alone. Yet, there are similarities in the proposed expansion of the NTSM with the actual expansion of the Paris Conservatoire in France. The significance of which starts with Richards’ criteria: whereas the NTSM was understood under a British culture, the same elements can be found in Paris, which was strongly associated with and influenced by Catholicism and Republican sentiment. Particularly given that domestic colonialism sprung out of the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars, it is curious that such two diametrically opposed countries had similar means of organising and disseminating musical education. We know from the 1865 Report that the NTSM (and RCM) drew inspiration from the Paris Conservatoire for some of its principles. Given this, how might this impact our understanding of imperial objectives codified in the NTSM’s constitution, and what can be learned about the wider-scale cultural interactions in the nineteenth century?

***

The National Training School for Music institutionalised the desire of the upper and upper-middle classes for their values to constitute Britain’s national musical culture. Viewing one of South Kensington’s institutions through the lens of domestic colonialism reveals the potential for a more nuanced understanding of the events and processes that shaped musical culture in the nineteenth century. The legacies of these educational institutions continue to shape musical education today.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Committee of Management as of the end of Christmas term 1876.\\footnote{RCM00834 Minute Books 1873–1882, p. 123a: ‘First Report, end of Christmas Term 1876’, p. 8.}

H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh, K.G. – Chairman
The Viscount Newry – Vice Chairman
H.R.H. The Prince Christian, K.G.
The Lord Alfred Churchill (or Chairman of the Council of the Society of Arts for the time being).
The Lord Clarence Paget, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. The Lord Mayor (for the time being).
Sir William G. Anderson, K.C.B.
Sir Henry Cole, K.C.B.
Mr. C. J. Freake
Mr. Alan S. Cole
Mr. J. Bath (City of London)
Mr. Charles Barry (London)
Mr. Charles Morley (London)
Mr. Thomas Chappell
And Representatives of Scholarships at the rate of one for every ten Scholarships founded by any Corporation, School, or Local Committee.
Appendix 2: Classification of students according to the Registrar General Social Class Scale (1911) using data on fathers’ professions of the Scholars’ Register, with justification of decisions\(^402\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of entry</th>
<th>Father’s profession</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Musical composer and professor of dancing</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>Unlikely that professors of dancing were university-accredited, so not Class 1. Musical composer is not a professional/managerial position but does require skill. While teachers are Class II, I think this likely refers to schoolteachers, so IIIN is a better fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clerk in holy orders</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>Could by IIIN, but part of Holy Orders so keeping this to a separate category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>University degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Professor of French</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>Potentially professor at university level, so needs a university degree – but Ehrlich’s discussion (p. 96) of working-class parents encouraging their children to become ‘professors’ suggests not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clerk Comptroller of Kitchen in Queen’s Household</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Comptroller is someone who examiners and supervises expenditures, and royal household might well elevate the position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{402}\) RCM00835 National Training School for Music – Scholars’ Register 1876–1882.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Boot and shoe maker</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td>Skilled as training required, but manual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Cutlers accountant</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>Cutler is someone who makes and sells cutlery. Accountancy requires some skill (not clerking) but not university-level, and not managerial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Superintendent of the Metropolitan and City Police Orphanage</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Does not require a university degree but is a position of power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Managing Clerk to a Firm of Solicitors</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>Initially went with II because of the 'managing' part, but managing clerk suggests that they were head of the clerk division rather than the firm itself. Therefore: IIIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Teacher of music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>Teacher (in a formal institution) is Class II. I am differentiating between ‘professor’, which seems to have been used more loosely, and ‘teacher’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Chemist and druggist</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>Does not require a university degree for this form of medicine and not a managerial position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Scripture Reader</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Very similar to a physician, which requires a university degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Office Clerk</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Treating all clerks as same class as bank clerk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Unsure about this one but implies that they own the grocery shop, not just working at one. Therefore, requires a level of skill above V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Shoe Manufacturer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td>Manual skills required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Licensed Victualler</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Licensed to sell alcohol, like a grocer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Med. Doctor</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Postman</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Needs some degree of training and literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Engraver</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td>Manual skills required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Naval Instructor</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Focusing on the term 'instructor' as like teacher. School teacher is Class II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Commercial Traveller</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Does not require a university level of education, and not technically in charge of anything (agent for a larger body) but this is still a position of responsibility. Unclear as to how the role taking place abroad might change it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Haberdasher</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Men's clothing or small items (e.g., buttons). Implication is owning the store, so similar to a grocer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Inspector of [In?]land Revenue</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Inspector of [In?]land Revenue</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Bag + Leather Goods Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Piano Maker (Broadwoods)</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Master</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School teacher is classed as II, but school master during this period might have required a higher degree of education, and certainly more power.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Stockbroker</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clerk in an Insurance Office</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>London Board School Master</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Organist and Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td>University degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Sculptor and Engraver</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clerk in the Board of Trade</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Hosier</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Cotton Doubler</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clothier</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Brass Founder</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Master Cooper</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clergyman and Physician</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Station Master on the L. Jollowy + Southend R.</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>In charge of the railway station, but do not know about the training required, nor about whether that was considered similarly to owning a company (Class II).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>School Master</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class I because university education required. Although Charles Freake did not have a degree, which is worth noting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Artist (painter)</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Lace Manufacturer</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Professor of French</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Metal Broker</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Hop Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Iron and Steel Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Artist (painter)</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Manager of the Albert Hall</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not require university education. But I think a strong case could also be made for Class I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Timber Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Omnibus driver [but dead, so they noted that mother 'is keeping a Lodging House']</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Grocer and baker</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Wire drawer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Manager of Quarries</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Farmer and Land Agent</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Colonel in the Army [7th Madras Light Cavalry]</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Chief [Engineer] in Navy</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clergyman. Chaplain of Horsemonger Lane</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Post Master, Walmer</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In charge of that specific office. Similar level to bank manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Machine Fitter</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Iron Founder's Pattern Maker</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Bookseller</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Landscape painter</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Organist and Journalist (for the Times of India)</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Shipping agent</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treating like merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Barrister at Law</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Collector of [...]</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could not read the final word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Bookseller</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Indian agent</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Brass Founder</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Banker's Clerk</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Collection of rates and Taxes for the Borough</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Professor of Languages</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Seaman</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Outfitter</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Civil Engineer and Electrician</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Teacher of Mathematics</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Writing Master</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Treating like a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Factory Overseer</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Architect + Land surveyor</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Confectioner</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Clerk in holy orders</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>A Minister of Religion</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Clerk to a Merchant's Firm</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Hat Manufacturer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Lace Manufacturer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Carriage Builder (retired)</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Silk Mercer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Stationer</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Stationer</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Music Seller</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Proprietor + Agent</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Solicitor's Clerk</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Captain of H.M. Ship Royal Adelaide</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Metal Plater</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Jeweller</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>A Publican</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Lace Designer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Commercial Traveller</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Corn Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Military Tailor and Outfitter</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Postmaster</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Bookmaker</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>- [Dead]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>- [Dead]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>General in the British Army</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Timber Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Timber Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Gentleman – retired from business</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>A Peer of the Realm</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>House Decorator</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Hosier’s Manager</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Performer</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>An actor</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Solicitor's Clerk</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Harbour Master</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>IIIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Milliner</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Warehouseman</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Clerk Comphollen of Kitchen in Royal Household</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Ornamental Carver</td>
<td>IIIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Clerk in Holy Orders</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Bishop of Tasmania</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Barrister at Law</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Aristocracy/gentlemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Clerk at Somerset House</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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