BRITAIN HAD BEEN AT WAR FOR SIX MONTHS when John F. Runciman piercingly commented in the *Saturday Review*: ‘‘No Englishman need apply’’ seems still to be written on many a well-meaning Englishman’s heart . . .’. Runciman’s candid assessment of the long-established neglect of native music and conductors was made within an article focused on the future of music festivals, events at that point cancelled due to the ‘world-cataclysm’. He warned: ‘though we have for the time got rid of the German-Austrian-Hungarian incubus, we shall have gained little if we are only to be fobbed off with Russians, Belgians and French in their place.’¹ Just over a year later, on 10 March 1916, amidst xenophobic fervour fuelled by the ongoing conflict, the Musical Conductors’ Association [MCA] formed in London ‘for the purpose of improving and consolidating the position of British conductors’.²

Since the 1870s—as I have discussed in detail elsewhere—the concept of the interpreter conductor had taken hold, bringing with it developments in the function and status of the role. Although the direct link between composing and conducting was deeply embedded in history and practice, conducting had gradually become more clearly understood as a separate branch of the British music profession. British exponents began to emerge from the long shadow of foreign exemplars and competitors.³ However, openings for conductors and musicians seeking stable, long-term work remained thin on the ground. Conducting was frequently just one of a portfolio of

---


occupations that in combination provided a viable living within the wider profession. Formalized conductor training did not become available in Britain until after the First World War, and the role was therefore learned through on-the-job experience. The long-standing reverence for foreign conductors and the blended professional activities that often made up the profiles of leading British conductors had far-reaching implications that played directly into the MCA’s purpose and struggle.

In March 1916 the MCA’s agenda was ambitious. Boldly, it sought to organize ‘conductors’ under one umbrella in pursuit of a shared—exclusively British—cause. Within a marketplace already served by a variety of associations and unions, its aim was to mobilize and harness a collective xenophobic identity and agency among conductors. Catalysed by war, it wanted to exert control through an autonomous negotiating position independent of the card-carrying musicians with whom its members worked. Germanophobia was raging. The MCA’s vision was for a joined-up and national structure that ensured employment for British conductors of all stripes and, through them, for British musicians.

Through this close analysis of the MCA’s impetus, aspirations, membership, propaganda, and impact, new understandings emerge that highlight the personal and professional issues that confronted British conductors during the First World War. This contextualization exposes the inner networks among British conductors in wartime from a unique and previously unexamined perspective. I argue in this article that this endeavour provides a lens through which British conductors’ diverse working circumstances and struggles for opportunity and influence within the music profession in wartime can be freshly interpreted.

WHAT’S IN A NAME?

For the purposes of this discussion we therefore need to understand the job titles (labels) that were generally used in relation to individuals who led and directed music at around the time of the First World War. Their varied roles and working conditions played out within a wider arena in which the societal status afforded to professional musicians was problematically entangled in issues including class, education, and genre association. Witness the coroner’s statement at the inquest of a music-hall musician in 1913 that only three proper professions were legally recognized: law, church, and medicine; all three were associated with the wealthy middle classes. As mass entertainment expanded, divisions and snobberies between types and locations of entertainment were becoming less pronounced for their consumers. On the ground within the music profession itself, it was often questions of financial survival that determined the types of engagements undertaken: dividing lines between serious, middlebrow, and popular music were therefore neither practical nor rigid. Shoring up the perceived status of cinema musicians in 1916, for example, J. G. Birkhead proselytized in the *Musical Herald*: ‘Don’t sneer at the picture-palace band. Members of the greatest orchestras we have in this country are playing in such combinations. The days when the “concert” musician spoke of the “theatre musician” in a patronizing tone are gone never to return.’
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6 J. G. Birkhead, ‘Work in Cinema and Theatre Bands’, *Musical Herald*, 821 (1 Aug. 1916), 276–7 at 277. The author of this article appears to have been the 34-year-old Manchester-based musician Joseph Garner Birkhead, whose
The MCA chose ‘conductors’ as the catch-all label for its membership. When plans for the Association were mooted, as discussed below, this label was initially unsettled. The final choice was significant. In practice, conductors (orchestral, choral, operatic) and musical directors (theatres, revues, music halls, cinemas, restaurants) sometimes sat on the fence (as it were), playing in the orchestra one day and conducting it the next. Birkhead noted that varied set-ups pertained in some first-rate picture palaces by mid-war: some had violin-conductors directing a chamber ensemble; others had full orchestras. This at a time when double-jobbing (which reduced job opportunities in the eyes of ‘organized’ musicians) was a source of debate and action. Blurring notional categories in another way, many exponents crossed over between multiple spheres of conducting, directing, leading, and playing. Yet another source of complexity stemmed from those who worked exclusively as conductors or as musical directors, and/or operated as fixers and/or managers. Then there were bandmasters (military; municipal; dance) who were less likely to transfer between types of conducting activity than their conductor/musical director peers. Therefore, a plethora of individual circumstances, professional hierarchies, and contractual arrangements was concealed beneath the labels of ‘conductor’ or ‘musical director’. Perhaps the adoption of the former was agreed upon in March 1916 since ‘conductor’ was a label directly associated with the concert platform on which the MCA’s Honorary Councillors were familiar figures. The label also firmly distinguished the MCA from any forerunners or currently active subsections of other unions or associations that utilized the ‘musical director’ label. Cognizant of this context, in this context I use the term ‘conductor’ as the MCA employed it: as a catch-all. The term ‘professional’ is applied to individuals whose livelihood significantly depended on work in music including conducting; ‘orchestral’ is used here to denote concert hall conducting. The prefix ‘Musical’ aligned the association with the wider profession and may also have avoided confusion with omnibus, tram, and railway conductors. To understand the classification ‘Association’ for this conductors’ collective, it is to the context surrounding musicians within the wider labour market that we now turn.

UNIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS IN CONTEXT: COLLECTIVE MUSICAL FORCES

The British music business was operating within an increasingly unionized context. Formed against the backdrop of warfare and the intensifying pressures created by rising costs of living and the levying of conscription in 1916, the MCA grappled with issues of definition, professional status, nationalism, and protectionism. Practical and ideological questions of control, professional categorization, and collective advocacy were on its agenda. Conductors found themselves on the horns of a professional dilemma. Should they belong to the same union or association as players? Would they forfeit managerial authority and status if they shared in the same cooperative benefits as players? If a union serving players and conductors alike agreed regularized rates of pay, would conductors lose the right to negotiate fees according to their individual status and experience? Was union membership—with its connotations of mass labour and open access to members of limited skill—suitable for conductors whose number included knights of the realm and whose role embodied an indefinable artistry? From

British Army First World War Service Record (accessed through Ancestry.co.uk) shows that he described himself as ‘musician and clerk’ and began army duty in the Army Service Corps on 30 Oct. 1916.

7 Christopher Wilson, ‘Orchestral Work on Tour: Some Experiences’, The Stage, 14 June 1917, p. 20.
its chosen title (association, not union) to its goals and membership, the MCA provides a snapshot of the diversity, preoccupations, and shared concerns among conductors as a branch of a profession that itself was struggling to organize itself.9

At the time of the MCA’s formation, and during and after the years of conflict, the protection of working musicians was in the hands of a range of unions and associations whose activities were by turns divergent and convergent. Labels adopted for these organizations conveyed their intentions and wider relationships in the job market. That market was oversupplied. Britain’s population almost doubled between 1879 and 1930 and, as Angele David-Guillou states, ‘the number of musicians (including music teachers) is thought to have multiplied by seven, jumping from seven thousand to fifty thousand’.10 Two ideologically opposed musicians’ organizations were dominant: the Amalgamated Musicians’ Union [AMU] and the National Orchestral Association [NOA]:11 a union and an association. The competition between them was fuelled by issues of professionalism and status.12

The AMU was the largest representative body by a considerable margin. Founded in Manchester in 1893 by Joseph Bevir Williams, a theatre clarinettist, it became affiliated with the Trades Union Congress in 1894 and opened a London branch from 1896.13 The [London] (later National) Orchestral Association was founded in the same year as the AMU by Frederick Orcherton, a flautist in Henry Wood’s Queen’s Hall Orchestra.14 As discussed below, it ‘spread its protecting arms throughout the United Kingdom’ in November 1913 by reconstituting itself as the ‘National’ Orchestral Association [NOA].15 However—and this is a critical point—the OA was not a trade union of diverse membership. Cyril Ehrlich likens the OA to unions of skilled craftsmen such as the Amalgamated Society of Engineers.16 As Annette Davison explains, it ‘expressed disgust at the notion of music as “a trade” and its membership was reserved for “professionals”’.17 It is also ‘striking’, as Simon McVeigh notes, that the founders of the breakaway London Symphony Orchestra were OA
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9 For contemporaneous awareness of this, see, for example, ‘Musicians under Control’, Musical Herald, 831 (1 June 1917), 171, where the report of the Fabian Research Department on ‘The Control of Industry’ was discussed.


11 The amendments to the name of the organization are summarized in John Williamson and Martin Cloonan, Players’ Work Time: A History of the British Musicians’ Union, 1893–2013 (Manchester, 2016), 19 n. 2, as follows: ‘This organisation was initially called the Orchestral Association (OA) but for most of its existence was known as the London Orchestral Association. However latterly it also went under the moniker of National Orchestral Association (NOA) and National Orchestral Union of Professional Musicians (NOUPM). After the merger with the AMU in 1921 it reverted to being the LOA and ran a members’ club in London.’ See also n. 149 below.


13 Williams became the chair of the Trade Union Council in 1922. For a summary timeline of the AMU see https://www.muhistory.com (accessed 31 Oct. 2019). NB. The Trade Union Act (1913) allowed unions to divide subscriptions into political and social funds.

14 Lna BT 31/6018/42504, Company No. 42504, Orchestral Association Documents of Incorporation (14 Nov. 1894).


16 Ehrlich, Music Profession, 153.

members and that it was at the Orchestral Association’s offices that the LSO had held its founding meeting.\(^{18}\)

John Williamson and Martin Cloonan have discussed the exponential increases in AMU membership between 1907 and 1918 and also assessed the impact of the ‘Union’s longest-running battle in the pre-war era, with Sir Oswald Stoll’.\(^{19}\) The master of an extensive variety theatre empire, Stoll’s employment of non-Union musicians on low wages caused controversy and strikes. For our purposes it is noteworthy that the AMU initially denied access to conductors and army bands and had frequent ‘conflicts of interest’ with them.\(^{20}\) Another trade union registered group, the National Federation of Professional Musicians [NFPM] (1907), was founded as a direct counter to the AMU.\(^{21}\) The NFPM argued that the Orchestral Association was not a ‘real protective society’ and that, had it been, the NFPM would not have been needed.\(^{22}\) Spurred on by the ‘Music Hall War’, the Variety Artistes’ Federation had been set up a year before and gone on to form a National Alliance with the AMU and the National Association of Theatre Employees.\(^{23}\) John Mullen’s revealing analysis of British music hall workers (1900–18) exposes the practical concerns and unionized responses among the workforce as well as the impact of the popularity of the revue format, built on teamwork.\(^{24}\)

Prime Minister Henry Asquith’s Liberal government had introduced Old Age Pensions for those aged 70 and above in 1908.\(^{25}\) In 1909 the British Musicians’ Pension Society was set up, providing pensions of £20 (30 years’ membership) and £25 (40 years’ membership) at 60 years of age. The NFPM encouraged its members (including conductors and musical directors) to join the Pension Society in 1912, advising them that the subscription of 15s. p.a. combined with Federation membership provided: ‘(1) An efficient protective society. (2) Help in distress and old age. (3) A death
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\(^{19}\) Williamson and Cloonan, *Players’ Work Time*, 56, 51.


\(^{21}\) Lna LAB 2/432/IC4559/3/1919, Chief Industrial Commissioner’s Department: Compliance with Mr Pilling’s Award. Includes correspondence (4 Feb. 1910) from Josef Pelzer, ISM member and Musical Director and Conductor of the Grand Theatre Glasgow, in which he stated: ‘P.S. The A.M.U. consists mostly of Amateurs working at other trades during the day time. Their officials take big Salaries [sic], the subscriptions are used, and spend [sic] in Law-Cases, Strikes, and in wages for the Officials. The N.F.P.M. consists of about 500 professional musicians, registered under the Trades Union Acts of 1871 and 1876, Reg. No. 1398, T.U., and is the Professional Musical Union of Great Britain. All Offices are honourary [sic] and without payment ...


\(^{25}\) For an overview of the wider context surrounding the introduction of the Old Age Pensions Act (1908) see https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN04817/SN04817.pdf (accessed 7 Jan. 2021). This was a non-contributory, means-tested provision, requiring a minimum UK residency of twenty years, minimum age of 70, an income below £31. 10s. 0d, and fulfilment of behavioural requirements. Those who qualified averted of a maximum weekly pension of 5 shillings to those earning less than £21 p.a.; a sliding scale incrementally reduced this amount so that those whose means exceeded £28. 17s. 6d but were no more than £31. 10s. 0d qualified for a pension of 1 shilling. See also Pat Thane’s wider analysis, which explains that ‘two-thirds of state pensioners were female’, in *The “Scandal” of Women’s Pensions in Britain: How Did It Come About?*, Policy Paper (20 Mar. 2006), http://www.historyandpolicy.org/policy-papers/papers/the-scandal-of-womens-pensions-in-britain-how-did-it-come-about (accessed 7 Jan. 2021).
benefit that will soon be equal to £50.'26 Well-known orchestral and theatre conductors (including Landon Ronald, Edward German, Henry Wood, Sidney Jones, and Edward Jones) were among the patrons of the Society.27 In 1913 the NFPM urgently pressed for a merger of the OA, AMU, and NFPM, underpinning its arguments by citing the recent formation of the new Union of [medical] Doctors:

In intellect, framing and reasoning powers, this body of gentlemen illimitably transcends those of the general musician. They, therefore, adopted the only means to their ends, viz., Trade Unionism. Yet the comparatively speaking mite-minded musician, in his egoistic vanity and purblind policy saith, “I will none of it, for it defileth art.” The time has come when this “pride bubble” should be pricked. It is beautiful to view but of no practical value whatever.28

That year, a Musical Directors’ Section formed within the AMU; one of its aims was to ensure that musical directors were paid twice as much as their musicians; another was to ensure that members employed only AMU players.29 By November the now National Orchestral Association [NOA] had changed its constitution, becoming a protective rather than voluntary society for the whole of the UK and Ireland.30 Although the AMU was larger, and enjoyed a growing membership, its ‘negotiating power was constrained by an over-supply of labour and its inability to form a closed shop across the profession’.31 In 1915 the AMU and the NOA signed a working agreement that remained in place until 1917; this weakened the control of managers, including Stoll.32 This agreement was therefore in force when the MCA was established.

ALIENS OUT

The outbreak of war in August 1914 shook the foundations of British musical life. The potential cancellation of events, and the consequences of such a reaction for the livelihoods of musicians in Britain, generated a concern that cut through to the heart of an abiding problem. Britain’s open market had long served as a magnet for foreign musicians, who had enjoyed preferential reception. The terrifying prospect of conflict now rubbed salt into the open wounds of oversupply and poor working conditions that had catalysed the activities of the union movement for the previous twenty years. Combined with the turbulent wartime context, this active labour reform triggered increased collective efforts among disillusioned British musicians to find coordinated ways to secure the supply of work and protect their own kind. The distinction between ‘enemy’ and ‘friendly’ (allied) foreigners remained contentious for some. A range of studies provides valuable wider contexts for the discussion here. These include Erik Levi’s examination of xenophobic attitudes in British musical life during the first half of the twentieth century; Lewis Foreman’s wartime-focused discussion of responses to German music and musicians; Jane Angell’s studies of public musical discourse and of

30 Lna BT34/1013/42504, document stamped 8 Nov. 1913.
31 Williamson and Cloonan, Players’ Work Time, 59. ‘Closed shop’ meaning mandatory membership of a specified workers’ union as a prerequisite for employment.
music and charity on the homefront during the war; and Panikos Panayi’s exploration of the treatment of Germans in Britain during the war through official and popular responses in *The Enemy in Our Midst*. Colin Holmes’s *John Bull’s Island* widens the perspective to look at immigration and British society across a century from 1871; Ehrlich’s ‘The English Piano Goes to War’ illuminates the propaganda, politics, and economic realities for the piano manufacturing industry’s perspective during the period; and—in relation to the music business and the management of foreigners—Martin Cloonan and Matt Brennan’s disentangling of the British Musician’s Union’s policies between the 1920s and 1950s, grounded in the Union’s earlier history.

Focused on the other side of the Atlantic, studies by Edmund E. Bowles, Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht, and Melissa D. Burrage respectively enrich understandings of responses to German conductors—and the Boston Symphony Orchestra’s ill-fated Karl Muck in particular—in America during the war.

Back in 1905 the Aliens Act had regulated incoming immigrants and empowered the Secretary of State to expel criminals and paupers. One day after the outbreak of war in 1914, the Aliens Restrictions Act, primarily focused on ‘enemy aliens’, was passed. The effects of the consequent internment and extradition of thousands of German, Austrian, and Hungarian ‘aliens’ resonated throughout the music profession.

Four days later, on 9 August, Landon Ronald wrote rousingly to the *Daily Telegraph* from his Principal’s desk at the Guildhall School of Music [GSM] in London. He urged coordinated resolve in the music profession, ensuring that those who relied on it for their income did not lose all engagements as a result of the precipitate cancellation of festivals, concerts, and other activities. Advocating for a nationwide approach to saving thousands of musicians from starvation, Ronald offered his services on any such committee.

In September it was reported that, among other moves to remove alien musicians from engagements, Ronald’s GSM had dismissed all German, Austrian, or Hungarian musicians.  

---


7
Hungarian professors. As the war continued, various groups of musicians sought not only to oust the ‘alien enemy’ from their workplaces but also to ‘future-proof’ by safeguarding against such an ‘infiltration’ after ‘the war to end all wars’.

In September and October 1914, a widely reported series of meetings leading to the establishment of a National Association for the Protection of British Interests in Music was held in London involving teachers, conductors, musicians, soloists, and patrons. One aim was to count up—and weed out—foreign musicians in theatre orchestras. The cry was that foreigners had ‘taken bread out of the mouths of the rank and file of the profession’. The resulting inventory was intended to encompass music hall, theatre, concert hall, and also private teachers and music publishers. One report ended forcefully: ‘The men of music mean business.’

The theatre conductor James (Jimmy) Mackey Glover (1861–1931) spoke up at the first meeting. Glover was later vividly portrayed in one obituary: ‘with his prominent nose and very stout body and constant and lively feuds and vast zones of acquaintances to quarrel with in a wide publicity atmosphere ... He told stories well’. While chef d’orchestre at Drury Lane Theatre, Glover had been a founder member of a Musical Directors’ Association in the late 1890s, becoming its chairman. Now, at Pagani’s Restaurant on 30 September 1914, Glover pressed for an initial focus on the exclusion of German musicians, with plans for a post-war extension of its reach to deal with Belgian, French, and Russian musicians.

Glover, who noted that he had not been invited to attend the meeting, was appointed to a committee involving Edward Elgar, Frederick Cowen, Ronald, German, and Hubert Bath to arrange a conference that would consider ‘a covenant not to engage, conduct, play with, or encourage any foreign musicians in our business’. Glover vowed to publish what he said would be a startling list of: “noms de plume” and “noms de théâtre” of those British musicians who have now for many years been masquerading as foreigners (German for choice) as they assert, to try to capture the English market. Many have dropped the aristocratic “Von Der something” for plain “Mister” ... But the list will be a surprising one when I do publish it.

A collective of prominent musicians formed as a result of this meeting and agreed to spread the word through the profession and arrange a follow-up gathering. The initial list of leading figures comprised eighteen influential men of whom eight (Cowen, Elgar, Ronald, German, George Miller, Sidney Jones, Bath, and Herman Finck) subsequently became involved in the MCA.

40 For example, ‘Joint Committee Decisions A.M.U.—N.O.A.’, Amalgamated Musicians’ Union Monthly Report and Supplement, no. 209 (Mar. 1917), 1: ‘RE ALIENS. That all musicians of alien enemy birth (whether naturalised or otherwise) be barred from membership of either Society, at and from the conclusion of peace.’
42 ‘To Combat Foreign Invasion’, Sheffield Independent, 5 Oct. 1914, p. 3.
46 James M. Glover, ‘Facing the Music’, The Era, 7 Oct. 1914, p. 10. Glover said that this was not ‘boycotting’ but ‘self preservation’.
47 Ibid. 8.
Small Queen’s Hall on 13 October 1914, at which a National Association for the Protection of British Interests in Music was established.\textsuperscript{49} German, Austrian, and Hungarian artists were this Association’s target. Providing some evidence of a lack of unanimity, one journal noted that a number of high-profile musicians had left before the conclusion of the meeting.\textsuperscript{50} Another newspaper report highlighted Vaughan Williams’s plea for the avoidance of a blanket approach that would cause established foreign musicians to be starved of employment. Handling foreign musicians who had been long-term residents in Britain and/or were from allied countries were but two of many complex dilemmas facing the profession. It was noted that this Association would form subcommittees whose purpose was to find out about unfair competition in all areas of the profession.\textsuperscript{51} In reality, the practical impact of the Association appears to have been minimal.\textsuperscript{52}

One stark example of the consequences of enemy-alien regulation for resident German and Hungarian musicians and their families can be seen in the role taken in 1914 by the long-standing conductor of the municipal orchestra in Bournemouth.\textsuperscript{53} Dan Godfrey Jr (subsequently an Executive Councillor to the MCA), testified in the case of one of his viola players, Adolf Wüstenhagen, a German married to an Englishwoman, whose application for naturalization was made within days of the outbreak of the conflict in 1914. Godfrey wrote to the Home Secretary on 18 August, confirming Wüstenhagen’s twenty-one-year orchestral service and good character. Godfrey added that Wüstenhagen’s 22-year-old son was a non-German-speaking Englishman and also played in the orchestra. Godfrey wanted to keep them both in his orchestra.\textsuperscript{54} Wüstenhagen’s naturalization file contains letters from a Bournemouth resident who objected to the presence of a German musician in the rate-payer subsidized orchestra. In the face of strong public feeling, Wüstenhagen had to leave the


\textsuperscript{50} ‘The War and Musicians’ Interests’, \textit{Musical Herald}, 1 Nov. 1914, p. 403.


\textsuperscript{52} Angell, ‘Art Music’, 112.

\textsuperscript{53} For an extended discussion of Dan Godfrey’s role in Bournemouth in the context of the developing role of conductors in the period 1870 to 1914, see Palmer, \textit{Conductors in Britain}, 197–261 et passim.

\textsuperscript{54} Lna H0382/91, Adolf Wüstenhagen: German musician with the Bournemouth Municipal Orchestra; exempted from internment in World War I but ordered to leave Bournemouth: application for naturalization.
orchestra and move ten miles outside Bournemouth (a restricted area), but Godfrey supported him in his successful application for exemption from internment.\footnote{Lna H0382/91; these papers show that Wustenhagen again sought naturalization in 1920 and was denied it. In 1936 he applied again and was successful. His son changed his surname to Weston at the start of the war. Note that when D. Godfrey was celebrated in Bournemouth in 1918, Stanford gave a speech in which he read out a letter from H. Carr and the MCA saying how proud they were of Godfrey and his membership, etc. ‘Bournemouth Municipal Orchestra. Twenty Fifth Anniversary. Presentation to Mr. Godfrey’, Bournemouth Guardian, 25 May 1918, p. 1.}

Announcements trumpeting the continuation of the Hallé Concerts in Manchester emphasized the nationalities of conductors planned for inclusion in the 1914–15 season: all were British, aside from Henri Verbruggen (Belgian) and Vasily Safonov (Russian).\footnote{‘Manchester’s Music: Hallé Concerts to Continue’, Manchester Guardian, 16 Sept. 1914, p. 8.} Moreover, the point was made that eighty-nine of the orchestra’s ninety-four players were British-born; the remaining five had been naturalized. In March 1915 the \textit{Musical Herald} disapproved of the plan for Emil Młynarski (the Polish conductor of the Scottish Orchestra) to conduct a festival of British music at London’s Queen’s Hall in May. The same column remarked on the blind-eyed response of the Liverpool Philharmonic Society’s committee on discovering that the portrait of the Austro-Hungarian Hans Richter displayed in their Hall had been turned to face the wall.\footnote{‘Personalia’, \textit{Musical Herald}, 1 Mar. 1915, p. 126. Richter died in Bayreuth on 5 Dec. 1916.}

Writing to Adrian Boult when newspapers were reporting on the deployment of asphyxiating chlorine gas by the Germans during the Second Battle of Ypres in late April 1915, Hubert Parry explained: ‘It is so important to keep music going in these distracting times.’ He went on: ‘[The Committee of Music in Wartime] may possibly have been in communication with you, as they are trying to get reports from all Musical Societies and Concert givers with the view of gauging the amount of outofworkness [sic] there is among musicians, and helping where they can.’\footnote{Lhl Add. MS 60499, Boult Papers, vol. ii, letter from Parry to Boult (27 Apr. 1915), fos. 56r–57r.} The Professional Classes War Relief Council and the Music in War Time Committee (chaired by Parry) had amalgamated on 1 January 1915.\footnote{‘Musical Notes. “Music in War Time”’, Birmingham Mail, 5 Feb. 1915, p. 3. It states that the Committee of Music in Wartime had received donations totaling £817.0s.2d since its formation in October. It had started putting on events in October and engaged 146 performers at fifty-two concerts. For further context see Claire Hirshfield, ‘Musical Performance in Wartime: 1914–1918’, \textit{Music Review}, 53/4 (1992), 291–304.} The Committee maintained a register of available musicians and involved the London and Birmingham music college principals (Alexander Mackenzie, Parry, Ronald, Frederick Bridge, and Granville Bantock). By the end of July it was reported that the Committee had given engagements to 1,300 artists.\footnote{Counterpoint, ‘Music and Musician’s [sic]: A Causerie on Current Topics. Modern German Music Banned’, \textit{Newcastle Journal}, 30 July 1915, p. 8.} Yet the musical editor of \textit{The Times} newspaper, H. C. Colles, described the Committee’s work as a ‘palliative’, noting the minimal fees earned by these musicians.\footnote{H. C. Colles, ‘Music in War-Time’, \textit{Proceedings of the Musical Association}, 41st session (1914–15), 7.} Anti-German feeling was stirred up still more on 7 May 1915 when the sinking of the Cunard ocean liner RMS Lusitania, torpedoed by a German submarine, caused the loss of 1,200 lives. That same month, writing for the \textit{Fortnightly Review}, Isidore de Lara (a leading figure in providing work for musicians and promoting British music through the War Emergency Entertainments initiative) wrote rousingly: ‘in the domains of what is known as serious music, for a very long period Germany was the...
Svengali of Britannia, who could only sing when under her hypnotic influence’. Ernest Newman, meanwhile, was reported to have said ‘that in becoming anti-German the British public has not become notably Pro-British [sic]. The fear is that the public will merely cast out the German idol to give its heart as wholly to idols of French and Russian origin’. Starting on Saturday, 31 May, Thomas Beecham and Ronald mounted their short-lived Promenade Concerts, offering programmes excluding German music. Runciman’s review of these Concerts railed against focusing on any one nationality of music in programmes. Ronald later recalled the failed formula:

there was a goodly audience to give us an enthusiastic greeting. We were quite pleased and thought we had ‘struck “ile”’. On Monday June 2nd, London was favoured by the first visit of a Zeppelin … We made one great mistake. We undertook to eliminate German music entirely. Imagine programme after programme without one work by Bach, Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Brahms and above all Wagner! We were asking for trouble and we got it! But I repeat the whole season was a joy to us and I do not regret one thing in connection with it except perhaps the fact that it will never be repeated.

In June 1915 J. Morton Hutcheson, the musical director for the Premier Electric Cinema chain, exhorted readers of The Bioscope, in stirring terms that were perhaps inspired by the recently deceased Lord Kitchener: ‘Wake up, musicians of Britain,’ and have every enemy musician out of your orchestra, or, as sure as I write these lines, you will find, at the end of the war, every position worth having in this country as a musician will be held by a foreigner.’ In the following month it was reported that Robert Newman and Henry Wood’s Queen’s Hall promenade concert season would exclude music by any living German composers. Wood was subsequently described as ‘too sane to fall a victim to those cranks who advise us to cut off our nose to spite our face by banishing German music’. In October the Philharmonic Society agreed to delete the names of alien enemies from its honorary membership: Max Bruch, Jan Kubelik, Sophie Menter, Arthur Nikisch, Hans Richter, Richard Strauss, and Franz Ondrick were removed; protests subsequently took place against the removal of Czech names in May 1916. Tracing the shifting wartime discourse surrounding the continued programming of German repertory, the universality of composers, and the ethical issues this raised lies beyond the scope of the discussion here. Nevertheless, Beecham and Ronald’s very public attempt to test the appetite among
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69 Lbl RPS MS 277, Minutes of General Meetings (1891–1918), fo. 215’ (9 Oct. 1915), fo. 222’ (27 May 1916).
audiences for a menu that excised the music of German composers, living and dead, exemplifies the struggle to exert visible patriotic action in the field of concert giving. Their failed formula (lasting one season only), followed by Newman and Wood’s inclusion of dead German composers, was tried less than a year before Ronald became the long-serving chair of the MCA. It is therefore perhaps no coincidence that the MCA’s ambitions did not extend to an attempt to exert control over programming.

New forms of propaganda and widened conscription reinforced nationalistic fervour as 1915 drew to a close and 1916 began. Some British conductors found their work promoted and recognized as at least the equal of long-revered foreign exponents. In November 1915, for example, the Manchester Courier stated that even five or ten years earlier only a German conductor could ‘fill a Richter’s shoes’, yet ‘To-day the lesser Bayreuth divinities assume as shadowy shapes in our mind as the lesser lights of an older Olympus. Beecham, Wood, Ronald, Harty … bid fair to dwarf the imported heroes of the past.’ From December onwards, propaganda and reportage included compelling and popular cinematic records of life at the front. In November 1915, for example, the Manchester Courier stated that even five or ten years earlier only a German conductor could ‘fill a Richter’s shoes’, yet ‘To-day the lesser Bayreuth divinities assume as shadowy shapes in our mind as the lesser lights of an older Olympus. Beecham, Wood, Ronald, Harty … bid fair to dwarf the imported heroes of the past.’ From December onwards, propaganda and reportage included compelling and popular cinematic records of life at the front.71

Asquith’s coalition government passed the Military Service Act in January 1916, in the wake of the Derby Scheme of national registration, which effectively required all men between the ages of 18 and 40 to enlist.73 Beecham, who came under the parliamentary spotlight as a potential conscript in November that year, recalled the words of a Labour MP in the Midlands who observed that mandatory conscription would have caused ‘revolution in the land’ had it been imposed only a few months earlier.74 The war was bloody; the allies were in a very weak position, and reports from the front were horrifying.

FORERUNNERS OF THE MCA
There had been forerunners to the MCA but none with the specific cause, membership, and impetus generated by the collision of wartime pressures and complex infrastructural problems within the music profession in 1916. A number of men who later belonged to the MCA had been associated back in 1897 with a short-lived, all-male Musical Directors’ Association [MDA], which had appointed a liquidator by 23 April 1901 and went on to be declared bankrupt by 5 February 1903.75 Incorporated in 1900, with a membership of 196, the MDA owned premises at 46 Chandos Street in London that served as a club for librettists, musical directors, and theatre managers. Its memorandum of association provided not only for social intercourse between its members, but also for the discussion of matters of interest to musical directors and the

---

71 'British Conductors’, Musical Herald, 812 (1 Nov. 1915), 504. (The article quotes the Manchester Courier directly.)
72 Laura Ugolini, Civvies: Middle-Class Men on the English Home Front 1914–18 (Manchester, 2013), 45.
acquisition and management of a library. As a member, James M. Glover explained to *The Era* that the MDA sought to eliminate deputizing and the activities of ‘farmer conductors’ (who underpaid players, keeping the lion’s share to themselves) while creating a community among its members.76 Lieutenant-Colonel John Mackenzie-Rogan, who served on the front in 1916 as bandmaster of the Coldstream Guards, later recalled:

Soon after I came home from India in the early ‘nineties I joined the London Musical Directors’ Club, to which all the principal London conductors at that time belonged . . . there on Sunday afternoons M. Paderewski would occasionally come in for an hour with one of our members. The great artist was quite at home in that Bohemian gathering and would sit down at the piano without ceremony and delight us with his matchless music.77

Fourteen MDA shareholders, including Mackenzie-Rogan, later joined the MCA.78

In 1913 the AMU had set up a Musical Directors’ Section. J. B. Williams wrote to *The Stage* clarifying its complete separation from the Choral Section and emphasizing the need to correct Glover’s misunderstanding of its status and purpose. Musical Directors’ Section members had to belong to the AMU already; Williams explained that its role was to improve musical directors’ pay and job security.79 A report from the Wolverhampton branch stressed the need for unity between musical directors and their players and the closed shop created between Musical Directors’ Section members and AMU bands.80 In May 1914 the AMU’s Executive Committee decided that since musical directors had a section of their own they should not sit on committees in small branches lest their influence become ‘too great’. Detailed regulations ensured that the Musical Directors’ Sections could not take action in relation to disputes or the creation of by-laws without the Executive Committee’s approval.81 Vexatious struggles of control and status inherent in the roles of musical directors were therefore on the table.

**FORMATION OF THE MCA IN 1916**

Although there appears to be no institutional archive for the MCA, a printed document detailing the MCA’s constitution and membership (at, or after, April 1917) survives among the papers of Alick Maclean, the conductor of Scarborough’s Spa Orchestra.82 As discussed below, it includes amendments to original wordings and membership lists. Two formational meetings took place on 10 and 17 March 1916. The MCA’s then ‘protem.’ Hon. Sec., Howard Carr (composer-conductor at the Adelphi Theatre), enclosed the confidential minutes of the meetings in correspondence with Bantock (Principal of the Birmingham and Midland Institute and Professor of Music

76 ‘The Musical Directors’ Association. A Chat with Mr James M. Glover’, *The Era*, 24 Mar. 1900, p. 11. In relation to farmer conductors, Glover was quoted as follows: “Farming” an orchestra has for many years been a persistent vice in the theatrical firmament of the West-end of London. It has grown to be a scandal . . . The “farmer” took a lump sum for his own services as musical director and a band of so many performers. The result of this was that it frequently happened that a guinea or twenty-five shillings per week was paid to each unfortunate musician, while the farmer commandeered the rest.’


81 STlU MU/2/1/3, Executive Committee Minutes (1909–17), 290 (15 May 1914), 308 (3 Sept. 1914), 347 (2 and 3 Apr. 1914).

82 Lbl MS Mus. 204, fos. 144r–150v.
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at the University of Birmingham). The minutes of the first informal meeting on 10 March, held at the Coliseum and chaired by Glover, reveal that the term ‘directors’ was adopted in the unanimous resolution that ‘an association of Musical Directors for protective interests should be established immediately’. Whereas these minutes described the attendees as ‘Orchestral and Theatrical Conductors’, the minutes of the follow-up meeting (in the Club Room at Gatti’s restaurant on 17 March) used the terms ‘Orchestral Conductors, and Musical Directors’. At this second meeting, under Cowen’s chairmanship, Glover’s motion to form ‘An Association of Musical Directors’ and to establish a ‘General Committee with a small Executive Committee’ empowered to draw up legally watertight rules for the Association’s ‘various activities’ was unanimously adopted. A further general meeting on 22 March ‘of Musical Directors and Orchestral Conductors’ (at Simpson’s Restaurant, on The Strand) was agreed upon. No evidence of the attendance or outcomes of that third meeting has been found. What is clear from the extant minutes is that the use of labels in respect of the new organization was unstable. By April 1917 its formal title was the ‘Musical Conductors’ Association’; fourteen of the men who attended both initial meetings (or sent letters of regret) were listed as members of the Executive Council.

Carr’s letter, dated 20 March, requested Bantock’s influential support for—and views on—the proposals. He explained that the NOA’s alleged plan to insist that theatrical conductors should be signed up members of its organization—effectively creating a closed shop—had sparked the instigation of the new association. Carr stated that the new association considered working relations between ‘the great majority of conductors and their men’ to be good and abhorred the prospect of ‘the submission of the orchestral director to his orchestra’s union’. These avowals encapsulated the new association’s essential premiss: it wanted to assert and safeguard professional separation, control, and autonomy for—and between—British conductors.

RESPONSES TO THE MCA IN 1916

The MCA’s foundation does not appear to have attracted extensive press coverage. The April Budget came soon after, bringing with it the Entertainments Tax, which increased ticket prices; musical organizations looked for loopholes including classification of their events as ‘educational’ to avoid imposing the additional charges. In April 1916 the theatre-focused newspaper The Era reported: ‘The object of the association is to raise the standard of orchestral playing and aims at nothing of an aggressive character either in relation to managers or musicians.’ In July ‘Musicus’ defined the conductor as ‘the middle man’ in the broadsheet Daily Telegraph and welcomed the MCA as a vessel through which conductors could ensure ‘justice’ was done to employers and employees alike. In August, Edwin Evans provided an appraisal in the literary magazine the English Review. He noted the need for cooperation between the MCA

84 Frederic Cowen; Landon Ronald; Howard Carr; Leon Bassett; Ernest Bucalossi; Albert Cazabon; Alfred Dove; Percy Fletcher; Albert Fox; Julian Jones; Norman O’Neill; Howard Talbot; J. Weaver; Christopher Wilson.
and NOA and also looked beyond the armed conflict, urging for continued anti-alien measures:

Another movement for the protection of English music is in progress. Hitherto the theatrical conductor has been ground between the upper millstone of the Associated Theatrical Managers and the nether millstone of the Orchestral Association. He is now to have his own organisation, which will be English in character, and will work primarily for the exclusion of the foreign intruder in a field in which our native musicians have proved their competence to do all that is required of them. Although by far the greatest number of conductors in this country are attached to places of entertainment, the Association includes, as it should, most of the acknowledged leaders of the profession, and its executive committee is a strong one, as it will need to be for the work that awaits it. To mention only one problem of the future it will be its duty to cooperate with the orchestral association in ensuring the return to their posts of the musicians who have now joined their colours, and have been in many cases replaced with neutrals and allies. It would be a scandal if they returned to find the foreign bandsman more firmly established than ever.88

It was also in August that the Daily Telegraph’s Robin H. Legge provided an extended analytical response to the MCA’s formation and intent.89 Some scepticism notwithstanding, he emphasized the healthy context in which organizations were planning ahead for post-war circumstances. Legge couched his critique as a means to assist in finding greater clarity and practical efficacy for the MCA. He argued that its ethos seemed to stem from the blinkered perspective of a mere handful of ‘local’ London-based orchestral conductors who might be in a position to face down an entire orchestra over refusing to admit foreign players. He questioned this seemingly London-centric membership given that musical directors as well as orchestral conductors were welcome. Legge understood that Stanford was on the Honorary Council and highlighted Beecham’s absence. His close analysis centred on three of the rules which he cited as nos. 2, 17, and 18:

[2.] ‘... mutual protection of the professional interests of its members, who shall consist of British subjects, who have been musical conductors in this country for a period of not less than six months’;

[17. & 18.] ‘In the one it is declared that “No candidate is eligible who belongs to a musicians’ society or association, other than a sick fund or benefit society”; in the other, that “No member of this association shall be, or remain, a member of any association or [recte of] orchestral musicians, other than sick fund or benefit society, after he has been elected to this society.”

Pointedly, he questioned the muddiness caused by the double-jobbing dilemma:

what is, or is to be, the position of the man in a variety show who directs the music for a day or a week or a month, or for the run of such and such a piece, when at the end of the run he reverts to type, as it were, that is, he returns to his old familiar place as a member of the orchestra, which temporarily he has been conducting? Does he become an orchestral player temporarily promoted, and if so does he come under Rule 2? Or, when he rejoins his orchestra as a player therein is he a musical conductor temporarily debased? (I used this word in no offensive sense, of course.)

Legge viewed rules 2, 17, and 18 as just one likely cause of limited success for the MCA venture given their exclusion of those who worked as both conductors and players and their apparent disregard for cinema and provincial music-hall conductors, many of whom were already in the AMU or NOA. He also doubted the MCA’s ability to enforce foreign conductor exclusion, should an orchestra collectively refuse to comply with it, unless the instruction came from MCA members whose sole occupation was conducting.

Legge’s analytical appraisal of the fledgling MCA’s constitution and likely reach provoked further clarification by its Honorary Secretary. Carr refuted Legge’s comments in a letter published in the NOA’s October 1916 Monthly Report. Emphasizing the inclusivity and lack of self-serving aggrandisement among the MCA’s members, he described the MCA as ‘an official society of musical conductors’ with guiding rules that aimed to improve the ‘status of the British musician ... whether he be conductor, instrumentalist, or composer’. These messages echoed the sentiments espoused in a letter Carr had written to the Pall Mall Gazette earlier that month. Signing off that letter with his MCA job title, Carr wrote passionately about the Philharmonic Society concerts, issues surrounding the programming of non-German repertory and the conflict between conductors and orchestras hungry to programme new ‘un-German’ music, and audiences who voted with their feet in favour of familiar foreign works. Clearly the MCA had work to do to find its position and define its rules; Legge’s detailed appraisal sparked public clarification by the MCA, which, although not accounted for in the direct evidence available, may well have resulted from further internal discussion.

Certainly, in the light of Legge’s critique and Carr’s response, it is notable that the April 1917 version of the MCA’s constitution conflated Rules 17 and 18, viz: ‘18. No member of the Association shall be, or remain, a member of any association of orchestral musicians, other than a sick fund or benefit society, after he has been elected to this Association.’ By narrowing it to ‘orchestral association’ this amendment removed the inaccessibility to membership previously imposed by the proviso of ‘musicians’ society or association’. The opportunity to join the MCA was broadened under this rewording. This emendation, made against the backdrop of competing organizations, shows a responsiveness to criticism and practical circumstances among the MCA’s leadership. This was at a time when the AMU Manchester Branch, for example, passed a motion that ‘no member of the A.M.U. who becomes Conductor of an Orchestra should attend Branch meetings, or become a Branch Official. Should any of our members who are Conductors give up the position of M.D. they will then be treated as ordinary members.’ Meanwhile the Committee of the Fabian Research Department on the Control of Industries had issued a draft report problematizing the issues surrounding the professional organization of musicians. That report highlighted—but did not offer a remedy for—the profession’s inherently diverse specialisms, non-specialisms, and executant discipline distinctions.

---


91 ‘Other People’s Views. To the Editor of the “Pall Mall Gazette”, Howard Carr, Hon. Sec., the Association of Musical Conductors, “A German Festival”’, Pall Mall Gazette, 2 Oct. 1916, p. 4.


By stating and redefining the distinct role and status of British conductors within the wider profession, while trying to improve orchestral conditions and coordinate and monitor available work, the MCA filled a gap in the web of active negotiating bodies. Its separation of conductors into an independent association gave it a distinctive identity and purpose. It entered the fray at a time when the AMU was advocating collective unionized action among its members and outlawing individual protest and local strikes. The MCA gained a bargaining role on the Conciliation Board alongside the Theatrical Managers’ Association, the Society of West End Managers, and the Joint Committee of the NOA and the AMU. Its practical efforts included acting as an agency for conductors and serving as a conduit for legal advice. Nationalist intentions underpinned its inclusive rallying cry to recruit conductors in concerts, theatres, music halls, cinemas, and restaurants. Membership was restricted to British subjects with evidence of active roles as conductors for a minimum of six months.94

The MCA’s four ‘chief aims’ summarized its purpose as a mutual protection association:

(a) To exclude enemy aliens from occupying any permanent position in British orchestras, either as conductor or instrumentalist.
(b) To limit foreign competition.
(c) To secure for the British conductor an independent and unprejudiced status.
(d) To promote a closer fellowship between conductors, and foster a united national spirit amongst them.95

This quartet of intentions is revealing. The tone is moderate—enemy aliens to be excluded from permanent orchestral and conducting jobs; foreign competition to be limited rather than eradicated (making room for foreign allies); establishing a separate independent professional status for the British conductor so that ‘his orchestra’s union’ could not exert control over him.96 A nationalistic ethos is emphasized; the generation of improved connections between conductors is redolent of the benefits enjoyed in the gentlemen’s clubs and Masonic lodges to which so many MCA members belonged.

The MCA’s top-down understanding of the conductor’s role was reflected in its two-tier governance structure, which headlined six public figures on its Honorary Council. Twenty-five rules were imposed under the direction of an Executive Council, chaired by Ronald. Three honorary roles (secretary, treasurer, and solicitor) were created, whose incumbents were empowered to attend the Executive Council meetings ex officio with General Meeting voting rights only. According to the April 1917 listing, the role of honorary secretary and honorary treasurer was in the hands of one individual: Carr. Fostering a democratic and inclusive approach to its membership, Rule 13 established an advisory committee comprising the Chairman, three honorary officers and ‘three unofficial members ... to act as an advisory board to the Association, and

94 Lbl MS Mus. 204, fo. 147r–v. ‘In view of the frequent applications by Theatrical Managers and Agents to the Association for conductors, members requiring engagements should notify the Hon. Sec. to that effect; stating the nature of the work desired—light opera, revue, entr’acte, etc., and whether for town, country or tour. Such members must inform the Hon. Sec. immediately on an engagement being secured.’
95 Lbl MS Mus. 204, ‘Foreword’ at fo. 147.
96 See Carr’s statement to Bantock (20 Mar. 1916) in Foreman, From Parry to Britten, 83: ‘You will see that the immediate reason for the discussions was the proposed action of the National Orchestral Association—which, if allowed to mature, would mean the submission of the orchestral director to his orchestra’s union. This arrangement it is believed, would be highly prejudicial to the good relations so necessary to good work, which now exists between the great majority of conductors and their men.’
consider means for its progress and enlargement’. The plan was that one unofficial
member would serve for four weeks before retiring and allowing a replacement from
the wider membership so that, in rotation, all members would have a voice. An
Annual General Meeting was codified under Rule 16 and measures to address person-
al propriety and any misconduct under Rule 17. Beyond these and the regulations
governing subscriptions (10s. 6d p.a. with entrance fee of 5s. paid within a month of
election), Council powers to adopt standing orders, and matters concerning voting and
meeting etiquette, Rules 18–24 addressed the agency and exclusivity of the Association
and determined that members: [18.] could not belong to any of the other orchestral
associations (other than sick fund or benefit); [19.] must positively discriminate in fa-
vour of British players and seek to retain jobs for musicians returning from HM
Forces; [20.] should ensure that illegal or dishonourable quitting of engagements ren-
dered musicians ineligible for engagement by MCA members prior to vetting by the
MCA; [21.] must supply personnel lists on a monthly basis (excepting concert orches-
tras) to the MCA enabling the MCA to monitor and track engagements; [22., 23., and
24.,] defer only to their employer and the MCA in matters of dispute and deal with
musicians directly wherever possible. These ambitious goals put considerable responsi-

MCA: MEMBERSHIP, GOVERNANCE, AND MANAGEMENT
The April 1917 membership list shows that sixty-two conductors of concert, municipal,
and spa orchestras, theatres, music halls, and military bands had signed up; all of them
were male. Although conducting remained a predominantly masculine preserve,
women conductors were working with all-women seaside and theatre orchestras. The
limited role of women activists in the MU’s history has been noted by scholars and
puts the absence of women MCA members into a wider perspective.97 A dearth of evi-
dence relating to direct efforts to include or exclude women from the MCA inhibits a
more detailed analysis of this point. Appendix 2, Tables 1 and 2 contextualize the pub-
ished MCA membership list. Although not comprehensive, the data is rich enough to
reveal overall patterns of age, nationality, locational spread, and main spheres of con-
ducting activity. It offers a glimpse of the immensely varied working conditions and
fortunes of conductors of diverse generations and backgrounds with an average age in
the mid-40s. Who’s Who in Music (1915) supplies ample evidence of their memberships
of gentlemen’s clubs including the Eccentric, Green Room, and Savage—places that
provided a space for impromptu encounters, networking, recreation, and dining be-
tween matinee and evening performances. In 1917 most MCA members were
London-based and worked in theatres; a rich first-hand insight into the demanding na-
ture of their roles is found in the Musical Association paper ‘Music to Stage Plays’ (1911)
by the Executive Councillor Norman O’Neill, who was based at London’s Haymarket
Theatre.98

97 The work of the Society of Women Musicians (founded 1911) focused on composition; see Laura Seddon,
‘Gendered Musical Responses to First World War Experiences’, Women’s History Review, 17 (2018), 595–609. For con-
text on Ladies’ Orchestras and their conductors including Rosabel Watson’s professional achievements see Sophie
Fuller, ‘Women Musicians and Professionalism in the Late-Nineteenth and Early-Twentieth Centuries’, in Rosemary
For the role of women in the [A]MU see Williamson and Cloonan, Players’ Work Time.
11), 85–102. For more on O’Neill see Derek Hudson, Norman O’Neill: A Life of Music (1945), new edn. prepared by
Six establishment heavyweights made up the Honorary Council. From the eldest (in his seventies) to the youngest (in his forties) these were: Sir Alexander Mackenzie; Sir Frederic Cowen; Sir Edward Elgar; Edward German; Sir Henry Wood; and, as chair, Landon Ronald. In 1916 four of them were knights, their profiles as orchestral conductors enwrapped in this high-status monarchical endorsement. The influence of the Honorary Council within the profession stemmed not only from their predominantly orchestral conducting activities, but also their portfolio profiles as composers, performers, educationalists, and writers. Wood excepted, all of them were also recognized as composers. As a group they were emblematic of a powerful, separate, high-status function within the conducting profession with authority drawn from combined networks, conducting experience, committee service, and influence. Their naming as members of the Honorary Council was a public statement of shared vision, affiliation, and nationalistic campaigning between figures whose status as conductors was founded on individuality.

That Ronald was Chair of the MCA chimes with his energetic and dominant position at the time. His profile boasted professional work that reflected and went beyond the activities of the wider MCA membership. His conducting experience encompassed opera, theatre, concert, light music, and municipal service; he had also conducted internationally. A Gramophone Company negotiator and artist and the publicity-canny Principal of the GSM (since 1910), he was also a composer and journalist. Within the profession his deliberately self-promoting tactics meant that he was not without his naysayers. Back in March 1909, on the matter of Ronald’s manoeuvring in relation to the conductorship of the New Symphony Orchestra, Delius wrote to Bantock: ‘He [Beecham] is more musical, modern and progressive than Ronald, who is an opportunist of the first water & a courtier – & cares as much for music as your gardener – A weak imitation of Nikisch – we want pioneers, my boy, & men of courage & not bourgeois.’ In August, Beecham wrote to Delius:

I learnt for the first time the other day the secret history of the ‘New Symphony Orchestra’s’ indifference to discipline last Winter and their rejection of my proposals. Just previous they had had a Committee meeting to consider a letter from our friend Landon Ronald in which he said he was prepared to ‘adopt’ the orchestra and make the fortune of everyone in it provided they had nothing more to do with me. This charming document was to an organization created and ‘run’ exclusively by myself for nearly two years and which had received from me £4000 in fees and expenses . . .

The result of this has been that since last Christmas, this orchestra has been playing for no fee at all and paying Landon a salary for his conducting!!!

This very personal perspective alleging that Ronald’s behaviour was ambitious and wily brings important undercurrents to the surface. So too does McVeigh’s recent analysis of Ronald’s very fraught relationship with the LSO (which had ended badly in 1909), in which Ronald emerges as a shrewd strategist whose stated views on positive discrimination in favour of British music were not fulfilled in his own ‘middlebrow’


99 For a detailed discussion of Ronald’s pre-war profile see Palmer, Conductors in Britain, 197–261 et passim.
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programming choices as conductor of the NSO. Yet, for the MCA, Ronald’s strategic skills and recognized efforts to change public understanding of the conductor’s role (‘not merely a composer or a fellow who waggles a stick for the amusement of the audience’) were key assets. The exact process through which he became the MCA Chair is unclear and he did not chair the formational meetings in March 1916. It is possible that he was the chief instigator of the initiative and his newspaper opinion pieces had long since asserted the need to do away with foreigner preference in the British profession. Mackenzie had been Principal of the Royal Academy of Music since 1887 and had achieved recognition as a conductor at home and abroad. Cowen was a very experienced conductor with strong reformatory instincts who had most recently worked with the Scottish Orchestra. Elgar had conducted the LSO (1911–12); he and ‘Lan’ (as Elgar called Ronald) were friends and colleagues. Although no direct evidence of Elgar’s advocacy on behalf of the MCA has come to light, he was a prominent conductor himself. In his outspoken lecture on ‘English Executants’ as Peyton Professor at the University of Birmingham back in November 1905, Elgar had identified the weakness of England’s ‘conducting department’ and urged the introduction of training programmes and increased opportunities. German’s long experience as musical director (particularly in theatres) brought another dimension; then there was Wood’s high profile as a British career conductor: his Queen’s Hall Orchestra and the Promenade Concerts had long been established. In 1913 he had created a precedent by admitting women to his orchestra. As discussed above, the Hon. Secretary, Carr, was composer-conductor at the Adelphi Theatre. Dan Godfrey Jr’s absence from the Honorary Council, given his long-standing and continuing advocacy for British music as the conductor of the Bournemouth Municipal Orchestra, merits further consideration. Although he served on the Executive Council, he was not one of the MCA’s figureheads. Perhaps the sense that the MCA was too heavily weighted to London was reinforced by placements—such as his—outside the headlined Honorary Council.

It is notable that other prominent figures, including Beecham, Bantock, Pitt, and Glover, did not belong to the MCA. The reasons for the recently knighted Beecham’s lack of involvement must have stemmed, at least in part, from his independent financial status. His working operation was self-sufficient: he had no need to get involved in the nitty-gritty of standard professional issues facing other conductors. It may therefore have been galling for the MCA to read this post-conflict description of Beecham in the Manchester Guardian:

Sir Thomas Beecham is something more than the most brilliant meteors in the musical firmament. He differs from other conductors in being armed aesthetically at every point for the operatic problem. He has always drawn opportunity from difficulty, and the war, which made others too diffident for action, made him audacious beyond even the precedent of his own
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106 See, for example, the report on Elgar’s lecture that appeared the next day in the Manchester Guardian: ‘English Executants. Sir E. Elgar’s Criticisms’, Manchester Guardian, 30 Nov. 1905, p. 8.
past. It is largely the result of his endeavours that music in England, instead of declining altogether during the war, has sprung to new birth...108

Bantock’s time was partly absorbed in advocating for the Birmingham municipal orchestra in 1916.109 Records show that he became Hon. Vice President of the AMU Musical Director’s Section for Scotland in late April 1916 when issues around players working with non-member musical directors were under the spotlight.110 Contentious issues of race, gender (equal pay for equal work), and nationality featured in the AMU’s minutes in this period. Bantock was therefore aligned with a union whose wide agenda within the music business was complex and demanding. The MCA’s specific purpose and scope may have appeared limited and inimical to his AMU role. His post-war public activism to ensure continued progress in giving British music a platform was certainly indignant and vocal.111 Percy Pitt, musical director of the Royal Opera at Covent Garden, had sent supportive regrets to the second formational meeting.112 A direct cause for his subsequent non-involvement remains unclear. Although Glover had chaired the first and attended the second of the rallying meetings in March 1916, his later published comments (discussed below) indicate his reservations about the set-up and practical value of the MCA.113

It was London-based theatre conductors who formed the majority within the Executive Council. Highlighting a small number of these individuals and drawing attention to a range of other Executive Council and Ordinary members serves to indicate the web of interconnections, influence, and circumstance that the MCA’s Honorary Council could not alone provide. Among the Executive was Herman Finck (‘the Nikisch of the Music-Halls’),114 who had worked at London’s Palace Theatre since 1892. Son of a Dutch immigrant, his ‘In the Shadows’ had been played as the Titanic sank in 1912 and his recruiting song ‘I’ll Make a Man of You’ was a music hall favourite. Finck featured on The Brèc-a`-Brac Records in 1915, a collection of discs that allowed the popular revue to be enjoyed ‘no matter how remote your home may be from the metropolis of the world’.115 A member of the ‘ACM dinner club’ (Mackenzie, Mackenzie-Rogan, Finck, and German) and a long-standing Savage Club member, his richly textured autobiography captures the sheer variety of work and networks hidden behind the labels and institutional affiliations in Appendix 2, Table 2.116 To take two other examples, Alfred Dove also served on the Executive. He worked as Stoll’s Musical Director and was involved in contentious hiring issues including replacing male players with females. New York-born Howard Talbot was a theatre conductor and leading musical comedy composer whose hits had included The Arcadians (1909); Howard Carr appears to have been his nephew.117 In September 1916

110 GB STIu MU/2/1/3, Executive Committee Minutes (1909–17), Report Committee and Sub-Executive Committee (26 Apr. 1916), 417; Sub-Executive Committee Minutes (17 May 1916), 420.
111 Levi, ‘“Those Damn Foreigners”’, 84.
112 Foreman, From Party to Britten, 83–5.
113 Glover was named as a member of the MCA committee in ‘Musical Conductors’ Association’, The Stage, 13 Apr. 1916, p. 19. He is not listed in the MCA’s Apr. 1917 membership list.
115 ‘Display Ad. 22. No Title’, The Observer, 15 Nov. 1915, p. 5.
117 H. Carr’s mother was Talbot’s sister, Lillie Munkitrick (b. 1858), who had married Edward Carr in 1880.
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Talbot and Finck provided the music for a farce titled ‘The Light Blues’ at the Shaftesbury Theatre.\textsuperscript{118} Two municipal orchestra conductors (Maclean and Godfrey, who, like Ronald, were in their forties), and two military bandmasters (George Miller and Mackenzie-Rogan, both in their early sixties), extended the Executive’s locational and experiential reach to the north and south of England. Godfrey belonged to a dynasty whose influence as military and civilian musicians was far-reaching: Arthur E. Godfrey, a first cousin who worked in theatres, was also a member. Maclean conducted the Scarborough Spa Orchestra, the Chappell Concerts, and the New Queens’ Hall Light Orchestra (1916–23). After his death his wife wrote that it was only strangers who had recognized his ‘exceptional qualities . . . . To his own land he was only “a seaside conductor” among many others’.\textsuperscript{119} When Mackenzie-Rogan’s jubilee as bandmaster of the Coldstream Guards was celebrated at the Queen’s Hall on 31 January 1918, a number of conductors joined him in the programme including German, Mackenzie, Cowen, and Beecham.\textsuperscript{120} The youngest member of the Executive Council, Julius Harrison, who conducted for Beecham’s Opera Company, participated in YMCA Concert Parties at the front, witnessing the effects of gas in 1915 first-hand, describing it as ‘this diabolical weapon of murder’; from 1916 he was signed up to the Royal Flying Corps.\textsuperscript{121}

Files disclosing individual struggles to be exempt from conscription experienced by a number of musical directors in hotels, theatres, and variety halls reveal their punishing schedules and their assertion of special skills and family dependents in support of their cases. Official application files for two MCA members provide vivid evidence of their working lives.\textsuperscript{122} In 1916 both Albert Cazabon (son of a Frenchman) and Aylmer Buesst (Australian by birth) were in their early thirties and worked as solo violinists and musical directors. Cazabon had attended the two formative meetings of the MCA in March 1916 and then served on its Executive Council; Buesst was an Ordinary member. Their written pleas to local and appeals tribunals provide rich evidence of professional pressures, individual ambition, self-definition, and financial and personal circumstances. Both men invoked the need constantly to maintain their practice, to protect their hands from damage through military service, their familial responsibilities, and their involvements with the Voluntary Training Corps. Each man gained exemptions from military service until well into the war.

Married with two young children, Cazabon appealed the failure of his case for exemption at the Hendon urban local tribunal in August 1916. Cazabon worked as a solo violinist, teacher, composer, and musical director. Citing his ‘one-man-business’ as director of the all-British orchestras at London’s New and Criterion Theatres, he argued that these players would be out of work should he be conscripted.\textsuperscript{123} Explaining that he would otherwise forfeit income through his absence from a matinee performance at the Criterion, he requested a change of appointment time for his


\textsuperscript{119} Lbl MS Mus. 204, Joanna Frances Maclean, Autograph Family and Biographical Notes (c. 1935), fo. 107v.

\textsuperscript{120} ‘Music. The 800th Philharmonic Concert’, \textit{The Observer}, 3 Feb. 1918, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{121} Julius Harrison, ‘Somewhere in France: The Adventures of a Concert Party’, \textit{Musical Times}, 56/869 (1 July 1915), 400–1 at 401.


22
appearance at Westminster’s Guildhall. He was granted a temporary three-month ex-
emption while continuing as a member of the Voluntary Training Corps. In
November he successfully applied again, citing the same grounds as before. Cazabon’s
air ministry record indicates that he served in the Royal Flying Corps from June 1917
until March 1919.124

According to a first-hand account, Buesst had been imprisoned in Strangeways
Prison for ten months following the outbreak of war. The story goes that he had fallen
foul not only of his mother’s use of an umlaut prior to the conflict but also of studies
abroad (in Leipzig with Nikisch) that had given his accent a Teutonic inflection.125
Buesst’s applications for exemption from conscription in 1916 show his attestation of
his occupation as a ‘Musical Conductor’ employed at the Aldwych Theatre by
Beecham’s Grand Opera Company. Buesst’s florid letters to local and appeals tribu-
nals include the grounds of his Australian nationality, mention of his two brothers in
active service in France and Egypt and of his own membership of the United Arts
Rifles Volunteers and efforts as a local Volunteer Corps member while on tour with
Beecham’s Grand Opera Company. Following temporary three-month exemptions in
September 1916 and January 1917 he was certified as medically fit in February 1917.
Buesst was called to the Colours in April with a temporary exemption granted until
the end of May. Having been refused permission to appeal to the House of Commons,
he became a Private in the Essex Regiment.126

The same age as Buesst and Cazabon, Hubert Bath was an Ordinary member of
the MCA, engaged through municipal provision as director of music for London
County Council; he later became an important composer of film music. His allegiance
with the MCA’s purpose in 1916 was grounded in activism begun shortly after the out-
break of war. On 30 September 1914 Bath had gathered musicians together at
Pagani’s Restaurant at the meeting to discuss alien musicians.127 At that meeting, Bath
had advocated that a census be taken of the numbers of alien musicians engaged as
conductors, instrumentalists, and choristers, of publishing companies with German
connections, and of restaurant orchestras and travelling opera companies. His lobbying
in this regard had continued in the press.128 Another Ordinary member was the com-
poser and pianist Joseph Holbrooke, whose wider significance and patriotism has re-
cently been reassessed.129 Holbrooke’s two articles in the Saturday Review in October
1916 railed against the continued preference for German music and exponents and
asserted that British conductors were to blame for the lack of British music in concert
programmes. Thus, both he and Bath were vocal in their support of actions aligned
with the MCA’s work. Adding to the bandmaster fraternity within the MCA,
Ordinary member Frederick William Wood was bandmaster of HM Scots Guards and
saw active service in France from April 1916.

124 Lna AIR 76/80/179, Albert George Alfred Cazabon, Air Ministry Officer’s Service Record (6 June 1916–21
University Heraldic & Genealogical Society, 7/3 (Easter Term 2002), 35–8.
128 Bath continued to lobby in this regard. See ‘Why German Conductors: Putting forward a Plea for the All-
129 Paul Watt and Anne-Marie Forbes (eds.), Joseph Holbrooke: Composer, Critic and Musical Patriot (Lanham, Md.,
THE MCA IN WARTIME: IMPACT AND ACTIVITIES IN CONTEXT

The MCA’s activities and impact during the war need to be understood within their wider context. By July 1916 and the devastating Battle of the Somme, the impact of war was being felt on the home front in many ways, including the rising cost of living, limited pub opening hours, restrictions on music halls, and an end to Football Association fixtures.130 Writing for the Daily Mirror in early July, Ronald reinforced his sense of the opportunity the war presented for native musicians: ‘If only we will make up our minds to prohibit the influx of Germans and Austrians after the war a most pernicious handicap to British musicians will have been removed.’131 For the music business, conscription meant that ‘two or three thousand registered orchestral players had enlisted in the Services’.132 Conscription in 1916 intensified deep-rooted problems in the profession: leading players were lost to their orchestras, ‘demand outstripped quality and quality suffered’.133 In August, Malins’s official war film The Battle of the Somme came out, giving cinema audiences an unprecedented sense of the reality of life on the front.134 Partly thanks to military personnel seeking diversion when on leave, the popularity of theatre, cinema, and light music increased.135

Reliable employment for orchestral players seemed to be expanding when plans were cemented in Birmingham in 1916 with the initiation of the Midland Concert Promoters’ Association (President: Lord Mayor, Alderman Neville Chamberlain). It aimed to establish a permanent orchestra in the city and also to act as a concert agency. Wood, Beecham, and Ronald were guests at a luncheon given by Chamberlain in celebration of its foundation; Beecham took the opportunity to promote British music and musicians and to urge for eradication of music festivals.136 Meanwhile, in Manchester, Beecham’s interventions and support led to the involvement of a medley of conductors (Beecham, Ronald, Młynarski, Harty, Harrison, and Eugene Goossens) in Promenade Concerts—‘Twelve Famous Saturdays—Six Famous Conductors’—programming a repertory inclusive of Wagner.137

By November 1916 it was reported that the Board of Trade had ordered the business premises of Bechstein, the German piano manufacturer, to be sold.138 The NOA was vigorously campaigning to raise awareness among its members of its opposition to the engagement of women in Oswald Stoll’s theatres. Castigating conductors who had

136 ‘Musical Development in Birmingham: A Permanent Orchestra’, Manchester Guardian, 26 Sept. 1916, p. 10. This article quoted Beecham describing the festival as an ‘effete, obsolete, and to some extent pernicious institution … the sooner it was done away with the better’. The ‘New Birmingham Orchestra’ was to be short-lived; see Richard Bratby, Forward: 100 Years of the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra (London, 2020), 19–30.
138 ‘News of the Month’, Musical Herald, 1 Nov. 1916, p. 387. As Christopher Fifield discusses, Debenhams took over the premises and it was renamed the Wigmore Hall in the following year; see Ibs and Tillett: The Rise and Fall of a Musical Empire (Aldershot and Burlington, Vt., 2005), 96.
formerly been players and members of the NOA or AMU, it called them blacklegs whose actions enabled the show to go on by agreeing to conduct orchestras including women. MCA members including Alfred Dove (London Coliseum), Walter Hague (Shepherd's Bush Empire), Harry Rattray (Chiswick Empire), and George Saker (London Opera House) were specifically cited as being guilty of this dereliction.\(^{139}\)

Intensified efforts to create a closed shop in the profession are evident, for example, in December 1916 when AMU members were put on special notice to carry their membership cards. This mandatory production of membership identification was to avoid being ‘held up when they come to certain halls in London . . . . Members in orchestras are requested to demand to see the Card of any stranger coming into the orchestra.’\(^{140}\) Meanwhile the Scottish AMU’s Musical Directors’ Section was gathering membership, asserting the concept of the musical director as ‘part and parcel of “the band,” and not something outside of it’, and proudly publicizing the appointment of a musical director member of the Glasgow branch as its new president.\(^{141}\)

In March 1917 the joint AMU–NOA Committee agreed on a number of shared regulations, including ‘That all musicians of alien enemy birth (whether naturalised or otherwise) be barred from membership of either Society, at and from the conclusion of peace.’\(^{142}\) The organizations explicitly stated that persons of ‘friendly or neutral alien birth’ could be admitted upon naturalization. The joint committee also ruled that women musicians were entitled to equal payment and should be encouraged to sign up for membership in order to ‘give effect to such decision’. Meanwhile, Stoll was chairing a Joint Committee of Representatives of the Entertainment Industry whose immediate focus was on issuing 55,000 census forms to managers in order to respond to Chamberlain’s Restricted Occupations Order with meaningful data.\(^{143}\) Ronald represented the MCA on this Committee, which was grappling with the implications of this call to national service among musicians and theatrical workers.\(^{144}\)

In October 1917, when the Theatrical Managers’ Association was dealing with issues arising from the Entertainments Tax, the MCA wrote to arrange a meeting.\(^{145}\) It is not clear if that meeting took place. Amidst concerns about handling the impact of members returning from military service, the AMU announced an amendment to the rules governing the Musical Directors’ Section in August 1918. It tackled a murky area that caused ongoing debate. In May 1918, for example, the AMU London Branch Committee had decided that formulating a definition of the duties of Musical Directors ‘was not expedient’.\(^{146}\) The amendment accounted for aspirant musical


\(^{140}\) STIu MU/1/1/11b, [Headline in bold text], Amalgamated Musicians’ Union Monthly Report and Supplement, no. 206 (Dec. 1916), [1].


\(^{144}\) ‘National Service. A Stage Census. The Restricted Occupations Order’, ibid. 15. Ronald was listed as the representative of ‘Musical Directors’ in this report.


\(^{146}\) STIu MU/4/3/1/1/1/2, London Branch Committee Meetings (Feb. 1914–Mar. 1919), ‘Minutes of the Committee Meeting’ (1 May 1918), unpaginated.
directors and for those who worked as players and also as directors, by making provision for a clear method of dispute escalation.\textsuperscript{147}

In the month prior to the armistice, the AMU’s Executive Committee agreed that the General Secretary together with two other Committee members would represent the Union at future meetings with the MCA. Tantalizingly, a draft letter to the MCA was read and approved, but its contents are unknown.\textsuperscript{148} But what this does show is that the two organizations were in dialogue: this large unionized group had to reckon with the MCA. In 1920 the NOA joined the NFPM, becoming a trade union under the title National Orchestral Union of Professional Musicians [NOUPM].\textsuperscript{149} In 1921, when the AMU and NOUPM merged to become the Musicians’ Union [MU], only a tenth of its approximately 22,000 members had previously belonged to the NOA.\textsuperscript{150}

\textbf{THE MCA AFTER THE WAR: IMPACT AND ACTIVITIES IN CONTEXT}
What then of the MCA’s post-war activities and impact? The problems that had given the MCA its impetus did not end with the armistice. A brief outline of the MCA’s role in the interwar years provides an indication of its profile within a wider profession fraught with internal competition and conflicting affiliations. Legislation in 1919 extended the Aliens Restriction Act (1914) in peacetime; the Aliens Order (1920) tightened these provisions. As Christiane Reinecke’s study of alien governance vividly portrays, this was a time of economic depression, race riots, and protectionist fervour.\textsuperscript{151} In May 1919 Carr wrote vehemently in the \textit{Daily Mail} that ‘all Hun influences’ should be ‘barred out’. Asserting that ‘a new order’ had been created through the conditions of war, he urged that the platform for all-British orchestras and British repertory should be preserved: ‘Composers, conductors, and players are coming out of the khaki in which they fought the Hun. They are preparing for the new battle—and if the nation gives them the proper backing they will defeat the Hun in the theatre and concert-room as completely as he was beaten on the gas-soaked fields of France and Flanders.’\textsuperscript{152} Carr’s comments followed a question on the British musical profession in the House of Commons proposing that ‘all Britishers are reinstated in employment

\textsuperscript{147} Amalgamated Musicians’ Union Monthly Report and Supplement, no. 226 (Aug. 1918), 2. ‘Members of the Union who are or have been M.D.s also members of the Union who aspire to become musical directors, are eligible for membership. Every member joining the section shall make a declaration to conform to the rules of the Section. The entrance fee shall be not less than 10/6, but any member of the Union with membership of three continuous years shall not be called on to pay an entrance fee unless he has secured an engagement at improved terms due to action of the M.D. Section. In the event of any grievance arising between a member and a member of his orchestra, the M.D. Secretary and Branch Secretary shall be communicated with, and if, after a consultation with the parties concerned, an amicable settlement cannot be arrived at, the matter shall be referred to the Branch Committee of the A.M.U. for a decision.’

\textsuperscript{148} STIu MU/2/1/4, Executive Committee Minutes [1917–21], Full E. C. Meeting, London, 8–12 Oct. 1918, pp. 86–7.

\textsuperscript{149} Although the year 1918 is given by Williamson and Cloonan, in \textit{Players’ Work Time}, 60 n. 1, newspaper evidence indicates that this change took place in the summer of 1920. See, for example, ‘General News and Notes. Liverpool District and Trades Unionism’, \textit{The Bioscope}, 29 July 1920, pp. 75–6; ‘Musicians Wanted’, \textit{The Era}, 25 Aug. 1920, p. 4, which reads: ‘Wanted Known, THE NATIONAL ORCHESTRAL ASSOCIATION has been reconstituted and will in future be known as “THE NATIONAL ORCHESTRAL UNION OF PROFESSIONAL MUSICIANS” (registered as a Trade Union). All Professional Musicians are eligible for membership.’

\textsuperscript{150} STIu MU/2/1/4, Executive Committee Minutes [1917–21], Joint Meeting of the Executives of the AMU and NOU (1 July 1921), 319. Williamson and Cloonan, \textit{Players’ Work Time}, 60. Details of the merger are mentioned in Davison, ‘Workers Rights’, 245. Membership statistics are taken from David-Guillou, ‘Early Musicians’ Unions’, 297.

\textsuperscript{151} Reinecke, ‘Governing Aliens’, 48–52.

before those of other nationalities are allowed to be employed in this country'. Sir R. Thorne, the Minister of Labour, responded that he supported this approach but was unable to compel employers to re-engage demobilized musicians. In an effort to prevent the return of foreign players and conductors to usurp British ones, the MCA signed up to a one-year working agreement with the NOA in March 1920. The complexities of such an alliance if it were to be ‘on trade union lines’ were noted in the *Daily Telegraph*. It was also stated that some MCA conductors already belonged to the NOA. The agreement created a closed shop in London West End theatres: conductors agreed to retain current orchestral numbers and work only with NOA members who, in turn, agreed to work only with MCA conductors. This agreement expired on 28 March 1921. The gaze shifted to new nationalities in the context of the Aliens Order of 1920. In October 1921, for example, J. B. Williams spoke on behalf of the MU in relation to a ‘recent outcry about a British conductor being prevented from conducting in Canada’, he was quoted to have stated: ‘The Canadians from their own point of view, are perfectly justified in objecting to the dumping of alien musicians, which throws their local members out of work. We take the same view here about the Americans who are brought over here as tourists and start in first class engagements the day after arrival.’ Ronald decried one-nation foreign market monopolies and asserted that Germany’s pre-war influence had now been supplanted by Russia’s. Meanwhile, providing evidence of developing ideas of value and professional hierarchy delineations, in March 1920 the Manchester Branch of the AMU considered the minimum rates for musical directors with a view to imposing a 70 per cent differential

155 Gu MS Farmer 69/2: this transcript of the MCA–NOA Working Agreement shows that it consisted of 7 clauses:

1. That a Working Agreement between the N.O.U. and the M.C.A. be entered into for the period of twelve months as from Monday, 29 March 1920.
2. The N.O.A. agree that their members will not play under any conductor not a member of the M.C.A. or approved by the M.C.A. and the M.C.A. agree that their members shall not engage or conduct any player not a member of the N.O.U. or approved by the N.O.U. It being understood that this clause applies to the London West-End Theatres only and is not to interfere with any existing arrangements.
3. That the two Associations shall give mutual support in demanding and obtaining such minimum salaries for Players and Conductors as shall be fixed by their respective Executive Committees.
4. That the M.C.A. agree to afford all possible support in keeping up the numerical standard of orchestras.
5. That, when engaging orchestras, members of the M.C.A. agree to send a list of the members they propose to engage to the offices of the N.O.U. to receive their stamp, which shall not be withheld if clause 2 has been complied with.
6. That a Joint Standing Committee of 12 (6 from each Association) be set up to supervise the working of this agreement and to deal with all matters of mutual interest which may arise from time to time (6 to form a quorum)[.] The Secretaries may be present ex officio without power to vote.
7. If a member of either Association shall infringe the articles of this agreement, the Joint Committee shall have power to recommend his Executive Council to inflict such penalty as they may determine.’

156 There had since been discussions and conferences but no agreement other than a letter dated 2 Sept. 1924. Gu MS Farmer 69/11, typed letter on MCA headed paper from Alfred Reynolds (MCA Hon. Sec.) to Dr Farmer (1 Mar. 1929).
above the rate paid to the orchestra leader.\textsuperscript{159} AMU minute books in the 1920s show that any formulation of regulations with regard to those who conducted or directed music was predicated on the provision of a definition of the meanings of these terms.\textsuperscript{160}

The conferral of a knighthood on Ronald, alongside Ethel Smyth, in the 1922 New Year’s Honours List led one newspaper to describe his role partly in terms directly allied to the purpose of the MCA: ‘As a conductor, he has always had at heart the cause of British music, and has also done much for British performers.’\textsuperscript{161} The MCA’s leading members honoured him at a lunch in Gatti’s restaurant (where plans for the MCA had been hatched in 1916), presenting him with a signed silver salver.\textsuperscript{162} Ronald maintained his stance, stating outspokenly the following year when stepping down as conductor of the Scottish Orchestra due to ill-health that as chair of the MCA he hoped that the country would never again see a German at the head of one of its orchestras.\textsuperscript{163}

In October 1922, as a strongly opinionated non-member of the MCA, Glover alleged in The Stage that, although the MCA’s intentions in trying to exclude foreign musicians were good, its work was toothless thanks to the complete absence of any theatre orchestra conductors from its management.\textsuperscript{164} In the following two years, Glover noted the MCA’s annual dinners in his column, thus categorizing it as more of a gentlemen’s club than an activists’ collective.\textsuperscript{165} In 1928, when ideas were afoot to establish a Kinema Conductors Association, Glover again reported that the MCA did ‘little more than hold an annual dinner to keep the members in touch with each other’.\textsuperscript{166} In February 1929 Glover described the MCA as ‘war-time growth’ with a membership comprising ‘some of the highest names in the musical world, mostly in better class light music’. Glover asserted that the landscape had changed and now included a Kinema Musical Directors’ Association and, following Dove’s retirement from the Coliseum, ‘another society’. He concluded that it was now unclear which organization to turn to when arbitration was needed. The MU and ‘one of the musical conductors’ associations’ had reached an ‘impasse’.\textsuperscript{167} By then the MCA’s Honorary Council had expanded to include the principals of the RCM and RAM respectively: Sir Hugh Allen and John Blackwood McEwen.\textsuperscript{168} In March 1929 Sidney Grew’s editorial in The British Musician discussed the initiative then under way to make conductors belong to the MU:

‘P.P.’ of the Evening Standard implies that the lower state of orchestral performance in this country is due to the Musicians’ Union. In an article published on Feb. 1st he describes how the Union is planning to force conductors into membership. Hitherto the Union has recognised

\textsuperscript{159} STTu MU/4/1/1/6, Manchester Branch Minutes (1919–21), unpaginated; see minutes of Branch and of Musical Directors held between 1 Feb. and 16 June 1920.

\textsuperscript{160} STTu MU/2/1/4, Executive Committee Minutes (1917–22).

\textsuperscript{161} ‘Topics of the Hour’, Fulham Chronicle, 13 Jan. 1922, p. 7.


\textsuperscript{168} Gu MS Farmer 69/2. Alfred Reynolds was Hon. Sec. and Ernest Bucalossi was Hon. Treas.
the Musical Conductors’ Association. Now it is forming within itself a ‘Musical Directors’ Association’, to which it is declared that all conductors must belong if members of the Union are to play under them. ‘P.P.’ says, ‘If conductors are forced to become trade unionists, the level of orchestral efficiency in this country, not any too high at the moment, will inevitably and rapidly deteriorate.’ There is more to be said of the matter than that. And what is the position in America and Germany, where the level of orchestral efficiency is high?169

The details of the context within which these negotiations took place at a round-table conference between the MCA and the Musical Directors’ Section of the MU on 21 February 1929 lie beyond the scope of this article.170 The MCA continued to speak up in relation to opportunities for British exponents, for example, at a conference in 1932 between the Ministry of Labour, music society representatives, the BBC, concert agents, and the Incorporated Society of Musicians, when permit requirements for foreign artists were a central issue.171 The thorny problems that affected conductors continued to hinge on questions of professional opportunity and autonomy. What this brief post-war outline shows is that, Glover’s scepticism notwithstanding, more than a decade after the MCA had been founded it had a seat at the table in these negotiations. There is evidence that the MCA remained in existence until at least the late 1930s, when it was one of many institutions and organizations that sent floral tributes to Ronald’s funeral. Strategic and influential, commanding an impressive portfolio career within the music business himself, Ronald had chaired the MCA since its inception. The MCA’s four central aims reflected his published convictions; one of his mantras urged conductors to gain experience and skill across a range of genres and outlets.

CONCLUSIONS

The First World War brought long-standing problems into sharper focus within the music profession. These problems have not previously been examined through the lens of the conductor’s role and status in Britain. Amidst rising xenophobia the MCA asserted a role for the conductor that was a force for more than music-making, fostering individual and collective podium power. It had the potential to exert influence in the interests of British conductors and musicians in an increasingly unionized industry. The MCA’s date of birth, leadership, membership, and protectionist (anti-alien, foreigner-limiting) agenda displays a shared belief in the power of collective effort through a new platform for united action. The fact that the MCA formed after the AMU had established Musical Directors’ Sections indicates its perception of the need for an association inclusive of conductors across the profession who together identified as a discrete branch of it, set apart from the mixtum-gatherum of the AMU.172 The formation of the MCA was an attempt to assert and levy control and autonomy through a collective effort among those in a musical position in which such qualities were increasingly seen as fundamental. Perhaps by calling itself an ‘association’ the MCA sought to align itself with other organizations associated with art rather than labour.

170 Gu MS Farmer 69/11.
172 GB–STIu MU/1/1/11b, Amalgamated Musicians’ Union Monthly Report and Supplement, no. 195 (Jan. 1916), n.p., lists Musical Directors’ Section Secretaries in London, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Ireland (Dublin), and Scotland (Glasgow).
However, the MCA’s bold ambitions were undermined by the slippery problems of definition, identity, and value inherent in the lack of uniformity in the varied contractual circumstances and differing levels of managerial authority attached to the roles of individual conductors. During a time of unprecedented turmoil, the actual impact of its intention to serve the best interests of conductors—while stabilizing, monitoring, and driving orchestral supply among British players—is unclear. Many conductors did not join the MCA. The limited membership demographic was one cause of its diminished agency. The vested interests driven by the composer-conductor status of many of the MCA’s members in promoting British music added to an already complex agenda. The problem of competing affiliations within the profession and the struggles between larger unions and associations to increase market share, create a closed shop, and achieve bargaining dominance was also beyond the MCA’s control. Nevertheless, given that the MCA took part in formal negotiations and had a voice in industry-wide discussions in the early 1930s, it is clear that it remained active and was more than a gentlemen’s club.

At the war’s end the British music profession—conductors included—faced another challenging phase. Were the changes in attitude towards conductors noted in 1920 an inevitable consequence of the realignment of national and international affiliations created by the preceding conflict? To what extent did the MCA’s advocacy play a part in raising conductor-related issues and cause systemic changes? No precise answers can be given to these questions. Nevertheless, this detailed contextualization and analysis has revealed a network of British conductors—some well-known, others previously more obscure. Their MCA connection and endeavour shed fresh light on the inner workings and preoccupations among a group of British conductors who mounted their own campaign as a separate and united branch of the music profession during and after the First World War.

ABSTRACT

This article examines the impetus, aspirations, membership, propaganda, and impact of the Musical Conductors’ Association, founded 10 March 1916. A collective effort to resist foreign invasion of British orchestral life, the MCA provides a lens through which artistic struggles in and out of wartime are brought into sharper focus. During the decades preceding the First World War the function, status, and value of the conductor’s role in Britain had evolved in the thrall of foreign exemplars. This evaluation of the MCA provides new perspectives on a protectionist agenda shared among conductors whose working conditions were diverse. An exploration of unionization within the wider music profession underlines the value placed in the formation of professional societies in this period. Fresh insights emerge in respect of individual and collective agency, networks, collective bargaining, and authority among British conductors who sought to identify themselves as a separate and powerful branch of the music profession.
APPENDIX 1

List of Abbreviations

**Initialisms**

BBC  British Broadcasting Company  
GSM  Guildhall School of Music, London  
LSO  London Symphony Orchestra  
MCA  Musical Conductors’ Association  
[N]OA  [National] Orchestral Association  
NOUPM  National Orchestral Union of Professional Musicians  
NUPM  National Union of Professional Musicians  
RAM  Royal Academy of Music  
RCM  Royal College of Music  

**Library Sigla**

Gu  Glasgow University Library, Special Collections  
Lbl  London, British Library  
Lma  London, Metropolitan Archives  
Lna  London, National Archives, Kew  
STIu  Stirling University Library, Archives and Special Collections  

**Online Sources: Newspapers and Journals**

British Newspaper Archive: <http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk>  
Aberdeen Press and Journal  
The Bioscope  
Birmingham Mail  
Bournemouth Guardian  
Daily Citizen  
Daily Mirror  
The Era  
Fulham Chronicle  
Kinematograph and Lantern Weekly  
Liverpool Daily Post  
Liverpool Echo  
Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser  
Newcastle Journal  
Pall Mall Gazette  
Runcorn Guardian  
Sheffield Independent  
The Stage  

ProQuest Multidisciplinary Database: <www.proquest.com/products-services/british_periodicals.html>  
Answers  
British Musician and Musical News  
The Bystander  
English Review  
The Field, The Country Gentleman’s Newspaper  
Fortnightly Review  
Manchester Guardian  
Musical Herald  
Observer  
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APPENDIX 2

MCA Membership Tables

Information in these tables is drawn from Lbl MS Mus. 204, fos. 144r–150v; censuses, birth, death, divorce, and marriage registers have been accessed through https://www.ancestry.co.uk; H. B. Saxe Wyndham and Geoffrey L’Epine (comp. and ed.), *Who’s Who in Music: A Biographical Record of Contemporary Musicians*, 2nd rev. edn. (London, Bath, New York, and Melbourne: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd, 1915); British Newspaper Archive; ProQuest British Periodicals Collection; Oxford Music Online; and the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

**TABLE 1** MCA members (April 1917) showing MCA role, nationality, and lifespan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MCA Role</th>
<th>Nationality (place of birth if known)</th>
<th>Lifespan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ansell, John</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Brixton, London)</td>
<td>1874–1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath, Hubert</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Barnstaple, Devon)</td>
<td>1883–1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucalossi, Ernest</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British-Italian (London)</td>
<td>[c.]1864–1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buesst, Aylmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian (Melbourne)</td>
<td>1883–1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Howard [Ellis]</td>
<td>Secretary and Treasurer; Honorary Council; Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Manchester)</td>
<td>1881–1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cazabon, Albert</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (St Pancras, London; father French)</td>
<td>1883–1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford, Julian</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Bayswater, London)</td>
<td>1877–1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowen, Frederic</td>
<td>Honorary Council; Executive Council</td>
<td>British (b. Jamaica)</td>
<td>1852–1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Marylebone, London)</td>
<td>[?]1852–1922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MCA Role</th>
<th>Nationality (place of birth if known)</th>
<th>Lifespan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darewski, Max</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Manchester; father Russian)</td>
<td>1894–1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Groot, David</td>
<td>Honorary Council</td>
<td>Dutch (Rotterdam; naturalized British subject 1915)</td>
<td>1881–1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove, Alfred</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Walworth, London)</td>
<td>[c.] 1867–1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgar, Edward</td>
<td>Honorary Council</td>
<td>British (Worcestershire)</td>
<td>1857–1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finck, Herman</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Lambeth; father Dutch immigrant)</td>
<td>1872–1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, Percy</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Derbyshire)</td>
<td>1879–1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Albert [Howard]</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Dulwich, London)</td>
<td>1868–1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German, Edward</td>
<td>Honorary Council</td>
<td>British (Shropshire)</td>
<td>1862–1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimston, Kendal [aka H. Kendal Grimston]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. [?] 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hague, Walter [Forrest]</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (b. USA)</td>
<td>1871–fl. 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haines, Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Manchester)</td>
<td>1879–1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, Julius [Allan Greenway]</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Stourport, Worcester; mother German)</td>
<td>1885–1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harty, Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irish (Hillsborough, Co. Down)</td>
<td>1879–1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbrooke, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Croydon, London)</td>
<td>1878–1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, W. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[not found]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving, K[elville]</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Godalming, Surrey)</td>
<td>1878–1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Stratford, Essex)</td>
<td>1867–1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivimey, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>MCA Role</td>
<td>Nationality (place of birth if known)</td>
<td>Lifespan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobi, [Charles Auguste] Maurice</td>
<td>British (St Pancras, London; father, George Jacobi—German Jew)</td>
<td>1871–1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Edward [‘Teddy’]</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Crewe, Cheshire)</td>
<td>1857–1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, [John] Guy [Sidney]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irish (Dublin)</td>
<td>[c.]1874–1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Julian</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (St James’, London; father Polish; mother German)</td>
<td>b. [?]1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie, Alexander</td>
<td>Honorary Council</td>
<td>British (Edinburgh)</td>
<td>1847–1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclean, Alick</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Eton, Windsor)</td>
<td>1872–1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews, Harry</td>
<td></td>
<td>[not found]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Neill, Norman</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Kennington, London)</td>
<td>1875–1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattray, Harry [Henry E.]</td>
<td></td>
<td>British</td>
<td>[?]1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds, Alfred Charles</td>
<td>[Hon. Secretary by 1922]</td>
<td>British (Liverpool)</td>
<td>1884–1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, George Bainbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Stockton-on-Tees, Durham)</td>
<td>b. 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogan, Captain John Mackenzie-Rogan</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Newport, Isle of Wight)</td>
<td>1855–1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald, Landon</td>
<td>Chairman; Honorary Council;</td>
<td>British (Kensington, London)</td>
<td>1873–1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Forbes</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Farnworth, Lancashire)</td>
<td>[?]1878–1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Harry H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Liverpool Asylum for Orphan Boys)</td>
<td>b. [c.]1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, William</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>American (New York; father Irish)</td>
<td>1865–1928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MCA Role</th>
<th>Nationality (place of birth if known)</th>
<th>Lifespan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talbot, Howard [aka Richard Lansdale Munkittrick]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapp, Frank [Harold]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vousden, Ernest</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Dublin)</td>
<td>b. 1872–fl. 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Theo</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Holborn, London)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver, J[ames]</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>[?1884–1953]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Christopher</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Melbourne, Derbyshire)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe, Ernest</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Nottingham)</td>
<td>b. [?]1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Arthur</td>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>British (Heckmondwicke, Yorkshire)</td>
<td>1875–1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, F. W. [Frederick William]</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Colchester)</td>
<td>1864–1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Henry</td>
<td>Honorary Council</td>
<td>British (London)</td>
<td>1869–1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodville, Ernie [Ernest Isrel]</td>
<td></td>
<td>British (Surrey)</td>
<td>b. [?]1867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**MCA conductor profiles c.1916**

NB. Institutional associations changed regularly for many of these individuals and the information here is therefore not a comprehensive summary of engagements between 1916 and 1918.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age in 1916</th>
<th>Conductor profile</th>
<th>Where based</th>
<th>[where listed]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ansell, John</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>‘conductor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath, Hubert</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London and provinces (inc. Torquay)</td>
<td>‘composer’; German, Athenaeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucalossi, Ernest</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (Squire Bancroft’s Theatre Royal, Haymarket)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buesst, Aylmer [Ellis]</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Opera; theatre</td>
<td>London (touring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Howard [Ellis]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Theatre/short time Harrogate resort orchestra</td>
<td>London (Adelphi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cazabon, Albert</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age in 1916</th>
<th>Conductor profile</th>
<th>Where based</th>
<th>Who’s Who in Music (1915): ‘chosen descriptor’; club membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clifford, Julian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Orchestral; municipal</td>
<td>London (Hampstead) Harrogate; Yorkshire; London; Birmingham</td>
<td>‘composer, conductor, solo pianist’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowen, Frederic</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Orchestral</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>‘composer and conductor’; Arts ‘composer and conductor’; Green Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook, John</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London/touring (The King’s Hammersmith)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darewski, Max</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Theatre (revues)</td>
<td>London (Finsbury Park Empire)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Groot, David</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hotel [violinist]</td>
<td>London (Piccadilly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove, Alfred</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Theatre (Stoll)</td>
<td>London (Coliseum)</td>
<td>‘composer’; Athenaeum; Royal Societies; British Empire ‘orchestral conductor’; Eccentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgar, Edward</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Orchestral/concert</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finck, Herman</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (Palace Theatre)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, Percy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Albert</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German, Edward</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Orchestral/concert/light music/operetta</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>‘composer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey, Arthur</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Municipal Theatre</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>‘orchestral conductor’; Savage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey, Dan [Jr]</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Municipal Orchestra</td>
<td>London (became conductor of Isle of Man Municipal Orchestra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godin, Felix [Harry] Albert Brown</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Orchestral/dance</td>
<td>London (Garrick Theatre and provinces (inc. Torquay)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimston, Kendal [aka H. Kendal Grimston]</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London and provinces (London Opera House from Apr. 1916; previously Liverpool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hague, Walter [Forrest]</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Opera; theatre (Stoll)</td>
<td>London and provinces (London Opera House from Apr. 1916; previously Liverpool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age in 1916</td>
<td>Conductor profile</td>
<td>Where based</td>
<td>[where listed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haines, Herbert Edgar</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Theatre; cinema</td>
<td>Empire, Shepherd’s Bush, and Colwyn Bay</td>
<td>'chosen descriptor'; club membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, Julius [Allan Greenway]</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Opera (Beecham Opera Company)</td>
<td>London (also Royal Flying Corps)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harty, Hamilton</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Orchestral</td>
<td>Peripatetic/active service during WW1 (debut with Hallé Orchestra 1914)</td>
<td>'pianist, composer and conductor'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgecock, Walter [William]</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Orchestral (organist)</td>
<td>London (Crystal Palace Co.)</td>
<td>'conductor, musical director, organist and composer'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuval, Jacques [van den Heuvel]</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (Empire Theatre)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbrooke, Joseph</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>'composer, conductor and pianist'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, W.H.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Corporation band</td>
<td>Sheffield; provincial tours as musical director to Martin Harvey Company; His Majesty’s Theatre, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving, K[elville] Ernst</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (touring)</td>
<td>'violinist and conductor'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivimey, Joseph</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Orchestral</td>
<td>London; Strolling Amateur Orchestral Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobi, [Charles Maurice Auguste]</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London; Alhambra (succeeded his father)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age in 1916</th>
<th>Conductor profile</th>
<th>Where based</th>
<th>[where listed]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Julian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (violinist at Alhambra; conductor of Beka London Orchestra)</td>
<td>‘composer and conductor’; Eccentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, [James] Sidney</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie, Alexander</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Orchestral/concert</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>‘composer and conductor’; Principal of the RAM’; Athenaeum, Garrick, Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclean, Alick</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Municipal Orchestra</td>
<td>Scarborough and London (Scarborough Spa Orchestra; Queen’s Hall Light Orchestra)</td>
<td>‘composer and conductor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews, Harry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Edinburgh (Empire Palace Theatre)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, George [J.]</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Military Bandmaster</td>
<td>Portsmouth (Royal Marines)</td>
<td>‘composer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Neill, Norman</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattray, Harry [Henry E.]</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Theatre (Stoll); Music hall</td>
<td>London (Chiswick Empire)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds, Alfred C[harles]</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Theatre/opera</td>
<td>Peripatetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald, Landon</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Orchestral/concert inc. resorts/theatres</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>‘composer, conductor and pianist’; Savage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Forbes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (fixer for West End comedies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saker, George M. [George Morton Saker]</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Music Hall/theatre (Stoll)</td>
<td>London (Liverpool); Apr. 1916 leaves Liverpool for Shepherd’s Bush Empire, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age in 1916</td>
<td>Conductor profile</td>
<td>Where based</td>
<td>Who's Who in Music (1915): ‘chosen descriptor’; club membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Harry H.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, William</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>King’s trumpeter/bandmaster/captain in Imperial Service Corps</td>
<td>London (LCC Band)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot, Howard</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>‘composer and conductor’; Green Room, Eccentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[aka Richard Lansdale Munkittrick]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapp, Frank</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Municipal Orchestra</td>
<td>Bath (Bath City Municipal Orchestra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vousden, Ernest</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Peripatetic (inc. Leeds, Torquay, London)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Theo</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Theatre and municipal</td>
<td>London (South London Syndicate Halls; Buxton Theatre 1911 onwards; later Eastbourne)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver, James</td>
<td></td>
<td>String band</td>
<td>?Kent (Edenbridge String Band)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Christopher</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (wrote for The Stage)</td>
<td>‘composer and conductor’; Savage, Yorick, London Sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe, Ernest</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Theatre/pavilion/minstrels</td>
<td>Nottingham; Wales (Pontypool Pavillion); touring (Mowhawk, Moore and Burgess Minstrels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Arthur</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London (inc. Shaftesbury and Gaiety Theatres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, F. W.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Military bandmaster</td>
<td>Director of Music, HM Scots Guards 1919–28 (recorded for Columbia and Regal labels 1910–16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Frederick William]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Henry</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Orchestral/concert</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>‘conductor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age in 1916</td>
<td>Conductor profile</td>
<td>Where based</td>
<td>[where listed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodville, Ernie</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1924 Musical Director of Opera House Manchester; pantomime; Broadway; composer, etc.</td>
<td>London</td>
<td><em>Who's Who in Music</em> (1915); ‘chosen descriptor’; club membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>