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Abstract

Educational sociologists and philosophers have long recognised that educational institutions play a significant role in shaping as well as supporting societal norms. In the face of growing global social, political, and environmental challenges, should conservatoires be more overt in expressing a mission to sustain and improve the societies in which they are located? In times of ever-increasing scepticism emanating from governments and the broader populace alike about the efficacy of public spending, if not the public sphere itself, this essay suggests it is both timely and necessary for conservatoires to reconsider, reinvigorate and re-articulate their capacity to contribute to broader social goods. Drawing on the authors’ professional experience as well as current literature and debates, the essay is both deliberately provocative and open-ended, articulating a number of points of departure that institutions might consider in addressing the challenge of maintaining and exercising their relevance to broader society.
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Introduction
At the conclusion of the 2012 ‘The Reflective Conservatoire’ conference at the Guildhall School of Music & Drama in London, John Sloboda, a research Professor at that institution, contributed to a final plenary session by challenging assembled delegates to think about how they could better articulate the potential of conservatoires to contribute not just to musical culture but also the needs of broader society. In particular, he asked:

whether conservatoires have any contribution to make to addressing the increasing polarization of modern society, increasing environmental and economic threats, the breakdown of popular trust in the ability of politicians and corporations to work in our interests [and] how conservatoires can work to ensure that [their] activities do not simply address the sickness and brokenness of the prison cell or the hospital ward, but also the shortcomings of the corporate boardroom or of the political system. (Johansen, 2014: 87)

Implicit in Sloboda’s challenge was the recognition of a problem, a threat, and ultimately an opportunity for conservatoire leaders. These in turn have origins partly in broad challenges facing Higher Education as a whole, but they also arise out of the nature of conservatoires themselves. As the name suggests (it is derived from the Latin conservare, ‘to preserve’), they tend to be conservative institutions, defenders of proud and rich traditions, to be sure, but also liable to be suspicious of, and resistant to, change (Tregear, 2014b). A recent report prepared by the US-based College Music Society noted:

Despite repeated calls for change to assure the relevance of curricular content and skill development to music outside the academy, the academy has remained isolated, resistant to change, and too frequently regressive rather than progressive in its approach to undergraduate education. While surface change has occurred to some extent through additive means (i.e. simply providing more courses, more requirements, and more elective opportunities), fundamental changes in priorities, values, perspectives, and implementation have not occurred. (Sarath et al., 2014: 4)

For the conservatoire system in particular, the threat such educational conservatism amplifies is the concurrent, and seemingly inexorable, retreat of the social contract, and associated revenue base, that once empowered and legitimised state support of elite arts education in the West (Danckert, 2015). At the same time, the types of arts organisations that traditionally provided employment pathways for
conservatoire graduates face their own challenges. In the United Kingdom, for instance, grant-in-aid, the annual budget that Arts Council England receives from the UK Department of Culture Media and Sport, has decreased from £453m in 2009–2010 to £350m in 2014–2015. In February 2015, the UK-based National Campaign for the Arts released its ‘Arts Index’ tracking changes in the financial and artistic health of arts organizations between 2007 and 2014, suggesting that despite signs of some good health, they are ‘living on borrowed time’. Board member David Brownlee wrote in the Guardian newspaper (UK) that:

The arts continue to be one of this country’s success stories; they could play an even larger role in helping to unite communities and grow the economy. However, we… worry we have now reached a tipping point where further cuts to funding will permanently damage how the sector supports society. Without new talent and adequate funding, the arts simply won’t deliver the outputs of excellence, inspiration, access for all and the financial benefits – jobs, exports, taxes, international reputation and so on – that our society depends upon. (Brownlee, 2015)

There is a sizable body of political theory which suggests that there is in fact a grim nexus between the decline of state support for the arts and arts education and the rise of globalised economies (Genschel, 2004; Hewison, 2014; Scharpf, 2000). Yet we also live in an age of unprecedented wealth generation. Music education is under pressure in the West not for lack of money, it seems, but for the lack of political will to collect and redistribute enough of it for this purpose or for the arts more generally.

Nevertheless, conservatoire-style education cannot avoid particular scrutiny. Is what it offers still really essential for either the potential student or for the state that might hitherto have generously supported it? Conservatoires arose principally to prepare elite music performers for a career in jazz or classical music performance (Polifonia, 2007). Does this imply, however, that ‘musical excellence’ is a goal pursued principally for the benefit of that individual, if not the kinds of social elites who seem especially to enjoy such music? If so, would a narrow ‘user-pays’ approach to meeting the cost of conservatoire education be so unreasonable?

Such challenges, however, also present an opportunity. As Samuel Johnson famously quipped as he mused upon the recent execution of William Dodd at Tyburn in London in 1777: ‘When a man knows he is to be hanged… it concentrates his mind wonderfully.’ The time, it seems, is right for conservatoires more explicitly to raise and address questions about what (and who) a conservatoire education is for, what sorts of new subjects it might cover, and why its on-going relevance might be important not just for musicians but for all of us.

Four questions that we believe could usefully be addressed explicitly by conservatoires are:

1. How do conservatoires currently express their commitment to society-at-large?
2. How might conservatoires better appear and act as institutions of public service?
3. How might conservatoires work to promote attentive listening to fellow citizens, in acknowledgement not only that it is a basic, human characteristic, but also one increasingly marginalised by the pressures of modern life?

4. How might an evolution of the conservatoire-society relationship be informed by research?

In the expository discussion around these questions that follows, we draw on recent commentary in both the scholarly press and the broader media.

**How do conservatoires currently express their commitment to society-at-large?**

Currently, the kinds of values expressed in the mission statements of European conservatoires include: ‘actively involved in society’; ‘for the benefit of society’; ‘independent, dedicated and reflective members of society’; ‘work responsibly’; ‘responsible citizens’; ‘take initiative in life’; ‘responsible for the welfare of our nation’; ‘strengthening principles of democracy’; ‘respecting human rights’; ‘contribute to society through artistic reflection on it’; and ‘encourage creative, entrepreneurial members of society’ (Jørgensen, 2015). These statements tell us that it is possible for institutions to include societal aims and not only musical and personal ones for their students’ development. Conservatoires can be potentially powerfully transformational because they can be incubators of such a culture that celebrates values somewhat at odds with those most common to consumerist society. Such values are not non-existent, they are only less visible and not as widespread as consumerist, measurable, priorities that confuse ‘value’ with price and measurability. However, only seven of 50 institutions across Northern Europe that we examined found it necessary actually to make such societal aims explicit. Of these, only four institutions stated they wanted to contribute to what could be called the ‘broader development of society’, with explicit statements like ‘social responsibility’, ‘serve the community’, ‘responsibility to society’, ‘a human-centred society’, ‘provide service for society’ and ‘benefit of local and regional communities’. A sceptic might question therefore how deeply the engagement with society really is.

Nevertheless, even if only four out of 50 institutions found it necessary to include such statements it is at least the beginning of a shift in rhetoric if not deed. And in defence of those institutions which lack more explicit statements, one might argue that a positive, engaged, relationship to society is nevertheless implicit in the nature of their curricula. After all, the task of educating future music professionals inevitably requires teaching programmes to strike a balance between meeting and shaping the specific needs of organisations that typically employ conservatoire graduates, and between reflecting and shaping the broader musical tastes of the audiences that sustain them. Conservatoires also typically support a variety of explicit social outreach initiatives, such as programmes that bring musicians into socially deprived areas of cities, or prisons, or that work with refugees or other
marginalized social groups. The motivations for such programmes can range from a desire to provide professional development opportunities for students interested in community music programmes, to meeting obligations directed by external philanthropy, either way they suggest that an institution’s social obligations can and should have concrete expression via the nature of musical activities undertaken.

What is less clear, however, is how these music-specific activities might relate to broader, pressing, societal challenges such as social inequality or climate change, or how music might be a ‘means of liberation and a vehicle for struggle for justice and against injustice’ and not just a palliative (Jorgensen, 2007: 172), and whether such engagement occurs because of, or despite, the education that music graduates may have received in conservatoires.

Musical performance could also be seen to be potentially critical of mainstream consumerist culture because it is an example of the gift economy, that is, because its value cannot be meaningfully captured by the price of a ticket alone. Unlike a traditional marketplace economy, implicit in a performance is a notion of giving; like public values more generally, music’s worth comes ultimately from the fact that it is shared. Conservatoires are potentially powerfully transformational because they can be incubators of such a culture that celebrates values somewhat at odds with those common to society as a whole. There is, however, a tendency to hide such potentially deeper messages behind a glamorous surface of concertising. The kinds of musical performance that remain central to conservatoire curricula are, furthermore, also now commonly portrayed, at least in the UK, as being largely for the benefit of a similarly small, rich elite (Atkinson-Lord 2015; Mason, 2015). A 2015 Warwick University report on the ‘Future of Cultural Value’, for instance, declares that it is the ‘wealthiest, best-educated and least-ethnically diverse 8% of the population’ that dominates attendances at live music events (some 44%).

On the other hand, participation in music in schools by children aged between five and 10 has dropped from 55% to 37% between 2008/2009 and 2013/2014’ (Higgins, 2015; Neelands et al., 2015: 33). Not surprisingly, we can also find increasing amounts of critical public commentary suggesting that musicians themselves are also disproportionately from the same proverbial wealthy elite. For instance, the UK Shadow Minister for the Arts Chris Bryant MP recently stated that ‘the truth is that people who subsidise the arts most are artists themselves. That of course makes it much more difficult if you come from a background where you can’t afford to do that’ (Mason, 2015). And as one Guardian newspaper commentator added by way of postscript, ‘It can also mean [too much] confidence and its evil twin entitlement’ (Lynskey, 2015). Recent research by Dr Christina Scharff at Kings College London gives some evidential support for these views by revealing extensive inequalities at every level of the classical music profession in the UK with regard to sex, class, education and ethnicity (Scharff, 2015; Service, 2015).

Conservatoires are not helped in this arena of cultural politics by the perceived nexus that exists in many countries (especially the United Kingdom and Australia) between classical music in particular and private secondary education – one commonly trumpeted as a point of difference in these schools’ brochures. Such private
schools frequently boast concert halls and other facilities that are far better than what is generally available to the broader community. An emphasis on classical music education can, as a result, appear as little more than an ‘act of class differentiation’ (Tregear, 2014a). But we should be careful not to overemphasize such observations not least because there is unlikely to be a professional class in existence in Western society today to which similar socio-economic observations would not apply. If access to, and investment in, the arts is to be depicted as little more than the posturing of a privileged class over the less privileged, then there is, frankly, little that can be said in favour of public arts education more generally.

Arguably the opposite is the case. That is, an investment that widens access to high-quality cultural education can actually help improve our capacity to think outside the realm of social and political clichés, as Andrew Bowie eloquently argues:

> Anyone who has been involved in the attempt, say, to persuade students who reject it or ignore the value of great music or other art soon realises that most of the rejection comes about because the language that would allow them access to it was never taught to them. Instead, such art is often incorporated into an image of class society, where it is basically for “them”, and not “for the likes of us”. The fact that it is possible to overcome this resistance is not a direct route to political change, but it can and does open up whole new worlds to many people: if that is not political, I do not know what is. (Bowie, 1997: 121)

Concurrently, the disillusionment of young people with the power of traditional structures to deal with the big problems like environmental change and the increasing gap between rich and poor is reflected in the fact that examples of new means of engagement and action are springing up everywhere. We need to make this situation a point of departure for constructively criticizing our society’s wider priorities and the roles given to the arts within it, and not be afraid to suggest directions in which they could move (Apple, 2013). Student musicians could be empowered by conservatoires to engage directly and pro-actively (rather than reactively) in these debates and actions. Even if it is hard to generalise about what this might mean for particular institutions in practice, such discussions need to be encouraged. Certainly, the ways most conservatoires commonly currently express their commitment to society-at-large are likely to have to change.

**How might conservatoires better appear and act as institutions of public service?**

One ‘mission level’ idea might be to adapt and apply a proposal most recently suggested by Alan Lane, the Artistic Director of Slung Low Theatre in West Yorkshire. We might re-envision conservatoires as unashamedly public institutions (just as Western society traditionally likes to think of public broadcasters or public
hospitals or national parks), owned by and for, the communities in which they find themselves. Conservatoires would then be charged with explicitly empowering students with perspectives and attitudes that enable them to be advocates for a renewed sense of public life once they leave, as well as also developing new programmes that more powerfully draw the wider public into their institutional life. Lane noted in support of the idea that the ‘banking crisis, the crumbling of trust in so much of the UK establishment and a profound shrinking of the size of the state means that the society theatres [and conservatoires] sit in [has] completely changed since 1997’. If that is true, then our arts institutions should as well. For, ‘if there was ever a time crying out for a profoundly accessible central place that people could go to be more than a customer then it is now’ (Lane, 2014). The answer to the question posed earlier, then, of ‘who is a conservatoire education ultimately for’, would be simple. It would be unequivocally for all of us.

Conservatoires could also usefully consider to what extent wider debates concerning Universities and their connection to society-at-large might also apply to them. David Russell, a lecturer in English Literature at King’s College London, has, for instance suggested that Universities should be asking themselves whether they are:

...Are they places that train thinking, particularly the critical thinking required if we are to live in a healthy democracy? Do they introduce students, and so the wider culture, to resources of history and art and literature that could make them feel more alive... And if some of these descriptions have come to seem expendable, or luxuries, affordable only by the wealthy few, then I think that’s a serious problem for all of us. (Rickett, 2015)

In a now famous essay for the London Review of Books, Marina Warner similarly was at pains to remind her readership that:

Universities are not businesses. Legally, they are charities, but the closer analogy would be a public coastal path or an urban park, a place created for the good of citizens. The current denaturing of the universities treats them less like a park than a shopping mall. (Warner, 2015)

This is more than window dressing, it could be a key to re-inspiring and reinvigorating conservatoires as agents of positive social change as well as potentially helping to guide the way they might be run. For, as has been argued for Universities, they ‘should not be desperately mimicking already outdated forms of corporate organisation, but rather be leading the way towards something better.’ (Hansson et al., 2015) Terry Eagleton made the shared challenge more explicit when he argued that we should:

...seek to restore the honorable lineage of the university as one of the few arenas in modern society (another is the arts) in which prevailing ideologies can be submitted to
some rigorous scrutiny. What if the value of the humanities lies not in the way they conform to such dominant notions, but in the fact that they don’t?’ (Eagleton, 2015)

Or, as Drew Faust posited in her inauguration address as President of Harvard University, ‘a university looks both backwards and forwards in ways that must – that even ought to – conflict with… immediate concerns or demands’ (Faust, 2007). How such a change of culture at the mission level might impact actual programmes in conservatoire will of course depend on local conditions and circumstances, but there are a few more interconnected ideas relating to change that might need to be considered:

Institute a new definition of musical excellence.

As Ian Pace and others have been drawing attention to in the UK, the rhetoric of musical excellence has been used in troubling ways to camouflage misuse of power (Pace, 2015; Tregear, 2014a). At the very least, the many revelations over the past 2 years from the UK of the damage a system of elite music education can do to vulnerable people should certainly make us more circumspect about praising the cultivation of performing excellence as a self-evidently good thing for students, let alone for society as a whole – a point made recently in an article in the Daily Telegraph (UK) in which the music critic and broadcaster Ivan Hewett posed the question ‘Can talented musicians be well-rounded people?’ (Hewitt, 2013). We must bring the more mysterious side of the culture we have traditionally inhabited out into the daylight and allow it to be inspected, discussed and critiqued. Need it be an inviable premise that the nurturing of individualism and competition between music students is the best, or even the only, way to prepare them for life as an elite performer? Might collaborative learning with their peers help students meet other needs as well, such as safety and belonging? Or, ‘what’s the point of being a great musician if it comes at the cost of a life well lived in a world worth living in?’ (Tregear, 2015). We might also note here, as The Atlantic magazine did recently that Finland has proved that educational systems actually achieve higher standards of excellence more generally if they focus on social equity. Lacking a private school system or standardised national tests, the main driver of education policy was fairness; a higher standard of educational excellence was the welcome byproduct (Partanen, 2011). To be sure, these issues are complex and difficult, but it is surely no longer sustainable to operate as if the teaching of individual musical excellence can be set apart from a broader social context.

Encourage research quality not research quantity

US historian Jacques Berlinerblau wrote recently in the Chronicle of Higher Education that tertiary education institutions of all kinds increasingly ‘resemble the ailing magazine, newspaper and taxi industries: crippled by challenges we never imagined, risks we never calculated, queries we never posed.’ With the
growing pressure on conservatoire staff (in the UK and Australia at least) to mimic the research culture of traditional Universities, we could do well to heed his warning that research, like other nominally socially useful activities, has become a quasi-fetishized ‘key performance indicator’ that can lead to publication and specialisation divorced from its social or educational impact. Nevertheless, in a number of countries, conservatoire-based research has recently been carving out a new and particular identity for itself, realising the unique opportunities that performance-centred institutions present for reflecting on musical practice and its application in a range of societally important interventions, including the beneficial role that music and music-making can play in promoting general and specific health and well-being. The next challenge is to harness this new-found confidence in order to transform our models of learning and teaching so that they, too, are genuinely based on the principles of prioritizing collaborative enquiry and innovation over repetitive and reductive formats. The succinct definition of research as an ‘original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and understanding’ (Research Assessment Exercise 2005, 34) surely applies equally to the process of learning to be a citizen musician. At the very least, if we wish to enable our students ‘effectively to share’ what they discover, let’s also train them to ‘write clearly, speak publicly and teach effectively’ (Berlinerblau, 2015).

Educate not just future performers, but future audiences.

Conservatoire education should be directed towards developing musical leadership of the community as much as in it. We should actively seek out and draw into our fold the music lovers as much as music professionals of the future. In turn, performers should use the platform performance gives them to do more than just entertain. They should seek to make a statement, seek, uncover or offer a truth, a meaning or message about the music they perform that also offers the audience something new to play with (conceptually, intellectually, spiritually and so on), lest their work risk being perceived as merely a pleasant distraction from everyday life or a self-serving indulgence for a privileged group of connoisseurs. Or, to put it another way, their art should be conceived from the outset as more than just servicing a need for entertainment and offering more than just an idle distraction from everyday life.

Teach a curriculum of giving

A conservatoire newly reconceived as a public institution would also always strive to find a more productive (in the best sense) relationship between performer and audience, one that transcends the limitation of a ‘music product provider meets passive customer/consumer’. Ultimately it this may lead to rethinking the very nature of the ‘social contract between student, teacher, and society as a whole’ (Tregear, 2014b). It will proffer a curriculum overtly conscious of its social context
and explicitly recognizing the foundations of generosity and the various forms of social contract, that inform all musical practice.

Arguably, conservatoires have been, or at least have been common considered as, places of privilege, narrowly defined. Reinvigorated as places of public service, we believe they are more likely to maintain broad-based public support and a central role in shaping our musical cultures.

**How might conservatoires work to promote the values of listening as a basic, human characteristic to fellow citizens?**

One particularly powerful public role conservatoires can play is in asking us to listen to music in fundamentally different ways than we do to the sounds that daily surround us. To be sure, our contemporary world is conceived principally through vision: images, symbols, logos, emoticons and so on. We are constantly bombarded by visual impressions, media and advertising, a ‘triumph of spectacle’ as one social critic has put it (Hedges, 2010). And yet, today, auditory problems have become much more common, and noise pollution a significant environment issue in its own right. Theodor Adorno’s 1938 essay ‘On the fetish-character in music and the regression of listening’ detailed a fear that we lose ‘along with freedom of choice and responsibility, the capacity for conscious perception of music’ by ‘listening atomistically and dissociating what we hear’ (Adorno, 2002, 303).

Adorno implies no less a belief than that music can condition the sensibility of the subject who listens to it. But we are increasingly at risk of not appreciating this possibility. As *New Republic* literary editor Leon Wieseltier stated at the commencement ceremony of Brandeis University in 2013, the technological advances ‘to which we have become enslaved, all of them quite astonishing, represent the greatest assault on human attention ever devised: they are engines of mental and spiritual dispersal, which make us wider only by making us less deep’ (Wieseltier, 2013). More particularly, the type of concentrate listening that we traditionally associate with the sorts of music taught in conservatoires is increasingly at odds with the ways most of us now experience music. To better understand and meet the challenges this state of affairs might present for modern society, we require a more critically informed performing and listening public, and this in turn requires music teachers who are not just prepared to describe the musical world they find around them but who are prepared to exercise leadership in it. In this context good listening becomes a synonym for being more present in the world. Listening to, and not just passively enjoying, music can be a means through which we can better engage with others, with ourselves, and with the world-at-large (LaBelle, 2010).

Good listening is, therefore, something conservatoires could help encourage as one agent of transformation we very much need amidst a growing sense of environmental crisis and deficiencies of communication and social cohesion. Perhaps part of the oft-lamented problem of ‘passive’ audiences in concert halls is the sense that the embodied part of the experience of music has become irrelevant, and yet the embodied element of music is core to the experience of hearing it.
encourage listening to musical performances as a ‘point of convergence where the specific and the general come together, music as the most specialized of aesthetics with a discipline entirely specific to it, performance as the general, socially available form of its cultural presentation’ (Said, 1991: 17).

Ultimately, we need better listeners listening to better music because, as Giles Fraser has argued:

The arts should be one of the places to challenge the idea that our political and financial masters have a monopoly on what counts as established reality. [The arts can provide] something we used to call vision, a sense that the world could be otherwise, that our political assumptions can always be turned upside down. That used to be the role of religion. It widened the lens and stimulated the political imagination to consider broader social perspectives. But in a secular age, that responsibility now resides primarily with the arts. (Fraser, 2015)

This is not to say that what conservatoire-trained musicians do can therefore be understood as a self-evident social good. As the author and environmental philosopher Charles Eisenstein has suggested, we could be forgiven for thinking that ‘the most sublime achievements of art, music, literature, science and technology’ are yet ‘built upon the wreckage of the natural world and the misery of its inhabitants... Under the shadow of every Chartres Cathedral, must there be women burning at the stake?’ The underlying challenge for us, more properly expressed, is to explore whether such gifts ‘of technology and culture’ that we now have can ‘somehow be separated from [that] curse’. (Eisenstein, 2013: xv). How might conservatoires promote more critically self-aware modes of listening, modes that would extend out from the concert hall and other rarefied places into everyday life. Can, indeed, better listening lead to also to more critically self-aware modes of doing?

**How might our knowledge of the conservatoire-society relationship be informed by research?**

If we at least accept that conservatoires need to understand what they do, and its social impact, much better, research is the obvious tool to hand. It is already an increasingly prominent part of conservatoire life. In some parts of the world, conservatoires are increasingly finding themselves ranked by the same impact methodologies that governments in Europe and Australasia already apply to Universities. In other places, conservatoires have been merged into larger Universities (Bennett & Franzmann, 2013), a process of academisation (Karlsen et al., 2015) which has led to conservatoire faculty being required to do research in addition to their teaching, not always comfortably (Croft, 2015). A general increase in research on tertiary, or higher, music education (Jørgensen, 2009) as well as a rise in interest in the sociology of music education (Johansen, 2014; Wright, 2010) is one result.
Such research activity in conservatories generally includes one or more of the following areas (Polifonia, 2010):

- Practice-led artistic (performance, composition).
- Musicological and music theoretical topics, often practice-based.
- Music psychology and performance science.
- Music education.

We propose the addition of, if not a new research field, then a widening of the traditional scope of research in music education to include explicit consideration of the sociology and social efficacy of conservatories. Research in this area could help us not just understand better how conservatories function in society but also determine whether there is/can be a definable set of relations between conservatories and society beyond just providing a music educational service. We could also develop better tools to evaluate, and ultimately promote, the benefits and general educational effectiveness of outreach, other community activities, and public artistic programmes. Conservatoire-based research thus could play a particular role in helping conservatories situate themselves more securely and appropriately in society.

It is also possible that conservatories could use research culture to promote a more critical and enquiry-led approach to their day-to-day learning and teaching, perhaps rebalancing the curriculum in favour of students as ‘co-researchers’ in addition to ‘apprentices’, again to encourage them to address wider societal issues. Master’s and doctoral students could also pursue collaborative projects that address broad questions about their own roles as musicians in society.

How conservatories ultimately see their role in society depends on their perceptions of society’s need for the kind of services they provide along with how they can, proactively, influence the ways in which society understands the potential of their contributions. Researchers could explore explicitly how society currently views conservatories and what they want conservatories to offer. Conservatoires could then use the practical and political resources that such research might develop to help prepare their students to become better citizens and not ‘just better’ musicians, people who also have something worthwhile to say about what the ultimate purpose of that ‘better’ might be’ (Tregear, 2014a). Conservatoires would be actively exploring the extent and limits of their social contract, and, indeed, how free they are to do so. Such questions will no doubt require them to reflect more broadly at the institutional and social level on the potency, or otherwise, of the musician to be an agent of social change.

**Conclusion**

In suggesting this agenda, do we risk pushing beyond the practical limitations of the educational brief, let alone resourcing, of the traditional conservatoire? Perhaps, but the alternative might be to risk witnessing conservatoires slide into impotency and irrelevancy, or just as concerning, becoming just another source of
education whose purpose, in the words of commentator George Monbiot is merely ‘to prepare people for jobs they will never have in the service of an economy ordered for the benefit of others.’ (Monbiot, 2015).

The time is ripe, therefore, to reconceive conservatoires now as unashamedly public institutions, overtly and actively engaged with the pressing social issues of our times. Conservatoires may then become better known as institutions that support and nourish not just the dreams and hopes of the talented, elite, performers fortunate to enter their doors, but ultimately the dreams and hopes of us all.
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Note
1. Several conservatoire leaders decided to respond to Sloboda’s challenge and set up a working group with the broad title of ‘conservatoires in society’. Self-nominated, it was able to attract participants from across Europe, North America and Australia. Two face-to-face meetings were held: 24 May 2013 in London and 13–14 January 2014 in Antwerp. Six members of the group decided to develop this essay from what the group had presented at the most recent ‘Reflective Conservatoire’ conference in February 2015.
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