

# Senza Sordino

January, 1965  
Vol. 3 No. 1

An Inter-Orchestra Newsletter Sponsored by the International Conference of Symphony and Opera Musicians

## NEW YORK PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA

Philharmonic Hall  
New York, N.Y., 10023

November 10, 1964

Herman D. Kenin  
641 Lexington Ave.  
New York, N.Y., 10022

Dear Mr. Kenin:

We, the members of the New York Philharmonic, wish to state emphatically our support of the position taken by the members of the Metropolitan Opera Orchestra. The established payments for television, radio, recordings, doubling etc., made through years of slow advancement, would be dealt a death blow at all future bargaining tables in all phases of music making if the Metropolitan Opera management succeeds in their present contract offers. A guaranteed annual wage is fine but it must be remembered that musicians' skills are not factory assembly line items that package into industry formulae. That the Metropolitan Opera Orchestra men went back to work without a contract demonstrates that the old contract (which in itself was deemed unsatisfactory) is yet superior to the newly proposed one. The new contract would actually threaten the financial progress of all musicians in this country. Every branch of music would rush to sign its musicians to this type of bondage. Managements' savings would be great and musicians' sources of income severely curtailed.

We strongly urge that you, as President of the American Federation of Musicians, take immediate action to bar this type of contract.

Fraternally yours,  
New York Philharmonic  
Orchestra Membership

cc: S. Berman  
Telegram: H. Kenin, A. Manuti

## PHILADELPHIA ORCHESTRA MEMBERS' COMMITTEE

ACADEMY OF MUSIC

Philadelphia, Pa. 19102

President Herman Kennin  
American Federation of Musicians  
Park Ave., N.Y., N.Y.

Dear Sir and Brother:  
The musicians of the Philadelphia Orchestra have voted to unanimously support the Met Opera Orchestra in their struggle against Managements attempt to impose a contract upon them which will turn the clock back for all musicians.

We respectfully urge you to give our colleagues all the assistance at your command, in doing so you will safeguard musicians all over the Federation against an industrial type of contract that lumps Radio, TV and other extra services together and will actually slash their wages.

At this time the musicians should achieve long overdue wage increases and improvements in working conditions that were promised in the Goldberg Award. The remedy is not embodied in Managements offer but instead the musicians are being pressured to accept a contract that will turn back the clock to depression days standards.

Very Sincerely Yours,

*Fred Batchelder*

Fred Batchelder  
Chairman of Philadelphia Members Comm.

<b>DOMESTIC SERVICE</b> Check the class of service desired otherwise the message will be sent as a fast telegram.		<b>INTERNATIONAL SERVICE</b> Check the class of service desired otherwise the message will be sent at the full rate.	
TELEGRAM	DAY LETTER	NIGHT LETTER	TELETYPE
NO. WORDS CL. OF SVC.	TO OR COLL.	CASH NO.	TIME FILED
<b>WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM</b> 1967 (4-65)			NOV 12
W. P. MARSHALL, PRESIDENT CHANGE TO THE ACCOUNT OF <b>Boston Symphony Orchestra                  Players Committee</b>			
Send the following message:			
To: <b>President Kenin</b>			
<b>THE MEMBERS OF THE BOSTON SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA VIGOROUSLY PROTEST THE PROPOSAL OFFERED TO THE METROPOLITAN OPERA MUSICIANS INsofar AS IT AFFECTS RECORDING, T.V., AND MOTION PICTURES. CREDITING RECORDING INCOMES TOWARD WEEKLY SALARY IS IN DIRECT OPPOSITION TO THE PRINCIPLE OF PAY ON PAY UNDER WHICH WE NOW OPERATE. WE REFER TO SEC.IIA.6 OF THE MET OPERA ASSN PROPOSAL. OUR PRESENT TRADE AGREEMENT CALLS FOR ONE WEEK FREE OF CONCERTS AND REHEARSALS AND DEVOTED EXCLUSIVELY TO RECORDING. FOR THIS GUARANTEED WEEK, ALL PLAYERS RECEIVE THEIR INDIVIDUAL SALARY IN ADDITION TO FULL PAYMENT FOR ALL HOURS SPENT IN RECORDING. WE THEREFORE URGE YOU TO PREVENT ANY PROVISION IN THE METROPOLITAN OPERA CONTRACT SUCH AS THE ONE CITED, WHICH WOULD DESTROY LONG ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES OF EMPLOYMENT</b>			
GEORGE ZAZOFSKY, CHM			Sender's telephone number

Next Issue of Senza Sordino  
The Story of the Indianapolis  
Symphony Negotiations

## SENZA SORDINO

*An Inter-Orchestra Newsletter  
Sponsored by the International  
Conference of Symphony and  
Opera Musicians*

Editor ..... Reinhardt Elster  
*Met Opera Orchestra*

### ICSOM OFFICERS

President ..... George Zazofsky  
*Boston Symphony Orch.*

Vice-President ..... Sam Denov  
*Chicago Symphony Orch.*

Secretary ..... Roy V. Cox  
*Detroit Symphony Orch.*

Treasurer ..... Gino Rafaelli  
*Cleveland Symphony Orch.*

#### • **THANK YOU, MR. LAUDENSLAGER**

*ICSOM expresses its deep appreciation to our former Secretary, Mr. Harold Laudenslager of the Detroit Symphony Orchestra, for his splendid efforts and exceptional devotion on behalf of ICSOM. Through his voluntary duties as Secretary he has made a large and lasting contribution to this organization, and we are happy to know that he will still be assisting us in other ways.*

#### • **NEW ICSOM SECRETARY**

Mr. Roy V. Cox of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra is the newly elected Secretary of ICSOM. He is an excellent choice to carry on the work, and we congratulate him for graciously accepting the voluntary burdens of the Secretary's office. Mr. Cox' address is as follows: 49 Bellefontaine St.  
Agincourt, Ontario,  
CANADA

• Orchestras which intend to ratify the by-laws of ICSOM, but as yet have not done so, please do so as soon as possible.

• *Proposed amendments to the ICSOM by-laws must be sent to the ICSOM Secretary before Jan. 1, 1965.*

#### • **THOMPSON BILL (H.R. 11238) DEAD**

It has been reported on good authority that the Thompson Bill, H.R. 11238, is to all intents and purposes dead. The storm of protest against the bill apparently assured its demise. This bill would have removed most members of the AFM, including Symphony Orchestra musicians, from all protection under the Federal Labor Laws.

• *In Washington a "Contract and Rapid Communication Center" was created. This is located in Baltimore. All current contracts and trade agreements must be sent to this center. Address: C.R.C.C.  
George Aranow Jr.  
3614 Eastwood Drive,  
Baltimore, Maryland.*

• The Washington Conference directed the compiling of an up-to-date Fact Chart. If you have accompanying the ICSOM minutes and forward to:  
John Dennis  
3004 S. Columbus St.  
Arlington 6, Virginia  
(Additional forms obtainable  
from ICSOM secretary)

## EDITORIAL

### ICSOM MEETING

The annual meeting of the International Conference of Symphony and Opera Musicians was held in Washington, D.C. last Sept. 10-11-12. The sixteen agenda subjects were well covered during the intensive three-day conference in an atmosphere of quiet determination, confidence and optimism.

Advances in a few areas were noted. However, in the words of a Danish Philosopher, "There is still lots of time before we get too much progress."

The dedication, intelligence, and ethical motivation of the delegates is most impressive. These men (and many more like them) will become the bridge between two worlds—the more practical world of the Symphony Society Board member, and the artistic world of the symphonic musician. Here, in America, exists the potential that "east" and "west" may meet. These men will be the avenue of communication and understanding between these two worlds.

### ICSOM OBJECTIVES

The primary immediate target of the ICSOM remains year-round employment of the fully professional symphony and opera orchestras, with wages equal to that of professors in the leading universities of our country. They demand reasonable job security for these highly-skilled artists. They seek those fringe benefits long-established in most other areas of our society—paid vacation, an adequate pension, paid sick leave, major medical, hospitalization and death benefits.

As a long range objective, the ICSOM evisions the maintenance of a major-status symphonic organization in each of the 50 United States, based on sound and adequate public support. In exploring this objective, ICSOM has given study to the long-range as well as the immediate problems involved. ICSOM is prepared to assist any orchestra association in realizing the above goals.

#### THANK YOU FROM WASHINGTON

The National Symphony Orchestra musicians are most grateful for the generous donations and the letters of support and encouragement received from many Symphony Orchestras and individuals, which helped them very much to bring the strike to a successful conclusion.

## ORCHESTRA NEWS

### HOUSTON SYMPHONY WAGE DISPUTE SETTLED

After a month long deadlock between the Houston Symphony Society and the Musicians, a satisfactory settlement was reached. Gains over the next three years include a \$37.50 across-the-board raise, with the scale reaching \$147.50 the third year; season lengthened from 25 to 29 weeks, and unemployment compensation in the 3rd year.

It was an active first year for the newly-formed Orchestra Committee under Chairman Caesar La Monaca. In the '63-64 season the scale players annual wage was only \$2750. The organization of the Committee gave the orchestra members a stronger voice in contract negotiations. The Society's first offer last Feb. 9th was almost unanimously rejected.

In order to safeguard ratification rights the orchestra submitted an amendment to the local by-laws which was passed unanimously at a membership meeting. This guarantees that all contracted agreements between the Orchestra and the Society must be ratified by a 2/3 majority by secret ballot.

During several weeks of meetings the orchestra maintained a unified stand. After drafting a 3 page "Public Statement on Behalf of the Musicians", (patterned after the one issued by the National Symphony), events moved swiftly. The Society's Executive Committee held an emergency meeting, and the President told the press the prospect of a '64-65 season was "dim". Extensive news coverage presented both sides of the dispute, and for the first time, the true picture of musicians' salaries reached the headlines.

Several meetings were held in the next few days and the Society President proposed a drastic revision of the Society's original offer. In effect, the musicians' 2 year \$30 across-the-board proposal would be met in its entirety, and, in an effort to get a 3 year contract, the Society offered another \$7.50 plus unemployment compensation in the third year. The orchestra voted 73 to 7 to ratify.

The management held meetings with the Committee and the union representative, to work out tour conditions, number of services, etc. New benefits include a regular day off, 7 day paid Christmas vacation, improved tour conditions, a raise in per diem, maximum weekly services reduced from 10 to 8 (with no more than 7 weeks of 9 services), some rehearsals reduced from 3 to 2½ hours. The last two points are to be re-negotiated for the '65-66 season.

The Houston Symphony Orchestra Committee expresses its thanks to Senza Sordino and to the many orchestra committees throughout the country whose assistance and encouragement have been invaluable.

### NEW YORK PHILHARMONIC FIRST WITH YEAR-ROUND CONTRACT

The New York Philharmonic this season becomes the first American orchestra in history—other than the NBC Radio Symphony—to provide its musicians with full employment.

Mr. Harold Schonberg, critic of the N.Y. Times said: "This 52-week contract which includes a month's vacation and a \$10,000 minimum salary, assures the players a kind of financial and emotional security they have not had in the past. And that the Philharmonic has been able to manage this without any kind of Government subsidy is little less than a miracle. The contract will inevitably set a pattern to which all American orchestras will aspire. Philadelphia goes to 52 weeks in 1965-66, and the Boston Symphony for some years has been enjoying almost full employment."

### DENVER SYMPHONY

The following is a report received on the situation in Denver:

For many years this orchestra has had 24 weeks of employment per year, and in fact, some 15 years ago we had 26 weeks. Two years ago our season was cut from 24 down to 20 weeks with the result that morale became very low. At the same time other segments of the community were advancing rapidly. Partly because of the knowledge that other orchestras were making gains while we steadily lost ground, we elected an orchestra committee and began discussions with management and with the union. After a year of such efforts, several important improvements in our contract were achieved and the union granted us the right of ratification. Following still another year of similar negotiations, a 3 year contract was agreed upon. This contract, to go into effect with the 1964-65 season, provides for a 2 week increase each year, ending in a 26 week season in 1966-67. Also, a whopping \$5.00 per week per year increase in the minimum salary resulting in a minimum of \$100.00 per week by 1966. Evidently we have stopped going backward, which is quite a change.

The Symphony Society has appointed a new conductor and music director—Vladimir Golschmann—and a new business manager as well. At this moment the outlook appears very favorable for future improvements. The orchestra is enthusiastic about our new conductor and all signs point to public approval as well.

### WASHINGTON NATIONAL SYMPHONY STRIKE

*Senza Sordino* is happy to report that the situation in Washington, D.C. has improved since the strike last spring. There seems to be an effort to create a better atmosphere, and both the musicians and the management are making efforts to forget the past and build the future.

The National Symphony musicians are indeed fortunate to have a union which has fully supported them through the most difficult times. Much credit must go to the President and the Executive Secretary of the local. They are exceptional officers who seem not only to understand the problems of the symphonic musician at the local level, but at the national level as well.

In the interest of amity and good will, *Senza Sordino* will not make a report on the strike at this time. The 35 day strike was called the longest and most bitter in the history of U.S. Symphony Orchestras.

We look forward to hearing more good news from Washington.

*"We all have a right to criticize the organization of which we are members."—President Manuti*

Met Opera Orchestra Negotiations

## ET TU, 802?

*...there was consternation (in Local 802 headquarters) when the (Met) musicians decided to fight the contract down the line.— "When the musicians turned it down" said one union official "it put us in an awfully bad spot. We have fought for certain things. Now we get them, offer them to the Met orchestra, and they spurn it." (Harold Schonberg, N.Y. Times, 10-11-64)*

The Met Management contract proposal was the only thing Local 802 officials "offered" the Met Opera Musicians. The union officials offered this proposal with the hard sell at a special meeting they called on Sept. 10th. When it became obvious that not just a few, but the entire orchestra was against this "offer", President Manuti resorted to obstructive and delaying tactics in an effort to prevent a vote. The Met orchestra finally forced a (secret ballot) vote which rejected the contract offer 80 to 0. Mr. Manuti then tried to claim the vote was illegal.

When the Met musicians witnessed this shabby episode they could logically assume that their bargaining representatives (1) had ignored orchestra objections to the contract (2) had shown no sign of truly representing the orchestra, and (3) had "fought" to foist a contract on the orchestra the union officials apparently wanted—which also happened to be just what the management wanted.

### PUBLIC GETS ONLY MANAGEMENT VIEWPOINT

The Met management accused the orchestra of striking on the first day of rehearsals. The fact is, the orchestra had actually *not* been notified to report to work. The orchestra made an immediate, generous offer to work under the old contract with no strings (i.e. no retroactive pay) and to continue negotiations. The offer was rejected by management—an unheard of response to such an offer! (Did they want the orchestra to strike so that the contract could be forced on the musicians through arbitration?) Only after the Mayor intervened was the orchestra's offer accepted. The one-sided picture of the negotiations previously appearing in the press could have been changed dramatically in favor of the orchestra—had the union not sat on this big story.

It seems that management's purposes have been served, in effect, by almost everything the union does (or usually, *does not* do.) Local 802 has a full time Public Relations man, but he has, by default, left the press to management. The only known Met orchestra "item" to come from the union and appear

in the press, was the N.Y. Times quote at the top of this article.

### ANOTHER UNION ACTION STUNS ORCHESTRA

Recently, at a critical period in the negotiations. The Met Orchestra was stunned by a management announcement that the union had quietly signed-up 17 fellow met musicians. These 17 non-orchestra staff musicians have previously been included in the orchestra contract. (This contract is alleged to be virtually the same as the one rejected by the orchestra) Management lost no time in exploiting this coup in the press, and in letters sent to individual orchestra members, in an apparent attempt to divide the orchestra and its committee. At least five of these 17 musicians were not present at the "ratification" meeting, which apparently did not use the secret ballot as guaranteed in the local by-laws.

### The "BROKEN RECORD"

Since the record clearly shows that 802 officials generally follow a certain routine formula in negotiations, we must ask: Why, when they are pressed hard for better contract conditions, do they ask for managements "final offer"? Do they speak for management when they say that management can't pay more, and then "recommend" that management's offer be "accepted" (*footnote a*)? Why do they accuse the musicians they are paid to represent of being unreasonable or "unrealistic"? Is it so they can rationalize that they run a responsible union in order to justify agreeing with management, and taking a stand against their own members?

The record shows that this dissident theme has been played (with variations) in the negotiations of the N.Y. Philharmonic, N.Y. City Center, Radio City Music Hall, Broadway Theaters, steady engagement night clubs—and the Met Opera. Can hundreds of the most outstanding musicians all be "out of step" with their union officials? (*footnote b*)

### SERIOUS QUESTIONS

Since the Met orchestra seems seriously hamstrung by very inadequate representation of questionable loyalty, would not further representation of this kind at the bargaining table be a mockery?

Would management allow itself half-hearted representation by someone who did not believe completely in its position? Are musicians entitled to less? Must musicians always be treated as second-class citizens even though they make a first-class cultural contribution? Must the Met musicians pay their union nearly \$50,000 "dues" in a 3 year contract period for this kind of representation?

### Footnotes

For example:

(a) "Mr. Manuti said that the Executive Board had recommended acceptance of the \$10 offer 'on the basis that it was the league's final offer. We believe they meant what they said and that they can't afford to pay more'".

(N.Y. Times 9-18-63)

(b) The Cleveland Orchestra got similar harsh treatment 3 years ago. Their union President was quoted in the press: "I'm proud of this contract. Management told us this was the last drop of blood from them". "If the (Symphony) members don't like it, they have the privilege of quitting."

The Cleveland local signed the contract the day after the orchestra rejected it 85 to 10. Note: Cleveland local President Repp, and Mr. Manuti are fellow International Executive Board Members. (AFM)

The Chicago Symphony Members Committee in Musical America, Feb. 1964, wrote: "We have speaking figuratively, dragged our union representative to the bargaining table, kicking and squealing, when (the union) seemed about to sign the first contract proposal put before them by management."

(N.Y. Times 9-18-63)

