

# Senza Sordino

Official Publication of the International Conference of Symphony & Opera Musicians

VOLUME V

5

APRIL, 1967 — No. 4

## ICSOM CHAIRMAN REPORTS ON AFM MEETINGS — DISCUSSION NIXED, REACTION MIXED



GEORGE ZAZOFSKY, ICSOM CHAIRMAN SAYS,  
"WE NEED A LAWYER!"

At the Los Angeles meeting of ICSOM last September the delegates voted to bring to their orchestras a proposed revision of Article XXII to be presented to their respective orchestras for discussion without delegate recommendation. Soon after, President Kenin called me requesting postponement of discussion until after meeting with him in New York.

### First Meeting

The first meeting took place October 14th, 1966. Present were Messrs. Kenin, Zazofsky, Herrett, Raffaelli, Maisel. Subject, ICSOM's proposed revision of article XXII of A. F. of M. by-laws.

At the outset, it was made clear to President Kenin that ICSOM delegates moved for discussion by member orchestras without recommendation. All the grievances and dissatisfactions, as expressed by delegates, were recounted to President Kenin. The sum total of these complaints led to the general observation that the A. F. of M. and most of its locals were not servicing symphony orchestras ade-

quately. As a result, the economic, physical and emotional well being of the symphony musicians and indeed the proper development of the symphony orchestras involved were being inhibited. President Kenin agreed that some of the frustrations were valid and needed remedial measures and disagreed with others. President Kenin also observed that the proposed Article XXII revision indicated that ICSOM needed help in financing delegate attendance for the annual conference. He assured us that he would devote serious thought and effort to relieve some of the frustrations of symphony musicians after consultation with the I.E.B. The meeting closed with President Kenin arranging a subsequent meeting for mid-November, with Mr. Ballard and Henry Kaiser, Chief counsel for A.F. of M.

### Second Meeting

The second meeting took place December 1, 1966. Present were Messrs. Kenin, Ballard, Wood, Rogers, Zazofsky, Raffaelli, and Maisel. Mr. Kaiser was not present. Subject was continuation of the first meeting. The ensuing discussion was basically along the lines of the first meeting. Mr. Ballard suggested that the A.F. of M. structure could be improved and should be examined, but he felt that a great deal more could be accomplished if the symphony musician were more active on the local level. President Kenin agreed to explore the various ideas toward helping the symphony musician that had been discussed at this and the previous meeting. Among them: financial support from the federation for ICSOM conferences, establishment of the symphony strike fund, redefining symphony orchestras in Article XXII, the possibility of improvement in the three year importee situation, possible amendment of the conference status to fit ICSOM's special requirements, program of education of local officers.

President Kenin once more requested that all discussion of proposed Article XXII be deferred until after the mid-Winter meeting of the IEB with ICSOM officers present.

In response to a question as to the possibility of delegates acting on the Article XXII regardless of his request, President Kenin stated that he was bound, as the head of the A.F. of M. to warn ICSOM that if his request for deferment was not adhered to "serious consequences would ensue."

### Third Meeting

The third meeting was the mid-Winter meeting in Palm Beach, Florida January 26, 1967. Present was the entire IEB, President Emeritus Petrillo, Zazofsky, Herrett, Smiley. Raffaelli could not attend and Maisel was delayed due to airport shut down. Subject; Article XXII. We were questioned for nearly 4 hours relative to needs and aspirations of symphony and opera musicians. We pointed out once more that the resolution to discuss and amend Article XXII was the result of the general frustration of the symphony musician and his sense of helplessness to get relief from his

(Continued Next Page)

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT (Continued)**

local and/or the A.F. of M. One member of the IEB suggested that we "throw the proposed revision of Article XXII in the trash can". Another IEB member suggested that we convince 5 additional delegates to disregard Article XXII discussion. The theory behind this tactic being that 5 voting delegates plus ICSOM Executive Board would constitute a majority of delegates that voted for Article XXII revision. We spent very little time explaining the utter impossibility of both of these tactics.

President Emeritus Petrillo was invited to address us. He gave a detailed and amusing account of the unionization of the Boston Symphony Orchestra and the subsequent birth of the three year importee concept. Mr. Petrillo pleaded with us not to hurt our cause by contemplating dual unionism. Your chairman once more reiterated the ICSOM Statement of Purpose as defined in our by-laws, namely to seek relief and progress within the A.F. of M. structure. This was the only dialogue between Mr. Petrillo and us.

**IEB Prohibits Discussion**

I then requested of President Kenin answers to two questions:

1) the IEB ruling on symphony musicians discussing Article XXII revision.

2) What was the A.F. of M. prepared to offer to ICSOM to help alleviate some of our difficulties?

At this point the IEB went into Executive Session. Very soon afterwards, we were called back to the Executive Board meeting and President Kenin informed us that the IEB prohibited symphony musicians from discussing the proposed Article XXII on the grounds that it was inimical to the best interests of the A.F. of M. Answer to question #2 was not forth coming. I requested written disposition by the IEB of Article XXII issue but as of this moment, I have received nothing.

**Evaluation by Zazofsky**

I shall now attempt to evaluate the sum total of the three meetings. On the positive side:

1—ICSOM officers were invited at A.F. of M. expense to state grievances on behalf of ICSOM.

2—President Kenin offered to recommend financial assistance for delegates to attend annual ICSOM conference.

3—The possibility that ICSOM officers might be invited to attend the annual convention of the A.F. of M. to help lobby for legislative reforms.

4—The exploring of a symphony orchestra strike fund.

The negative aspects were:

1—By executive order, we were forbidden to discuss a subject voted for discussion by an overwhelming majority of ICSOM delegates at our annual conference.

2—The general feeling that it was very difficult for the IEB to really comprehend our total working situation with all its specialized problems.

3—In all three meetings chief counsel Mr. Henry Kaiser was not present to help explore alternate machinery for symphony orchestra improvement and autonomy.

**ICSOM Needs Lawyer**

Too often, ICSOM officers have experienced total frustration in arguing on behalf of symphony orchestras with the A. F. of M. Part of this inability to convince the IEB is a result of lack of proper preparation and technique. The enormous distances between ICSOM officers, the full demands on our time professionally as well as our very limited finances, cannot be disregarded as contributing factors in our relative ineffectiveness. Therefore, I strongly urge ICSOM to consider retaining an outstanding attorney preferably stationed in New York to help coordinate our efforts and increase our overall effectiveness.

Sincerely yours,  
GEORGE ZAZOFSKY

**RESOLUTIONS TO AMEND ICSOM BY-LAWS****Delegates at September Conference To Vote Orchestras Opinion****AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE X**

Section 2 and 3 to remain, but to be combined and designated as Section 2a.

Sections 4, 5 and 6 to be deleted.

Add the following:

Section 2b.

Upon receipt of the proposed amendment and before the next duly convened meeting of the society, member orchestras will amend, approve or reject the proposed amendment.

Section 2c.

At the next duly convened meeting of the society voting delegates will cast a binding vote on the proposed amendment together with amendments thereto.

Section 2d. A 2/3 (two-thirds) majority vote of the voting delegates present will be necessary for adoption.

Section 3.

Amendments to the by-laws may also be submitted at any regular or special meeting of the society. Upon approval by a majority of the voting delegates present the amendment will be referred to the member orchestras for ratification. Within 60 days following the final day of the meeting, the member orchestras will cast their ballots by registered mail addressed to the secretary. A 2/3 (two-thirds) majority vote of member orchestras shall be necessary for adoption.

*Explanation: This proposal would make it possible to adopt amendments to the ICSOM by-laws 60 days after being proposed at an ICSOM conference by a 2/3 majority vote of ICSOM orchestras.*

*It would also provide for orchestras to amend proposals they receive and to instruct their delegates as to amended proposals. Submitted by 1966 conference.*

**AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE VIII (Sec. 3.)**

Section 3 of this Article to be deleted and to read instead:

3 (a) A member orchestra whose guaranteed annual salary per member does not exceed \$5,000.00 will pay yearly dues to the society in an amount equal to \$3.00 per member.

(b) A member orchestra whose guaranteed annual salary per member is more than \$5,000.00 but does not exceed \$10,000.00 will pay yearly dues to the society in an amount equal to \$4.00 per member.

(c) A member orchestra whose guaranteed annual salary per member is more than \$10,000.00 will pay yearly dues to the society in an amount equal to \$5.00 per member.

(d) The society shall pay the traveling expenses of one delegate from each member orchestra plus the traveling expenses of the officers to all regular and special meetings.

(e) All dues shall be paid by Dec. 31.

*This by-law change would provide for a "sliding-scale" dues structure, and equalize the traveling costs between orchestras. Submitted by Cleveland Orchestra.*

**AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE VIII (Sec. 4)**

Add Sec. 4.

The secretary of the society and the editor of *Senza Sordino* shall receive a yearly honorarium of \$500.00.

*Submitted by the Cleveland Orchestra, this would make a part of the By-laws a motion adopted for 1966 by the conference delegates in Los Angeles.*

**All Orchestras should consider the above amendments and send their delegate to the Houston ICSOM Conference (September 1967) instructed as to the orchestra vote.**

*(Pro and con arguments on these amendments would be welcome for the next issue of Senza Sordino—Ed.)*

## BOOK AND PERIODICAL REVIEW

*Union Democracy in Action* is a 10 issue a year publication that is strongly recommend to *Senza's* readers. While it may only deal with the musician's union problems on occasion (issues #11 and #17, for instance) it provides insights into the problems and responses of local unions as well as international unions. Many other publications purport to be interested in union reform when their basis purpose is to destroy unions—but UDA shows none of these defects.

UDA strongly supports the position of the American Civil Liberties Union urging all unions to incorporate a Bill of Rights for the members into their own constitutions, for the establishment of a Public Review Board and other liberalizing moves.

It is recommended that musicians subscribing to UDA make a special request for issue # 11 of UDA, which gives a very clear and penetrating analysis of the state of union democracy. UDA says "nothing constructive has emerged from top AFL-CIO leaders after the 1959 (Landrum-Griffin) law except from Walter Reuther in adopting the Public Review Board for the United Auto Workers."

"The labor movement is one of the principal forces for democracy in society but to fulfill that role it must be democratic itself. What is at stake are the rights of thousands of active unionists who strive to protect the democracy and decency of the labor movement and to restore these qualities where they have been weakened or destroyed."—this is the goal of UDA. Subscriptions are \$3.00 for 10 issues, UDA, 136 Liberty St., New York, N.Y. 10006.

*Commitment to Culture* by Frederick Dorian—Art Patronage in Europe, its Significance for America, is a book of facts, many of which can be used to advantage in pressing for the necessary support for art institutions and the artists in the U.S.

Because of the survey nature of this book, it is difficult to summarize it, but the author believes that "We need art—today more than ever before." Mr. Dorian carefully catalogues the performing art history of various countries, of their art institutions and of their current state. Because so many symphony orchestras have this long history of support the statistics become quite compelling. In the final chapters of the book, after covering Austria, Italy, Switzerland, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and England, he gives goals for a search for a workable "American formula" for support.

He feels that it is possible to find some answers to our patronage-support problems from these European countries where art patronage is ages old and where the performing arts enjoy a high degree of security.

For the most part European methods for support work well, but he also indicates three instances where "lethal experiments" were effected by dictatorships. "Art support concerns every American; for a free art life is allied with the basic concepts of genuine democracy. It is bound up, as European history has shown dramatically and fatefully, with the cause of personal liberty and spiritual leadership in a free world."

*Commitment to Culture* is published by the University of Pittsburgh Press at \$10.00.

## ICSOM OFFICERS

### CHAIRMAN

George Zazofsky  
18 Fredana Road  
Woban, Mass  
Ph: (617) LA 7-6751

### VICE-CHAIRMAN

Carlton Herrett  
3601 South 16th St.  
Arlington, Va. 22204  
Ph: (703) 671-5521

### SECRETARY

Robert Maisel  
3317 W. Main  
Belleville, Ill. 62221  
Ph: (618) AD 4-3519

### TREASURER

Gino Raffaelli  
2477 Overlook Rd., #404  
Cleveland Hts. Ohio, 44106  
Ph: (216) 321-4259

### EDITOR, SENZA SORDINO

David Smiley  
512 Browning Ct.  
Mill Valley, Calif. 94941  
Ph: (415) DU 8-9107

### CONTRACT AND RAPID COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

3614 Eastwood Drive  
Baltimore, Maryland 21206  
George Aranow, Ph: (301) HA 6-0727

*SENZA SORDINO* is the official publication of the International Conference of Symphony and Opera Musicians and is published four times a year on a bi-monthly basis in October, December, February and April. ICSOM is affiliated as an official conference of the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada, AFL-CIO.

## TREASURER'S REPORT

10 Orchestras have yet to pay their 1966 dues. The General Fund is barely keeping its head above water, with a projected expense of \$1,000.00 for two final issues of *Senza Sordino* for this season. In recent months the balance of the General Fund has dropped below \$500.00 several times.

Member orchestras are urged to take care of their financial obligations immediately. 1966 Assessment as follows:

Compulsory dues .....	\$2.00 per member
Emergency Dues Assesment .....	\$3.00 per member
Emergency Relief Fund .....	\$3.00 per member

### Orchestras Which Have Paid 1966 dues:

Cleveland .....	\$525.00
Seattle .....	249.00
Chicago .....	535.00
Kansas City .....	405.00
Rochester .....	94.00
Toronto .....	460.00
San Francisco .....	480.00
Detroit .....	510.00
Buffalo .....	170.00
Minneapolis .....	446.00
Pittsburgh .....	465.00
National .....	455.00
Current General Fund Balance April 2, 1967 .....	\$4,166.97

### Emergency Relief Fund as of 3/11/67:

Savings Account Balance .....	\$5,500.00
Checking Account Balance: .....	\$ 973.65

### 1966 Contributors:

Cleveland .....	315.00
Seattle .....	228.00
Chicago .....	321.00
Rochester .....	141.00
Kansas City .....	243.00
San Francisco .....	288.00

**Please collect and send your 1966 dues and ERF contributions now!**

## SENZA SORDINO

### CLASSIFIED

Rate per insertion (10 word minimum) ..... 30c per word  
3 or more continuous insertions ..... 25c per word  
Send printed or typewritten copy with check or money order to:  
Editor, 512 Browning Ct., Mill Valley, Calif. Advertising Rates: Apply to Editor.

■ ■ ■

CAMARA BRASS QUINTET PUBLICATIONS  
495 Douglass St. Rm. 4, San Francisco, Calif.  
Catalogues Available

DAVID SMILEY, Editor — Mailing Address:

512 Browning Ct. Mill Valley, Calif. 94941

Subscriptions: Member, A.F.M. \$2.00 per year

Non-Member, A.F.M. \$5.00 per year

Printed by Graphic Arts of Marin, Inc. Sausalito, Calif. 5

## ICSOM'S 1966 CONFERENCE COVERS VITAL ISSUES, FUTURE ACTIONS

This report is from notes taken by the delegate from the National Symphony Orchestra, Carlton Herrett, and is not an official account of the proceedings.

The 1966 ICSOM meeting was held in Los Angeles at the Hollywood Roosevelt Hotel on September 1, 2, 3, and 4. The ICSOM is now composed of twenty-two (22) member orchestras, twenty (20) of which sent a voting delegate. In addition, there were twelve (12) non-voting delegates. These are composed of second delegates from member orchestras and non-voting delegates from interested orchestras such as Honolulu. The Seattle Symphony and Kansas Philharmonic Orchestras became member orchestras at this conference. The Secretary reported that he was corresponding with nearly forty (40) orchestras altogether, and felt the growth rate of ICSOM should at least be steady. The ICSOM has taken in 2 or 3 new orchestras at each conference held thus far. The only charter member orchestra not present was Cincinnati, because of their around-the-world tour then in progress.

A tape recorder was used to take down the proceedings of the meeting from which a professional stenographer would transcribe the notes. These notes would then be given to the ICSOM's secretary to be put into official minutes. This proved to be quite cumbersome from time to time during the meeting, and is responsible for a delay in receiving the minutes.

### Reports on AFM Convention

The Chairman, George Zazofsky (Boston), reported on his meeting with the International Executive Board of the A. F. of M. in Las Vegas. The most rewarding aspect of the meeting was that as a direct result, ICSOM was recognized as an official conference within the A. F. of M. by the Las Vegas convention last June. Improvements in Article 22 (Symphony Orchestras) sought by the ICSOM were rather miniscule and largely technical.

The Treasurer, Gino Raffaelli (Cleveland), gave his report and submitted a breakdown of same to each delegate. The treasurer, after proper explanation, submitted an "interim" resolution (one (1) year only) raising the dues of each member of each member orchestra from \$2.00 to \$5.00. Following discussion, the resolution was adopted.

### Sliding Dues Discussed

The following resolution to amend the bylaws was discussed: Orchestras making less than five thousand dollars (by contract) would pay \$3.00 per man, orchestras making between five and ten thousand would pay \$4.00 per man, orchestras making over ten thousand would pay \$6.00 per man.

The Emergency Relief Fund was also given due consideration. The treasurer reported a total of \$4,600.00 plus, presently in the fund, about half in Cleveland and the other half in Washington, D.C. As there was a minor legal complication in removing the funds from Washington to Cleveland, this matter was left in the hands of the Executive Committee.

A resolution was made and adopted to ask for voluntary donations to the ERF in the amount of three dollars from each member of each member orchestra and transmitted to the treasurer.

The Vice-Chairman and Editor of the ICSOM's official publication *Senza Sordino*, Sam Denov (Chicago), gave his report. In addition to the slightly higher cost of putting out the vastly improved paper, he spent some time explaining some of the ways he had arrived at (mostly technical) in expediting layout, mailing, handling, etc. His only complaint was that newsworthy items tended to come from just certain orchestras and that each orchestra should designate a correspondent to *Senza*, a practice which we adopted several years ago but which seems to have faded away. Denov was given a large round of applause for this excellent effort, so necessary to the ICSOM's improving image.

The Secretary, Roy Cox (Toronto), made his report. This was largely a review of his correspondence with orchestras and groups outside of the ICSOM. He asked for faster reporting in changes of local committee personnel. He also reported that he had addressed the American Symphony Orchestra League at its convention in St. Louis and that he was well received. He felt that the ICSOM should continue its membership (resolution made and passed), and that whenever possible ICSOM should participate.

### Alan Wood Represents Kenin

The conference was addressed at length by Mr. J. Alan Wood. Mr. Wood was designated by the President of the American Federation of Musicians, Herman Kenin, to represent him officially at last year's conference in Toronto and this was a welcome repeat performance. Typical questions directed to him of real interest to the conference concerned the A. F. of M. retirement plan (Employees Pension and Welfare), and the growing need for a Symphony Department within the A. F. of M. and its present posture. It was pointed out regarding AFM-EPW that the provision not allowing a player to continue in music after his retirement had been dropped; and further that in his Local, the Toronto players enjoyed both this plan, paid for by the employer, and also a private plan paid in part by the employer, and that he felt this could be achieved by any orchestra. Mr. Wood is a member of the A. F. of M.'s Executive Board.

### ICSOM Search for Foundation Aid

The search for a Foundation Grant for the ICSOM is still on, and it is hoped that within the next year or two we will meet with success. The ICSOM's possibilities as an organization of real influence would be greatly broadened if sufficient operating capital could be obtained. For instance, three British orchestras and the Berlin Philharmonic are very interested in the ICSOM, but financial implications of a true world-wide organization are staggering on our present budget. In areas such as lobbying for beneficial legislation, some full time administrative help and attendant costs are prerequisite to effectiveness.

A most interesting report was given by the St. Louis delegate on the ASOL convention.

### Sabbatical for Players

Zazofsky arranged a kind of sabbatical—working arrangement between two members of the Boston Symphony and their counterparts in the Tokyo Philharmonic. Zazofsky personally knocked on doors of Boston Symphony Trustees and raised an additional \$2,000.00 for family expense of the Boston players (a violinist and cellist), and further has met with Senator Edward Kennedy on the matter of possible legislated money to broaden this idea. The Senator has promised to introduce such a bill at the next session of Congress based on the Fulbright Grants.

On Pension Plans, it was decided that each orchestra should send through the Rapid Communication Center (Baltimore) its plan to each member orchestra, as delegates present were generally unable to answer specific technical questions.

On the splitting of orchestras into several groups, attitudes and experiences of the different orchestras were quite varied. The largest orchestras have been bothered the least by this trend due perhaps to ability to stay in demand as a whole. The largest orchestra to accept such a contractual arrangement is Chicago, but this arrangement has only been used once. This concept seems to have originated with the ASOL, recommended to the Ford Foundation, re-recommended to the various recipients of Ford Grants, and finally brought to the bargaining table.

On the role of the Personnel Manager, a great deal of discussion ensued and a sub-committee was appointed to produce a suitable resolution for the conference to act upon. In the same vein, a sub-committee was also struck to produce a resolution on the Shop Steward (presently exists only in the Chicago and Toronto Orchestras).

*To Be Continued in Next Issue*

## CONDUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE STIRS WIDE INTEREST

The questionnaire (*which is reproduced on page 6*) is still not in final form, and revisions and final approval will be made by the delegates to the 1967 ICSOM conference. Those delegates will answer the difficult questions: "should questionnaires be required or requested from each ICSOM orchestra? who should have access to the information—ICSOM Executive Board, each orchestra committee or ???, should each orchestra be told the results of the tabulation, or should a graph, chart or other mechanism be used to inform the members? should individual conductors be informed of the results? Should the results (even after several years) be available to the press?"

ICSOM's project of evaluating conductors will begin as soon as the form is finalized. Already several orchestras (Baltimore, Boston, San Francisco and others) are rating their guest conductors! Sam Denov, of the Chicago Orchestra issued a press release which brought an immediate response from Chicago newspaper critics.

### Denov Press Release Quoted

"The questionnaires, which will be filled in on every conductor, both guest and permanent, will be under the supervision of the orchestra members' committee in each respective group. When completed, the results will be forwarded to the ICSOM Rapid Communication Center in Baltimore, Maryland where they will be tabulated and correlated with the results from other orchestras.

The total collective appraisals rendered on any conductor will be made available only to ICSOM orchestra members' committees requesting them. The results may also be made available to orchestra managements and boards of trustees through arrangements with its orchestra's members' committee.

The project, which is too new and unknown to have been commented upon by symphonic and operatic conductors, is bound to be controversial.

The orchestral musicians believe its value to be monumental. Never before has the collective professional knowledge of the nation's orchestra musicians been tapped in this manner. The non-profit corporations that maintain the symphonies and the operas have boards of trustees that are generally composed of businessmen, doctors, lawyers and other civic leaders. These people may all love good music but they are completely in the dark when it comes to professionally evaluating a conductor to direct their group.

Now they will be able to have the considered opinions of professional orchestral musicians from coast to coast to aid them in their deliberations.

Aside from the pool of information that will become available through the project, (and frankly, the ICSOM would welcome financial aid from any of the foundations now making grants in the

arts and humanities field) other salutary effects are expected by the musicians.

Symphonic and operatic maestros, long known for their autocratic attitudes toward the musicians they direct will now have to be on their best behavior. They will never know when their comparative abilities are being scrutinized by the musicians under their batons who may be filling in a questionnaire whose results may be considered in deciding their futures."

### Critics Respond

From an article about the future of the Chicago Symphony by Donal J. Henahan, in the *Chicago Daily News*:

"Unfortunately, the Chicago decision is likely to be made too soon to take advantage of a fascinating new rating service for conductors, planned by the International Conference of Symphony and Opera Musicians. The musicians will evaluate "the overall abilities of all conductors appearing before the American public," and make the results available to members' committees in orchestras. The members may then, if requested, offer the musicians' collective opinions to orchestra managements and trustees.

The plan is not going to be popular with conductors, of course, but it has unquestionable merit, particularly for trustees who would like guidelines in just such an emergency as faces the Chicago Symphony at the moment."

However, Robert Marsh, of the Chicago Sun-Times, takes an opposite tack: "Many agree that no critic can size up the strong and weak points of a conductor faster than seasoned orchestral players. The trouble is that the orchestra players frequently have private axes to grind, and their judgements must be modified by awareness of these extra-esthetic considerations. Every orchestra of consequence, regardless who its leader may be, has complaints.

"My chief reservation, however, is that most professional musicians fault a conductor excessively for weakness in baton technique and, on the other side, give unreasonably high marks to musicians who may use the baton with aplomb but are relatively mechanical or unperceptive as interpreters.

Critic Marsh goes on to comment on conductor's "autocratic attitudes", says, "What this really seems to mean is that the good conductor is the easy going fellow who accepts a standard of mediocrity if his players don't feel like providing him with better . . . it is part of the conductor's job to impose that kind of discipline (to hold musicians firmly in line) and uphold artistic standards by whatever professional means are necessary.

"When the members of ICSOM reach the point where they would recommend the appointment of a conductor known to be a strict disciplinarian because of their respect for his musicianship, they will reflect another and more important aspect of artistic maturity."

Orchestra committees which want copies of the questionnaire for use for this 1966-67 season may order from the Editor of *Senza Sordino*, prices on request.



# CONDUCTOR EVALUATION SHEET

Name ..... Date .....

## PART I — EMOTIONAL REACTION

Please express your PERSONAL FEELING in answering the following two questions:

- |   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Do you, or would you, like to play under this man as a guest conductor?<br>Make comments on reverse. | YES | NO |
| 2. Do you, or would you, like to play under this man as a permanent conductor?                          | YES | NO |

## PART II — OBJECTIVE EVALUATION

Please answer the following questions as OBJECTIVELY as you can. Try not to slant the answers. Consider each question separately. Make comments on reverse.

### LEADERSHIP

1. Is he able to convey his ideas clearly and in a way that gets a willing response from the musicians?
2. Does he command respect as a person?
- 2A Does he maintain self-control under pressure?
3. Does he have the necessary self-confidence?
4. Does he make the orchestra feel secure during performance?
5. Is he inspirational to the musicians?
6. Does he consistently treat the musicians with courtesy and respect?

Exceptional	Good	Mediocre	Inferior

### MUSICIANSHIP

7. Does he understand the emotional content of the music?
8. Is he sensitive to good playing rather than just errors?
9. Is his ear keen enough to hear clearly many parts being played simultaneously?
10. Does he have a good sense of pitch and intonation?
11. Does he have a strong sense of rhythm?
12. Is he able to achieve good orchestral balance?
13. Does he demand the best performance of which the musicians are capable?
14. Does he know what he wants musically, that is, a definite interpretation for each piece?
15. Does he communicate the proper mood for his interpretation?
16. Does he know the score well?


### TECHNIQUE

17. Is his beat clear most of the time?
18. Does his beat have a clear inner rhythm?
19. Does he give proper cueing?
20. Can he conduct complex modern rhythmic passages without error?
21. Does he accompany soloists well?
22. Does he show his interpretation with the baton, keeping talk in proper perspective?
23. Does his beat communicate proper character, mood, and intensity of the passage?
24. Does he avoid stopping for mistakes that will correct themselves?
25. Is he efficient with his rehearsal time?
26. Does he conduct performances essentially as he rehearsed them?
27. Is he familiar with the capabilities of the various instruments?


### FOR REGULAR CONDUCTORS ONLY

28. Does his programing indicate a well-rounded knowledge of the symphonic repertoire?
29. Is he concerned with the working conditions of the musicians?
30. Have the new musicians chosen by the conductor proven satisfactory? (does he audition well?)
