CLEVELAND DISAPPOINTED

Contract negotiations in New York and Chicago a few months ago resulted in eminently satisfactory contracts. At the same time the Cleveland Orchestra was enduring a long strike which ended in acceptance (59-34) of a markedly inferior contract. The strong contrast leads Senza Sordino to devote an unusually large amount of space to the Cleveland negotiations.

Before the Strike

The Orchestra wanted its own lawyer to participate in negotiations. The Union (Local #4, Tony Granata, President) said “no.” Orchestra gave in because of a serious impasse with Union over this question during 1967 negotiations.

Nov. '69: Management asks that negotiations commence. Committee submits questionnaires to membership and prepares proposals.

Dec. 8: Final proposals submitted to Union.

Dec. 9: Simultaneous exchange of proposals with management.

Major items of Orchestra proposals:

Salary: $290, $310, $340.
Size of Orchestra: To remain same and be specified.
Vacations: 8 weeks.
Services: 8 in winter, 7 in summer.
Recordings: $1,000 guarantee.
Medical: Full coverage for member and family.
Pension: General improvements.
Proposals for seating, rotation and Audition Committee.
Orchestra voice in choice of Musical Director.
Seniority pay.
Recognition of Orchestra Committee.

Management submits non-money items only:

a) Reduce season to 48 weeks.
b) Reduce orchestra size if financial situation requires it.
c) If Association cannot meet its financial obligations, it may cancel season on 4 weeks notice.
d) Pension Plan not to be subject of negotiations.

Committee refuses to negotiate any contract based on a premise that length of season can be reduced, size of orchestra can be reduced, a cancellation clause, etc.

Jan. 15: Committee informs members of management’s intentions.

Jan. 17: Upon Union’s insistence, Committee submits membership’s questionnaires to Union.

March & April: 10 negotiating session accomplish only minor changes. Management finally promises to submit money offer at end of June following Japan tour.

July 16: Management’s first complete offer. Includes withdrawal of proposals to reduce season, reduce size of orchestra and the cancellation clause. Scale offer: $265, $272.50, $280.

July 30: George Szell dies.

During August negotiations continue with little progress.

Some important developments are:


(Continued on Page 4)

MONTREAL PLEASED

The Montreal Symphony Orchestra is situated in a large metropolitan area serving some three million persons, with a community well-disposed toward dramatic presentations, especially opera and ballet, perhaps owing to the joie de vivre of our predominantly French population. Attendance figures from last year’s Symphony concerts were quoted to the members of the orchestra, revealing an average attendance of well over ninety percent of the house, impressive for our 3,000 seat hall in Place des Arts.

Until recently, individual members of the Montreal Symphony have felt relatively little of this substance reflected in the material provisions contained in our master agreement. A final year a year ago, President of the Board of Directors, William Plenette (President of Iron Ore Company of Canada), established a precedent and foreshadowed a new era in orchestra-management relations when he came to speak personally to the members of the orchestra during a rehearsal break. He spoke clearly and informatively on the financial position of the Symphony, his hopes for the then-imminent contract negotiations, gave us his personal assurance of a specific raise for every member of the orchestra, and finally opened himself to questions from the orchestra. Most important, he told us of the establishment of a Comité de Planification to consider and make recommendations for the long-range guidance of the Montreal Symphony Orchestra in future seasons — a phenomenon distressingly absent during the past.

This planning committee is composed of ten members: two from the Canada Arts Council, two from the Québec Ministry of Cultural Affairs, two from the Montréal Arts Council, two from the administration of the M.S.O., and two (elected) from the members of the orchestra. The committee has indeed met during the past year, with the result that each of the three levels of government has agreed to increase by ten percent its grant for the current season in order to assure the financial stability of the orchestra (management) in meeting the orchestra’s (players) demands. The federal arts council grant covers approximately 20% of the Symphony’s total budget, the provincial cultural affairs ministry grant 9%, the metropolitan arts council 7%, and the M.S.O.’s fund-raising campaign another 20%; it is a fact of life that less than half of the expense of the orchestra is realized in revenue from the box-office. It may be noted, sadly, that Canadian orchestras do not receive assistance from any of the major philanthropic foundations.

Our recent negotiations, concluded after the present season had begun in October, were unquestionably the most fruitful to date, both in terms of the process and the results of the negotiations. Much credit must be given to our chief negotiator, newly-elected President of the Musicians’ Guild of Montreal, Gordon Marsh, who has been himself a personnel manager and a business manager in the music field, as well as a performer (bass trombone). Credit must also be given to suggestions contained in a previous issue of Senza Sordino. A questionnaire was completed by each member of the orchestra on items to be dealt with in the negotiations, and the results were tabulated by the Players’ Committee for use by the negotiating team, consisting of the President of the Musicians’ Guild and the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman of the Players’
CHAIRMAN’S MESSAGE

Recently, I became aware of some basic misconceptions held by a number of rank and file orchestral players concerning the nature of ICSOM. Please bear with me because their existence demands our attention.

1. ICSOM is not a hierarchy. It is an organization of professional musicians whose policies are formulated by elected representatives from the member orchestras and directed by nine non-salaried officers who, in turn, have been elected by the above delegates at an annual convention.

2. It is absolutely impossible for these officers, orchestral players themselves, to deal with individual players. An orchestra or an individual orchestra member desiring services from ICSOM must channel requests through their delegate or their officially elected orchestra committee.

3. The quality of the services that can be offered is a direct function of those orchestras’ participation in the ICSOM activities. Without the raw material of information and ideas from the member orchestras the ICSOM Executive Committee becomes severely handicapped. Without the willingness of member orchestras to respond to requests, whether they be telegrams of support or the solicitation and gathering of opinions, the organization would wither.

4. Above all, let it be said and understood that ICSOM does not exist to interfere in local symphony affairs. Help, including organizational and legal advice, is extended only on request and performed only in consultation with the orchestra involved.

I sincerely regret that more players have not had the opportunity to attend and participate in the annual conferences. These are stimulating, thoughtful, highly responsible, hard working meetings, characterized by a dedication and purpose that makes one proud to be a symphonic musician.

Fraternally,

Ralph Mendelson

MONTREAL PLEASED
(Continued from Page 1)

Committee. The members of the orchestra were consulted several times during the negotiations in late-night meetings in which deadlock items were presented to the orchestra for reconsideration. The orchestra elected to begin the season as scheduled while continuing to negotiate, a practice becoming frequent in other union contract negotiations, to finalize items such as salary and schedule which were then made retroactive to the beginning of the season.

The master agreement was extensively reworked, even to the point of putting non-contentious articles into a more professional legal language. Tour conditions were redefined, including provision for run-out concerts; per-diem was raised two dollars to $16, plus 8% salary extra and hotel accommodation while on tour. Non-renewal and appeal procedures were revised and strengthened, and new auditioning procedures were instituted, involving members of the orchestra. Provision was made for leave of absence without loss of tenure. The librarian was brought under defined contract conditions. The current season (of a one-year contract) was increased two weeks to 44 weeks, including 3 weeks of vacation at salary; and minimum salary was raised twenty dollars, across the board, to $200 per week.

Tremendous progress has been made over the last three years. At that time the Symphony was on the verge of collapse: the management was having great financial difficulties, the orchestra had no provision whatever for appeal procedures in non-renewals, and a typical nineteenth-century “dog and cat” attitude existed between the management and many of the orchestra members. There is yet room for improvement, but we feel that we are in a new era of mutual understanding and respect. Certainly this is due to the progress of the joint Planning Committee, and to the professional atmosphere which characterized our negotiations. Barring an unforeseen socio-economic or political upheaval, the future of the Montreal Symphony Orchestra appears bright.

Robert Ryker, ICSOM Correspondent
THE INTERNATIONAL SPORT SCENE

On September 7, 1970 at Jingu Stadium, Tokyo, Japan, an exciting softball game was played to a 3-3 tie.

The game, between the New York Philharmonic Penguins and the Japan Philharmonic, was the realization of an idea of mine and Seiji Ozawa’s. It took many cablegrams between New York and Tokyo but Lukas Foss’ rehearsal with the Japan Philharmonic was cancelled and the game was “on”.

When we arrived at the Tokyo Railroad Station we were directly hustled off by taxi to the “Yankee Stadium” of Japan, and in slacks and our Penguin sweatshirts (courtesy of Schiltz) we entered the stadium and saw a youthful Japan Philharmonic warming up in regulation baseball uniforms.

The men were throwing a small, hard, rubber ball, and were jogging around 90 foot basepaths. We were accustomed to our regulation softball and 60 foot basepaths.

Soon we discovered that stadium rules require the wearing of regulation baseball pants and socks, so these were provided for us by the stadium management. After several calls to the game officials regarding the type of ball to be used and the length of the basepaths, a compromise was agreed upon: we would use an official softball, but the 90 foot basepaths would remain.

After the arrival of Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic management, the two teams lined up on either side of home plate and bowed to each other. The lineups were announced over the loudspeaker, and as if it was World Series time, Mr. Bernstein threw out the first ball.

Three umpires, one of whom was Mr. Oh, Japan’s greatest ball-player, took their positions and Seiji Ozawa, playing second base and leading off for the Penguins, stepped into the batters box and the game began.

Great defensive playing by Hal De Windt, Jim Candido, and John Ware helped the Penguins out of several tight spots in the opening innings. Our opposition scored three runs in the third inning, but we came back with one run in the fourth and two in the seventh, with the tying run being scored by Jim Candido on a two out Texas League single by Steve Freeman.

After one scoreless extra inning and with concert hour approaching, the game was called and both teams gathered at home plate for final bows and good wishes.

On the following evening our orchestra was honored by the Japan Philharmonic at a very fine party, and the Penguins were

THE NATIONAL SPORT SCENE

Last summer the softball team of the Pittsburgh Symphony dealt a stunning defeat to their counterparts from the Philadelphia Orchestra. The final score was 28 to 9. The Pittsburgh team says their rigorous Spring Training schedule will commence just as soon as weather permits. They say, “Anytime you want a rematch Philadelphia, we’ll be ready!”

Certainly every musician is proud when the New York Philharmonic tours Japan because that great orchestra represents so ably the very high level of performance our orchestras have to offer. But when it comes to softball — the question arises, “Did America really send her best?” Of course road games are tough, and the Penguins were at a disadvantage with those 90 foot basepaths. Still, the Pittsburghers sound like a pretty solid team. Who is really Number One? Ed.

INTERNATIONAL DISCORDS

Soviet violinist Leonid Kogan and conductor Maxim Shostakovitch were to appear with the Pittsburgh Symphony for a pair of concerts on January 15th and 17th. One week before their scheduled performance the President of the Symphony Society, Mr. John E. Angle, announced that the gentlemen had refused to appear with the Symphony on the same stage with a “defector.” (Two seasons ago the Society engaged as assistant principal cellist Vassilod Lezhnev, formerly with the Moscow State Orchestra and a defector during a tour to the United States.) The Society stated that the contractual agreement was with all members of the Orchestra and all contracts would be honored; it was decided that Messrs. Kogan and Shostakovitch be released from their commitment rather than allowing a performance without cellist Lezhnev onstage.

It is unfortunate that the often termed “international language” of music should be used as a political tool . . . the whole incident called “childish” by Mr. Angle. The all Russian program remained all Russian and replacement artist James Oliver Buswell IV provided a brilliant performance of the Shostakovitch Violin Concerto under the baton of conductor Henry Lewis, Musical Director of the New Jersey Symphony!

Thomas Fay

The members of the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra today voiced their support of Mstislav Rostropovich in his efforts to help Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn, Nobel prize-winning author.

Solzhenitsyn is being discredited by the Soviet government, which apparently is attempting to expel him from the Writers Union. Rostropovich recently wrote an open letter to the Soviet press, defending the author and his writings.

Speculation is that Rostropovich, considered by many to be Russia’s finest cellist, may fall from official favor or his career may become jeopardized because of his defense of Solzhenitsyn.

The orchestra members wrote: “The arts have always transcended frontiers and political beliefs and we are looking forward to the next time we shall make music with our fellow artist, Rostropovich.”

From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, 11/24/70

presented with a trophy and the wish for a return game at the real Yankee Stadium. Each Japan Philharmonic softball team member was given a Penguins emblem and sincere thanks for a wonderful experience.

Walter Rosenberger
CLEVELAND DISAPPOINTED  (Continued from Page 1)

2. Orchestra votes to: a) grant Committee vote of confidence; b) Offer to work after Sept. 7th deadline on retroactive basis.  
3. Management mails a contract to each member with accompanying letter calling for a vote on Sept. 3. Union President Granata states lawyers for Management and Union had decided on that action.  
4. Letter from management states, “in the absence of a contract some fringe benefits may lapse, unless the individual musician makes arrangements to meet premium payments personally.”  

Sept. 3: Against wishes of Committee, Union requires a vote on virtually unchanged contract, Rejected, 79-17.  
Sept. 5 & 6: Management refuses Orchestra’s offer to continue vote on retroactive basis. Improves offer to include: a) 1 extra week vacation; b) reopener on salary in third year; c) 8 services during summer season; d) participation on screening committee to advise in selection of next Musical Director. Union and Committee again offer to continue work while negotiating — again refused. Committee reports to Orchestra and unanimously recommends a strike. Orchestra agrees. No vote taken.

After the Strike  
Sept. 7: Union implements strike — provides picket signs, secretarial help, publicity in newspapers and TV.  
Sept. 10: Committee presents complete proposals (numerous concessions) in an attempt to get negotiations moving. Management says “unreasonable.”  
Sept. 15: Orchestra members begin to draw benefits from the recently established AFM Symphony Strike Fund. Benefits continue throughout the strike.  
Sept. 20: Contract rejected, 77-17.  
Oct. 7: Contract rejected, 70-27.  

From the latter part of September until acceptance of a contract on Oct. 16th, events centred around the actions of dissenting orchestra members, the importation of expert advice, and the Union’s response to both of those situations.

A dissenting orchestra member attempts to arrange meetings between General Manager and groups of orchestra members. The Union finds this procedure acceptable. An orchestra member, by calling Association attorney, affects rebate of medical coverage payments for 20 orchestra members. Association attorney confirms that dissenting members are informing Management, Trustees and Union by telephone of their disagreement with Committee’s recommendations.

AFM Vice-President, Vic Fuentesalba and Lester Asher, attorney for the Chicago Local join the negotiations at various times. (The Committee had also asked for the importation of Phil Sipser but the Union refused on the grounds that he represents ICSOM.) Fuentesalba and Asher gain immediate respect and confidence of the Committee. Both castigate the Association severely for its attitude in negotiations. Asher releases public statement, “It seems clear to me that the Musical Arts Association does not want a first-class symphony for Cleveland. . . . I am left with the conviction that these spokesmen . . . have only contempt for the majority of the musicians . . . . I am extremely proud that I live in Chicago.”

Oct. 14: Vice-President Fuentesalba attends negotiations. He informs Association not to call another meeting until they improve money offer. He then advises Union President Granata. Union attorney Mortimer Riemer and Committee not to call either a negotiation session or an orchestra meeting until Association improves money offer.

Oct. 15: Union President Granata informs Committee he has called for negotiation session to be followed by orchestra meeting and vote to be held the following day.

Oct. 16: Negotiation session held. Management offers extra $2.50 in 2nd year, $5.00 in 3rd year plus hospitalization for members only: $265, $275, $285.  

At three-hour meeting Association officers and attorney present their case to orchestra. Union attorney Riemer states management would probably be within its rights to mail out individual contracts if orchestra rejects the trade agreement. This is questioned by a Committee member but attorney Riemer remains silent. (After the final vote he concedes to an orchestra member that such procedure probably is illegal.)  

The Committee unanimously recommends rejection of contract. Orchestra accepts, 59-34 (3 abstentions).

CLEVELAND COMMITTEE STATES ITS CASE  

“We would like to speak to our ICSOM colleagues of the behavior of the three parties involved in our recent negotiations: our Union Local #4, Anthony Granata, President, our own orchestra membership and lastly our orchestra management, The Musical Arts Association.  

The cooperation of our Union leadership was far less than that which is necessary. To their credit we acknowledge their willingness to pay for the services of a good pension actuarial consultant, newspaper ads, leaflets, and the use of Union facilities such as addressograph machine, etc.

On the more crucial issues however, their behavior was a source of constant frustration. They refused to grant the orchestra’s wish to have its own attorney at the bargaining table, and they refused to permit the importation of Phil Sipser because he represents ICSOM, which to Mr. Granata is “a dual union, if I ever heard of one.” Throughout the negotiations, their posture was one without force or conviction. At the table, the Union leadership played the role of mediator rather than advocate. Incomprehensibly they permitted members to deal privately with management, and finally, they ignored the expert advice of Vice-President Victor Fuentesalba and attorney Asher in the crucial final days.

The behavior of the orchestra membership was all we could have hoped for up until the final week. The record of ratification votes speaks for itself. Attendance at meetings was excellent, the cooperation and imaginativeness in suggesting possible solutions was immeasurably encouraging and a source of motivation for us. It was not until the final week, when, for reasons perhaps too complex for us to understand, that a significant segment of the membership began to exclude the committee from its deliberations, consult individually with management and thereby bring about an end to resistance. The failings of our Union representatives as outlined above, drove many members to the point of "why keep on fighting?"  

The behavior of the Musical Arts Association stifled not only our money demands, but all attempts to make the membership a part of the creative process. These requests would not have cost the Association one penny.

One aspect of our management's methodology bears special attention, since it may be used again in other cities. The Association openly declared to the citizens of the city via newspaper ads, and to the membership via numerous personal communications — that it was prepared to raise only $ amount of dollars because they as experienced fund-raisers, knew exactly how much could be raised. Unfortunately, they convinced the membership, the Union and the citizens. If this tactic can be relied on by Symphony Societies elsewhere, then negotiations at the table will be fruitless. Management will decide on the size and scope of the wage package, feeling that sooner or later the membership will come around to acceptance.

The management money offer was never increased from the original proposals. A few dollars were shifted around on the last offer, but this was done by reducing the raise originally set aside for the over-scale players to a point where it merely equaled that offered to the scale player.”  

The Cleveland Orchestra Committee 1969/70