AFM HOSTS SYMPHONY SYMPOSIUM

The two-day 1971 AFM Symphony Symposium, attended by musicians and union officers representing 30 orchestras, took place in New York City on March 19th and 20th.

Highlights of the meetings were addresses by Mr. Amyas Ames, Chairman of the “Partnership for the Arts,” by Dr. Walter F. Anderson, Program Director for Music, of the National Endowment for the Arts, and by Mr. Lane Kirkland, AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Ames, who is also Chairman of the Board of the New York Philharmonic, gave a brief history of the “Partnership for the Arts,” and outlined its goals. He recounted how letter-writing campaigns, personal calls to legislators and other lobbying efforts had resulted in the New York State Legislature appropriating 18 million dollars to support the Arts in 1970. It was this success which led to the formation of the national “Partnership for the Arts.” This year’s goal is to get a favorable Congressional vote on President Nixon’s request for 30 million dollars to fund the National Endowment for the Arts. The long-range goal is annual federal funding at a 200 million dollar level.

CHICAGO BREAKS A TRADITION

Contract Outlaws Permanent String Chairs

As a result of its new contract the Chicago Symphony Orchestra has an innovation in the seating of string players. Exclusive of first desks, all players are on a periodic revolving rotation basis. The contract reads:

“The seating of all members of the string sections other than the first two stands of the first and second violin sections and the first stands of other string sections, shall be on a periodically revolving (rotation) basis throughout each contract year. The precise schedule for revolving of the members with respect to such seats shall be arranged between the Personnel Manager and the Union Steward. Members in the revolving seats shall be listed in the program in alphabetical order.”

The rotation plan was not the idea of a single individual or group of individuals. It is a natural development which arose from the needs and experience of the string players of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

Before the introduction of any sort of rotation plan, the system which prevailed, and which we believe prevails in most orchestras, was one in which the string sections operated as a “hierarchy.” This system was headed by front desks which were described as “critical areas.” Starting from the first desk, the system operated on a value scale of descending importance. On this basis of evaluation the last stands were expendable. This was shown by the practice of lopping them off when a reduced orchestra was called for. Men were permanently frozen in their places. They could expect no change unless someone retired, became incapacitated, or died.

Ed. note: Out of twelve orchestras responding to a Senza Sordino questionnaire, only four reported some form of rotation system — in the other eight, the back stands never play in a reduced orchestra.

The first breakthrough which shook this practice was the introduction of a limited rotation system. This served the purpose of creating a more equitable distribution of the workload and of employment on outside engagements. Other than first desks, outside engagements up to this point were distributed by the Personnel Manager on a “most favored individual” basis. The equitable distribution of workload refers to the rotation procedure which allows all players, irrespective of where they sit in the section, to participate alternately in the performance of works using a reduced orchestra.

Most players do not support the assumption that a string player’s contribution is determined by the chair he occupies. It should be logically clear that it makes no difference whatsoever to the total musical product where a player sits in his section. The section remains the same and for practical purposes no change occurs at all.

We pushed the existent limited rotation procedure to its logical conclusion. Exclusive of the first desks, this means to remove the difference of position or place. Inside, outside, front or back cease to exist. All rotate on a basis of equality, in a periodic revolving rotation plan, the mechanics of which are chosen by the players.

(Continued on Page Two)
HONOLULU SYMPHONY NEGOTIATES

Negotiations for a new contract in Honolulu have been in progress since November 1970. The Orchestra Committee and Union officers established basic proposals after studying the results of an orchestra questionnaire, discussions at several orchestra meetings and the usual study of other contracts. The five-man Orchestra Committee and Union President, I. B. Peterson have been in charge of negotiations.

Problems compounded when a grant of $200,000 was cut from the Governor's legislative budget. A drive is now under way to get the Legislature to restore that sum to the budget. The Orchestra has a mailing list of 1500 people for its newsletter; speaking engagements are being arranged at various clubs (accompanied by small ensemble performances) and the Orchestra is planning a three-day “exhibition” at the huge Ala Moana Shopping Center.

The expiring agreement provided for a scale of $115; 32 weeks; no pension; no medical care; no non-renewal clause and only three services of sick leave.

Shortly before printing of this issue, Richard Rohlee, Chairman of the Honolulu Committee reported that the state legislature had killed the $200,000 appropriation. The Orchestra set out to picket the legislature. Then word came that the Mayor of Honolulu would guarantee $150,000 since the legislature had failed to pass the appropriation. (The Mayor’s promise must yet be approved by the City Council.) Instead of picketing the legislature, the Orchestra marched to City Hall and serenaded the Mayor! The Ala Moana “exhibition” was very successful and the Orchestra’s public relations efforts are well received. But, at best, there is $50,000 still missing.

Good Lord, how can anyone say symphony musicians don’t work hard enough for their money? Ed.

FLASH —

San Francisco Opera contract ratified 32 to 22. $270, $282 and $294 for six-service week. Big gain was reduction of basic service from 4 to 3 1/2 hours. As always the S. F. Committee praises the work of Jerry Spain, Local #6 negotiator.

CONTRACT OUTLAWS PERMANENT STRING CHAIRS

(Continued from Page One)

Thus, internal auditions to fill vacancies within the sections are eliminated. It is unnecessary to single out any one for preferential treatment. And most importantly, it will attract the best players to come into the orchestra because they know they are coming into the section as equals and will not be frozen into the last stand.

The plan can only be tested in practice and judged by its consequences.

The Members Committee of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

Editor’s Desk

Senza Sordino recently received a subscription request and a most interesting letter from Mr. R. C. Jones, Secretary-Treasurer of Local 99, Portland, Oregon. As an officer of Local 99, Mr. Jones has participated in negotiations, in monitoring audits and in processing grievances for the Oregon (formerly Portland) Symphony. He writes that he has found “Senza” helpful to him in discharging these duties. He also reports a feeling among some members of the Oregon Symphony (not yet in ICSOM) that only the “major” orchestras benefit from ICSOM membership but that he hopes they can be convinced to join us.

We replied to Mr. Jones in part as follows:

“Thank you for your subscription to Senza Sordino, and a special thanks for wanting your Orchestra to join ICSOM. Who would have thought, ten years ago, that a local union official would be proselytizing for ICSOM? Too many musicians and union officials still tend to forget that our full title is now “The International Conference of Symphony and Opera Musicians, an OFFICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS.” The words in capital letters really tell the whole story. ICSOM is an active and vital unit within the Federation. It exists because symphony musicians require certain services which neither any local nor the national governing body are presently equipped to supply.

“A very timely case in point is the Federation publication, ‘Wage Scales and Conditions in the Symphony Orchestras.’ As you know, this is actually the 1970-1971 version of the old ‘ICSOM Chart,’ known to many of us, and to many a manager, during negotiation years as ‘the bible.’ This year’s edition owes its excellence to a pooling of Federation and ICSOM resources. It is the most comprehensive and practical compilation of data on orchestral wages and working conditions ever assembled. In every orchestra there are one or two players who know their own contract, and the contracts of other orchestras, backwards and forwards. They are generally committee members who not only know what item 2.4. (b) sub-paragraph (7) means, but how, when and why it was written. Through these people ICSOM supplied most of the information for the Chart. The Federation supplied money, manpower and distribution well beyond ICSOM’s former efforts.

The next time your orchestra prepares for negotiations one of your most important tools will be the “Chart.” That might be a very excellent moment to ask your musicians whether or not ICSOM really benefits only the major orchestras. It is precisely because of ICSOM that we have the Chart to work with. And the Chart is of value to both large and small orchestras simply because ICSOM is composed of both large and small orchestras.

(Continued on Page Four)
CHAIRMAN’S MESSAGE

AFM-Symphony Symposium

The 1971 AFM-Symphony Symposium, held in New York City on March 19th and 20th, was by far the best organized, best prepared, most productive one that I can recall. ICSOM Sec’y Maisel and I participated at every stage of the planning and we can be certain to the fact that AFM Pres. Davis, Sec’y-Treas. Ballard, and Sec’y Dreher put the greatest pains to ensure that the agenda and the choice of speakers would be relevant to the needs and interests of the symphony player-delegates and the delegates from the local unions. Bob and I could not have asked for better cooperation, good will and understanding.

The atmosphere was cordial and, with few exceptions, all parties were turned in to the same channel and going in the same direction. It is significant that with each passing year our players and our union officials demonstrate an increasing sophistication and a higher degree of know-how concerning the problems of symphony musicians. The remarks from the floor were extremely articulate and reflected the cumulative experience of the orchestral players and the unions working together to achieve better wages and artistic working conditions. Particularly impressive was the responsibility of the AFM officers on all issues and to all questions. They obviously had done their homework.

Orchestral Leadership

The key to our effectiveness as individual orchestras and as a conference is the quality of the leadership we derive from our ranks. Orchestras must encourage their best people to serve on their committees and as ICSOM representative. Organization takes leadership and good representation demands able, articulate men. Each year — not just contract years — requires the services of experienced people; the element of continuity cannot be slighted. How can we expect the best from our local unions and from our managements if we do not lead with our best?

Basic to all this must be the knowledge of orchestra, union and management, alike, that committee members shall be, must be free from all union pressures and coercion. An orchestra that will not support and protect its elected leaders is an orchestra in name only, unworthy of belonging to the community of symphony orchestras.

Partnership for the Arts

As this issue goes to press the final congressional hearings on the funding for the National Endowment are taking place. Certainly, our efforts have been a major factor in providing the climate for favorable legislation. However, before congratulating ourselves, let’s stop and think if there is anything else that can be done to sway the balance in our favor. Is there someone who should be telephoned or buttonholed? Is there a letter yet to be written or a telegram yet to be sent?

Fraternally,

RALPH MENDELSON

(1 to 7) Arons, Fuentealba, Kaiser, Mendelson discuss Contracts and Negotiation techniques at AFM Symposium.

SENGA SORDINO PUZZLER

By ALETT MCCIs, N.Y. Philharmonic

ACROSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern prince</td>
<td>Serpent</td>
<td>Thanks</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AN APOLOGY

There were three errors in the previous puzzle for which we humbly apologize. 3 down should have read "comes up," 6 down, which was omitted, should have read "correct," and 35 down, another omission, should have read "legend." V. B. & A. M.

ANSWER TO APRIL PUZZLER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editor’s Desk
(Continued from Page Two)

I wonder how your members would define a “major” orchestra. “Senza” recently received a symphony program listing a Board of Trustees of 21 people, a Women’s Association, Sponsors, Associate Members, Sustaining Members, Contributors, etc., etc. The program announces the Thirty-Ninth (sic) season of the “Fargo-Moorhead Symphony Orchestra.” It lists seven regular concerts, a series of youth concerts and six televised broadcasts on Channel 4 “as a public service in cooperation with Local 382 of the AFM.”

One does not compare the Fargo-Moorhead Symphony with the New York Philharmonic on financial or artistic terms. But one can draw valid comparisons on the basis of what each organization means to the cultural life of its community. Looking at a map of the U.S. it seems obvious that the Fargo-Moorhead Symphony, and the Oregon Symphony, supply an irreplaceable cultural service to their communities. But New York City would hardly be a cultural wasteland without the New York Philharmonic. What, then, is a “major” orchestra?

Although ICSOM did begin as an organization of major orchestras, the last few years have seen more and more smaller orchestras seeking membership. This trend must continue. The Arts will survive in our country only if we effect greatly increased federal, state and local subsidies. ICSOM can be an effective force in securing that aid. But, it must be an ICSOM which can speak for the Oregon Symphony as well as for the New York Philharmonic.”

* * *

We would like to recommend that every ICSOM musician establish the habit of contributing to “Tempo.” Tempo is non-partisan. It does not ask on which side of the aisle a senator or congressman sits. But, it is concerned with how he votes on labor legislation. Tempo dollars will help elect men and women Congress sympathetic to the needs of musicians. Writing a letter to a congressman is a real chore for some of us. Writing a check to Tempo takes only a couple of minutes.

AFM HOSTS SYMPHONY SYMPOSIUM
(Continued from Page One)

Sennati yearly allocation to the Endowment which would permit more long-range planning than is now possible.

Secretary-Treasurer Kirkland pledged AFL-CIO support to achieve full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. The AFL-CIO has called on its “State Federations” to support Arts Endowments in their own state legislatures.

By their support of public education, earlier retirement, vacations, holidays and shorter working hours, unions have “compressed the working years,” Kirkland said. They have “democratized work” and must now “democratize the constructive use and enjoyment of leisure.” He spoke of concerts for union members sponsored jointly by the AFL-CIO and the AFM as one example of unions providing such constructive use of leisure.

Two panel discussions were held during the meetings. The first, moderated by Henry Kaiser, AFM Counsel, with Max Arons, IEB member, Vic Fuenteslaba, AFM Vice-President, and Ralph Mendelson, ICSOM Chairman as panelists, explored the problems of “Contracts, Negotiating and Bargaining Techniques.” There was general agreement that Orchestra Committees should attend negotiations — “as active negotiators,” Arons said, while Fuenteslaba felt committees were more useful if used in an advisory role. The use of fact-finding committees and of mediation in deadlock situations was approved by the panelists, but all agreed that arbitration hardly works to the musicians’ benefit. The panelists did not agree on whether or not a useful purpose is served by beginning with very high demands in first proposals. Most felt this depends largely on local customs. Mendelson expressed the view that an impasse must not be allowed to arise except over the major issues.

Keith Kummer of the Baltimore Symphony, Eugene Frey, President of Local #1, Cincinnati, and I. Martin Emerson, IEB member took part in the second panel discussion moderated by IEB member David Winston. The subject was “Auditions, Dismissals, Non-renewals and appeals procedures.” Winston posed the question of whether Conductor, Orchestra Committee or individuals outside the Orchestra should have final decision on contested dismissals. Kummer felt the use of outsiders was essential to orchestral harmony. There was no general agreement reached except that no one suggested leaving the question of dismissals entirely in conductor’s hands.

AFM Secretary-Treasurer Stanley Ballard reported on the Symphony Strike Fund and answered questions from the floor. Twenty-four orchestras are presently paying $72,000 a year into the fund. Ballard said he felt there should be $2 million in the fund for it to be truly effective. He pointed out that the Cleveland Orchestra members had received strike benefits for five weeks, an amount equal to seven years of contributions to the fund by that orchestra.

AFM Counsel, Henry Kaiser stated that the Theater Defense Fund (a fund of $2,800,000 as of March 1970) can be used in any way the IEB sees fit but that the Symphony Strike Fund cannot be used for any other purpose.

Henry Kaiser told the delegates of AFM efforts to stop piracy of recordings. There is hope an international agreement on this question will be signed by next fall. The agreement must then be ratified by each participating government. This will provide protection which does not presently exist under U.S. law. Kaiser also reported the AFM’s long fight for revision of the 1917 Copyright law to include protection for performers may be won in this year’s Congress.

President Davis provided essential information on the members of the House Appropriations Committee, listing their past voting records on funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. He asked the delegates to remind their orchestras that contributions to “Tempo” are used to help elect congressmen and senators sympathetic to the goals of Labor.

Editorial Comment: President Kenin in response to a pointed question from the floor at a symposium some nine or ten years ago, said something to the effect that, "Gentlemen, that is not a subject for discussion here. It is a matter for the Federation to handle." In contrast there were no "Taboo" subjects at the 1971 symposium. This is said not to demean President Kenin's memory, but rather to report that the process of bringing ICSOM and the AFM together, which began under President Kenin, continues to move steadily forward.

The symposium had its faults. The panel discussions would have benefited had the panels been composed of two union officials and two players with special expertise. And, anyone who has attended an ICSOM conference knows the frustration of seeing the hours slip by while one delegate after another recounts "this is how we do it back home." The New York symposium fell into this trap once or twice.