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...Growth of AGMA...

Since the last issue the following new members have been elected to the Guild:

Louise Arnoux
Joseph Bentonelli
Adolph Bolm

Walter Damrosch
Henri Deering
Phil Duey

Dusolina Giannini
Easton Kent
Beatrice MacCue

Mary Pasmore
Catherine Steed
Margaret Tilley

AGMA’s New Address

On April 20th, 1937, AGMA will move its offices to Room 505, 576 Fifth Avenue. The new telephone number has not been yet ascertained and will be announced later.

Members are requested to visit the new office as often as possible. Incidentally, if you have changed your address be sure to let us know.

576 Fifth Avenue, New York City

Copyright, 1937, by American Guild of Musical Artists, Inc.
WE WERE agreeably surprised to see our name in the papers the other day in the columns of the eminent critic of the New York Post, Mr. Samuel Chotzinoff. Mr. Chotzinoff's interest had been taken, seemingly, by an article in the December issue of "AGMA" Magazine (the "Bulletin" then) in which Dr. Ernest Schelling recounted his experiences at the International Theatre Congress which he attended in Vienna last summer, and the sympathy of the critic of the Post was aroused by Mr. Schelling's unhappiness in being unable to answer with any report of vitality or progression in the large field of American musical life the glowing tales of activity and progress in the musical life of Europe.

To the accounts of the expeditions of "whole caravans of trucks towing trailers loaded with tents and scenery and other caravans having living quarters for the performers," which, according to Mr. Schelling's report, "tour Italy from the Alps to the furthermost corners of Calabria and Sicily bringing the theatrical art to the people" Mr. Schelling could, as Mr. Chotzinoff points out, offer no more striking parallel on behalf of the Italian peasant could be induced, or ordered, to do without 'I Pagliacci' and 'Cavalleria Rusticana'. "One is inclined to believe," says Mr. Chotzinoff, "that no self respecting Italian peasant could be induced, or ordered, to do without 'I Pagliacci' and 'Cavalleria Rusticana'." When you say "Pagliacci" to the self respecting American peasant you must be careful to smile.

There is a nice dilemma here. If the musical exuberance of the Italian peasant has resulted in the subsidization by the American Government of a musical caravan such as Mr. Schelling describes (a caravan which, we are sure, pays for itself handsomely at the end of the tour), might not a caravan subsidized by the American Government result in the stimulation of a like exuberance on the part of the American peasant? The question is not wholly unanswered. The statistics offered by the Government as the result of a recent survey of WPA audiences throughout the country discloses the creation of a box office public of many thousands who, previous to their experiences at WPA Theatres, had never attended a legitimate production and who now never miss a production, WPA or independent, that comes to town.

This is one advancement to which Mr. Schelling could point with pride among the delegates from a rejuvenated theatrical Europe. The pride would have to be qualified, no doubt, because, unlike the free and self sustaining caravans of the Italian roads, our WPA caravans are "relief projects" and there has been no indication that they will be continued any longer than it seems necessary to keep unemployed artists from starving to death.

In this same issue of the "Bulletin," by strange coincidence, is an article by Mme. Queena Mario dealing with the WPA Music Projects in which she says: "The first thing that is necessary is the removal of the implication of charity or relief that is attached to the Government supported enterprises and the students and teachers connected with them. . . . No artist can develop and no permanent good can result from activity which lacks the psychology of independence and artistic integrity. . . . " The WPA, because of this stigma of relief and this burden of impermanence is, Mme. Mario believes, "a vast machinery that is even now waiting to be put to some lastingly useful and constructive purpose." We doubt if this is true of the caravans in Calabria and Sicily.

As Mr. Chotzinoff sadly remarks, there was little enough for Mr. Schelling to report upon; little enough that was being done to lift the lined face of American music, beyond one or two valiant and isolated campaigns—among which his own series of Music Appreciation concerts takes an outstanding place. But in reply to the "Advisory Board of young men—Roussel, Ibert, Milhaud and Auric—" on the staff of the Paris Opera, he could report as the only change in the opera situation in America a four weeks Spring season at the Met and the Hippodrome Company at popular prices. In the company of men who would have had no hesitation in translating "Parsifal" into Hindu if it were to be presented to a Hindu audience, he might, perhaps, remark wistfully upon the success of "The Bartered Bride."

Mr. Chotzinoff attributes this sad contrast to the close nationalistic unity of European countries. "It proves, perhaps," he says, "what a huge standing army can do for a country in the way of culture."

Possibly this is the answer. There was one more observation that was made by Mr. Schelling, however, that might have given Mr. Chotzinoff pause. We think that it is very significant, that is, perhaps, the key to the solution of the entire problem.

"In these countries," Mr. Schelling remarks in his "Bulletin" article, "organizations of artists, like the American Guild of Musical Artists, are things of long standing."

The American Guild of Musical Artists is not a thing of long standing. But it will stand very definitely, and if need be very long, for the relief of a situation which put Mr. Schelling, as the representative of American artists among the artists of the world, at such an unfair disadvantage.
SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS
AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

ON APRIL 5th, 1937, at 2:30 P.M., the Second Annual Meeting of the membership of the American Guild of Musical Artists, Inc., was scheduled to open in the Grill Room of the Hotel Plaza, New York City. It did not, in point of fact, open until 3:00 P.M.

Partially consoled, or at least reassured, by the reflection that, due to some curious tradition to which all musicians are committed, the meeting, had it been scheduled for three, would not have opened till four, the President called the members to order and embarked upon the business of the day.

A speech by the President and reports by the Recording Secretary, the Treasurer and the Executive Secretary, were followed by the election of the candidates nominated by the Nominations Committee as officers and members of the Board of Governors, and the ratification by the membership of the four changes in By-Laws voted by the Board during the year. The meeting also voted to ratify the action of the Board in its meeting of March 16th at which an Advisory Board, members of which are to be appointed by the Board of Governors, was created.

The reports of the Recording Secretary and the Treasurer are printed below. Mr. Tibbett’s speech is printed on the page opposite.

The officers elected were:

President .................... LAWRENCE TIBBETT
First Vice President ......... JASCHA HEIFETZ
Second Vice President ....... RICHARD BONELLI
Third Vice President ........ ALMA GLUCK
Fourth Vice President ...... FRANK SHERIDAN
Recording Secretary .......... QUEENA MARIO
Treasurer .................... FRANK LA FORGE

LEO FISCHER was reappointed Executive Secretary. Elected to the Board of Governors for three years were:

RUTH BRETON    EVA GAUTHIER
RICHARD CROOKS   FREDERICK JAGEL
LANNY ROSS

and for one year

DEEMS TAYLOR    ALEXANDER SMALLENS

In the absence of Miss Gladys Swarthout, Mr. Leo Fischer made the following report for the Recording Secretary:

Meetings held during the fiscal year 1936-37:

Meetings of the Board of Governors ........... 17
AGMA FORUM Meetings .................. 4
Membership Meetings ................. 2
New members .......................... 238
Members deceased .................. 2

The Treasurer, Mr. Frank La Forge, made the following report:

DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1936-37 ENDING MARCH 31, 1937
Receipts ................................ $13,084.49
Membership Dues and Initiation Fees
Disbursements .......................... $ 9,386.71
ASSETS
Cash in Bank ........................ $ 4,297.78
Telephone deposit ..................... 40.00
Office furniture and fixtures, cost $525.00, carried at ................................ 1.00
SURPLUS .............................. $ 4,338.78

NOTATION: Effect has not been given in the above statement to dues and initiation fees receivable from members at March 31st, 1937, which amounted to $6,221.50.

The Executive Secretary in a short talk outlined the work of the Guild during the past year and invited the membership to visit often at the new offices in which, he said, there will be installed a new couch. Several members voiced vociferous approval of this accommodation.

It was decided, at a request from the floor, that a definite and concise summary of the Dickstein Bill and AGMA’s connection with it be prepared and issued to the membership in order finally to put at rest all questions in the matter. Accordingly, in this issue of “AGMA” Magazine the summary is printed.

Routine business was quickly disposed of and, after a short and informal general discussion, the meeting was adjourned upon the motion of Frank Chapman.
AGMA's FIRST YEAR

by LAWRENCE TIBBETT

Outlining, at the Meeting on April 5th,
the Progress So Far Achieved

A LITTLE over a year ago there was no American Guild of Musical Artists, and there was very little, if any, cooperation between any of us in facing our common problems, although we dealt with the same interests and even with the same people in arranging the details of our professional life.

I do not know if this situation seems as strange and incredible to you as it does to me, now, after one year of AGMA, but I rather think that it must. The urgent necessity of AGMA and its place as an integral part of our professional life has proven itself so completely that I cannot believe that there was a time—and so very recently—when AGMA was not even in existence.

By this I do not mean to say that in its one year of existence AGMA has returned to us any large material benefits, although even in this short space of time it has returned us some. The exemption of the civic and community concerts from the Federal amusement tax—an exemption which was brought about by AGMA's activity in Washington last Spring—has, for instance, brought us all a definite material gain in making possible a number of additional concerts on this series.

But it is the psychological change that has come about that is, I think, the thing that is most valuable to us. We are only now, through AGMA, arrived in a position as a profession where we are unified and organized and can take stock of the situation about us and take steps to remedy the many conditions which demand our unified attention. In problems that affect us as one we can act as one. We are establishing a sense of security and solidarity in the profession such as has never existed before. As one of our prominent West Coast members wrote: “We artists out here feel a real sense of security and confidence in having an authoritative organization such as AGMA to turn to.”

I am myself astonished at the progress AGMA has made in this one year. When we met here for our First Annual Meeting last May I did not hope for so much. We had the example of other organizations like our own which had taken many years of preparation before they had perfected their organization and begun to act as a body. We have not yet perfected our organization but we have made a good start toward its ultimate perfection. We are still, it is true, in a formative stage but we are rapidly advancing. When a thing is so right as AGMA it needs only half a chance to prove itself.

Securing the exemption of the civic and community concert series from the levy of the ten per cent government amusement tax was AGMA's first accomplishment. Our managers and their representatives had been in Washington for some days, using all of their influence and persuasion with the Senate Finance Committee trying to persuade them to exempt Civic and Community Concerts from the Federal levy and their efforts had proved pretty generally futile. This was in the middle of last June and an AGMA committee was in Washington conducting our first investigations about the Dickstein Bill. Our managers asked our committee to plead their case for them before the Senate Committee. AGMA's committee did so and secured the exemption in a five-minute hearing—the only exemption, by the way, and the only change made in the bill, out of hundreds of requests.

We were thanked for our pains by Mr. Ward French and had a sincere sense of satisfaction at having made a positive demonstration of our good will. You may well understand, then, our surprise when, instead of any demonstration of good will in return, our managers, who had formed themselves into the Concerts Association of America, embarked upon a campaign of publicity in an attempt to throw discredit on the activities of AGMA in connection with the Dickstein Bill. This campaign comprised the issuing of thousands of press releases and the mailing of erroneous and misleading statements in connection with what were represented as the possible results of the Dickstein Bill, which misrepresented and misconstrued its clearest provisions as well as its underlying purposes.

This campaign did not stop with newspaper publicity. The Concerts Association of America did not hesitate to try to instigate dissatisfaction among the members of AGMA by attributing to AGMA the most unethical purposes with regard to the bill and by continuing the misrepresentation of the bill itself which was going on in the press.

All of these oppositional activities did not, luckily, succeed in entirely clouding the issues and distorting AGMA's stand; AGMA has been able to hold its position and to demonstrate to all who were cool enough to appreciate it that AGMA has stood for complete international freedom of art and for nothing else.

The whole thing has not been important—it has been merely aggravating. But it is very aggravating indeed for persons such as comprise our Board of Governors to be confronted with a situation in which an opposition, in a hasty, unthinking, hysterical and misguided manner, accuses them of unethical and inartistic views and purposes.

Let me here once more and finally state the principles upon which AGMA stands and has stood—principles which I am confident you will all applaud and defend—let me say that the objective of the American Guild of Musical Artists is to make the present reality instead of a distant ideal; to make it as easy for an artist to enter a European country from another European

(Continued on Page 12)
STUDIO AUDIENCES AT RADIO BROADCASTS
by QUERNA MARIO

Mme. Mario made this speech at the Award Luncheon of the Woman's National Radio Committee at the St. Regis on March 31st.

Mr. Rudy Vallee was scheduled to speak in defense of studio audiences at the same time but spoke, instead, in opposition so that the poor things were left without a leg to stand on.

Most of the prominent people in Musical Circles were present at the luncheon. Mme. Yolanda Mero-Irion is Chairman of the Committee.

Madam Chairman and Ladies of the Women's National Radio Committee:

WHATEVER I may say to you today is, of course, the expression of my personal opinion based on my own experience, but if you will allow me I should like to speak in some measure for all of the Musical Artists in America who are faced with this question of studio audiences and whose feelings in this connection are, in large part, identical with my own. So that you will not think it presumptuous of me to assume this representative capacity I must explain to you that Musical Artists in America, confronted with this as with a great many other pressing and important professional problems which affect all artists alike and must be solved by and for all alike, have recently formed into a group to examine the conditions of their art and to preserve its standards. This group is called the Ameriran Guild of Musical Artists and today it numbers in its membership nearly every prominent musical artist in this country as well as a great many young and rising stars of tomorrow.

In the many discussions which have been held in Guild meetings upon the subject of large non-paying audiences at radio-broadcast performances I have never known any of my friends and colleagues who were not opposed to the practice of admitting these audiences to the broadcast studio and who were not in favor of some action to curb their admission.

I hope that you will understand that this was not a purely selfish opposition engendered by the fact that approximately twenty thousand people weekly were getting into the habit of hearing their musical entertainment free of charge. Artists are notoriously impractical people and I do not think that even the realization of this considerable financial loss carried much weight in their decision against radio studio audiences. It was the danger which they saw to the standards of their art in the continuance of this practice and the terrible technical and psychological disadvantage under which they were placed by the presence of a studio audience which aroused their opposition.

So that you will understand their position let me remind you that the business of being a Musical Artist—the singing or playing or conducting of complicated and difficult music—is no easy matter and that it requires the utmost concentration of attention and energy on the part of the person who is engaged at it. What has sometimes been called temperament is usually only a manifestation of the terrific strain under which an artist is placed by the mere physical reactions of a trying performance. Even under ordinary circumstances—by which I mean the performance of an artist either to a visible audience before him in a concert hall or an invisible audience over the radio—the artist on the stage or in the studio, is both physically and psychologically under tension. However gracious he may appear you may be sure—and the most experienced artists will bear me out in this—that he is not nearly so self assured as he looks. One of the most important parts of any performance, therefore, is the adjustment between the artist and his audience and the establishment of a sympathetic communication between them. This is why different audiences color the performance that their critical opinion may induce. An artist is attempting to give a radio broadcast performance before a studio audience of two or three or five thousand people.

First of all, let me remind you that the technique that is employed in singing or playing in a radio studio is not at all the same as that employed in legitimate concert or operatic performances. There is, to begin with, the necessity of keeping to one spot on the floor in order to preserve the acoustical niceties of the various microphones; then certain passages must be played or sung in a distorted manner in order to get the proper effects over the radio transmission system. Radio broadcasting is a highly specialized thing and consists of a great deal more than merely placing a microphone before the artist who is performing. Now when an audience is present in a room it is the artist's natural reaction to perform to that audience; this is practically an involuntary thing, and one of the highest refinements of musical artistry is to tune your performance to the individual mood of the particular audience before you. So if the artist follows his natural inclination, on seeing a large audience in the studio, he performs to it and responds to its reactions, and, because the artist music is the most important thing and technical problems in inversely proportional wave frequencies something strange and for the most part ungenial, he usually forgets all about his microphone spot and his volume control and all of the other mechanical requisites of broadcasting. Consequently, although the audience that is in the studio his performance may be superb, to the considerably larger audience at the other end of the transmission system his performance is very unusual indeed, and they will turn quickly to other stations after making ungenerous remarks about his musical ability. On the other hand, if the artist turns his whole attention to what is of the most immediate importance at the moment—the performance of a perfect radio broadcast—because of the acoustical requirements of the studio, the audience that is present there can in most cases hear nothing or hear so distorted a performance that their critical opinion of the artist will be most unfairly affected.

I once attended a performance of one of my colleagues made before a studio audience of over two thousand people. There was a microphone situated immediately before the artist to pick up the sound of his voice and in other places throughout the studio microphones were placed to pick up the orchestral accompaniment. In the control room voice and orchestra were properly blended so as to insure perfect radio reception. In the studio, however, the voice did not emerge clearly from the orchestra and the audience of two thousand began to show signs of dissatisfaction. These the artist noticed and he began to perform to the audience he saw before him, giving full play to his range and volume. This had a rather startling effect on the acoustical balance that (Continued on Page 8)
A Letter from
The Concerts Association of America

On March 30th the Office Received the Following Communication:

Mr. Leo Fischer,
American Guild of Musical Artists,
551 Fifth Avenue,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Fischer:
We have recently heard that the American Guild of Musical Artists is going to take over the Grand Opera Artists Association of America, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Should your organization thus become affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and its members be required to limit their appearances to Union houses, we take the liberty of calling to your attention at this time a situation which may react against the interest of your members.

There are an increasing number of smaller cities giving concerts nowadays in high school auditoriums throughout the United States, and it is a settled policy of the Boards of Education in these cities to maintain these high school auditoriums as non-union houses.

We have had in the past year several disputes arising from the playing of concerts or dance attractions in high school and college auditoriums, and threats of boycott.

The matter is important from the local manager's standpoint because these high school auditoriums represent the last remaining item in concert budgets which can be said to be economical. The presumable purpose of the union in boycotting a high school auditorium would be to compel the local manager to place his attractions in a theatre.

Now the rental of theatres is always more than a high school auditorium and sometimes twice, three, even four times as much. If the average rental of a high school auditorium is $100, and the average rental of a theatre of the same size $250, and 200 cities are involved for five concerts, or a total of 1000 concerts in one season, there would be $150,000 paid in extra rentals to theatres, and I am sure you will agree with me that it would better suit our mutual interests if this $150,000 were paid to concert artists!

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK SCHANG, JR.
Secretary.

CONCERTS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
March 31st, 1937.

AMERICAN GUILD OF MUSICAL ARTISTS, Inc.

Mr. Frederick Schang, Jr.,
Concerts Association of America,
113 West 57th Street,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Schang:
This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 31st. Preparations for the Guild's annual meeting on April 5th have prevented my earlier reply. I have read your letter to our Board of Governors and have been instructed by them to assure you that we will take great care in all matters to make arrangements which are to the best possible interest of Guild members and of the concert business in general.

With best wishes, I am
Very sincerely yours,

LEO FISCHER
Executive Secretary.

To Which the Following Reply Was Given:

Mr. Frederick Schang, Jr.,
Concerts Association of America,
113 West 57th Street,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Schang:
I have read your letter to our Board of Governors and have been instructed by them to assure you that we will take great care in all matters to make arrangements which are to the best possible interest of Guild members and of the concert business in general.

With best wishes, I am
Very sincerely yours,

(Continued on Page 9)

ONE of the most interesting things that has come out of the negotiations for AGMA’s affiliation with the Four A’s has been the discovery that otherwise experienced and well informed people are hopelessly ignorant of the workings and the policies of labor organizations. Even at this late date, when actors and musicians have for many years been organized, important people in the musical world entertain the most unfounded and the most inaccurate notions about the implications of affiliation with the Four A’s.

Mr. Schang’s letter seems to us to be a rather good example of the prevailing but erroneous point of view in these matters and, in order that the membership may not be confused in regard to the matters that are raised in it, it seems necessary to here set forth a definite clarification of the situation.

The letter begins: “Should your organization thus become affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and its members be required to limit their appearances to Union houses…” Now in this simple non sequitur lies the fundamental fallacy of Mr. Schang’s position.

Affiliation with the Associated Actors and Artists of America, an organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, does not mean that AGMA’s members would be required to confine their appearances to “Union houses.” Mr. Schang’s letter is so worded as to give the impression that affiliation would place AGMA’s members under an obligation in this matter; there is, of course, no doubt but that Mr. Schang thinks it would. The fact of the matter is that it would not. That is the simple answer to that.

Because Mr. Schang’s mistake is such a general one, it might be well, however, to examine it further in order, once and for all, to clear it up as far as AGMA’s members and prospective members are concerned.

When an organization affiliates itself with the A. F. of L. or, as in the case of AGMA, with another organization so affiliated (the Four A’s), it does not relinquish any of its autonomy or its inde-
Special Delivery

W E'VE finally managed to straighten things out with the postman and we're glad because he's turned out to be a very nice fellow. He's musical.

He was born in Vienna and learned to play the violin before he could walk; as a consequence whenever he plays it now he sits down. He lives up on 133rd Street near Amsterdam Avenue—just across the way from the Stadium. In the summer he sits up on the roof and can see and hear everything perfectly—some of the diction, he says, on vocal nights, isn't what it might be although he thinks the trolley may interfere.

He's very well up on the subject of diction, having had his first experience as an opera fan in Vienna where everything is translated into German. He doesn't know why everything isn't translated here—it spoils most of the pleasure, he says, when he doesn't know what it's all about. Now he only completely enjoys the German operas because he understands the words. He wonders why other people who don't understand the words sit with such solemn expressions through the long dialogue parts—sometimes he wonders what they can be thinking about and that distracts his attention from the performance. He suspects that a lot of them are just putting on airs, so to speak, because they don't look happy and only applaud after everyone else has well started so as to be sure not to make a noise at the wrong time. He thinks if they could hear the operas in their own language they wouldn't look so dyspeptic.

After listening to his account of the Stadium concerts from the top of his roof, we asked him if he ever paid to get into an opera or concert and he said that he used to pay but not any more. He said that in the summer he could just go on the roof and that in the winter he went to Carnegie Hall on Sunday nights. He said he didn't think the Carnegie programs were musically as good as the roof programs but the light was brighter and besides he had paid so much for his automobile that he wanted to get something out of it. He asked me why the automobile companies didn't just sell automobiles to people that wanted them and let the musicians sell music the same way.

I told him I didn't know—that I thought the automobile companies were interested in raising the standard of American Culture and that they wanted to Bring Good Music To The Masses.

He said why do they cut everything in half then. He said he heard the Franz Lehár at the Minor Symphony three times at the automobile concerts and that one time they played the first and second movements, one time they played the first alone and the last time they played the second and part of the Nutcracker suite to fill out the rest of the time but that they'd never gotten around to playing the third movement at any of the concerts. It gave him a sort of dissatisfied feeling, he said. Then, too, he likes to get up and walk about the roof during the Stadium intermissions and he used to like to walk about the corridors of the opera house in the intermissions at Vienna but at the auto concerts he has to sit and listen to speeches about things.

I asked him why he went to the auto concerts then, if everything was wrong, and he said, oh well, all the artists sing on them, so he just goes. He said he had heard that all the artists were going to live out near Detroit. I said, oh no, you must be mistaken, and he said, well, you never can tell.

I was so interested in our conversation that when he left he took this month's special delivery letter away with him. That's why it isn't printed here.

We will always be grateful to the Radio Corporation of America for the delightful aplomb with which they go about bringing the opera to the people on Saturday afternoons. Everything is done to make the radio listener as comfortable as possible and those trying intervals between acts when the audience in the Opera House are rustling in and out of seats—intervals which might easily be so painful over the loudspeaker—are made diverting and enjoyable instead by the alternate observations of Miss Marcia Davenport and Mr. Milton J. Cross.

We especially liked the course of events the week of the Faust broadcast. During the third intermission Miss Davenport spoke of a number of things and at the end told us hurriedly that the music was just about to begin and that Mr. Cross wouldn't have time to say a word before it did.

She must realize by now that she underestimated Mr. Cross. With a little click he switched off Miss Davenport and heroically if a little warily—Faust is so long—he delivered his valedictory.

"And now," said Mr. Cross, "we have the short last act of Faust—brief but powerful."

And then the music started, very loud and deep.

At the Annual Meeting at the Plaza it was suggested that the office issue literature outlining the Guild's policies and purposes to aid members in their drive for new members. We've been giving the matter a lot of thought and we

Studio Audiences at Radio Broadcasts

(Continued from Page 6)

had been so carefully arranged and there were frantic signals from the control room. The artist became uncertain and abandoned his position on the floor; the conductor gesticulated; the artist stepped back; the conductor narrowly avoided putting out his eye with the baton. It was all very exciting and fascinating to watch if not particularly satisfactory to hear.

This was the sort of thing that the artist experienced, and these are the conditions under which the performer of serious music must labor when giving a performance on any of the programs which feature a large studio audience. Trying to do two difficult and distinct things at once he finds, usually, that the results are, to all concerned, unsatisfactory in the extreme. I am sure you will understand what effect this condition would have on the whole art of music if it were allowed to continue indefinitely.

On the other—the financial—half of the question I will not even attempt to touch because it is too complicated a problem for the time that remains at my disposal. In passing I will merely say that when the audience can hear the most prominent artists in the world perform every week free of charge, even in programs which are as technically and artistically excellent as these must be, it becomes exceedingly difficult for these same artists or their colleagues or the young artists who are beginning their careers to induce the public to pay for admission to legitimate concert enterprises. One single series of these programs has, during the past season, admitted one hundred and eighty-seven thousand people free of charge in this way.

In closing let me say that neither I nor my colleagues seek to prevent the admission of the studio audience in cases where its presence is vital either to the program or to the performer. In the case of variety shows over the air or in comedy programs it is easy to see that the presence of an audience in the studio may contribute something of value. In the case of musical programs the studio audience is fatal. I believe that it is to the best interests of the artists themselves, of the musical public and of the standards of musical art that these audiences be discontinued on programs where serious music is performed.

I can't decide whether to make up a lot of literature of our own or to just wait for the next printing of Dale Carnegie's "How to Win Friends and Influence People." If the membership and the membership of the Guild's "How to Win Friends and Influence People" there would be no problem; they would become Svengalis and win all the Thisses. For ourselves, of course, there would always remain the problem of insomnia.

• 8
A Letter From the Concerts Association
(Continued from Page 7)

pendence in forming its own policies. This may, perhaps, be qualified by remarking that a member of one affiliated organization may not break strikes of members of another; that is, a member of AGMA would not be encouraged to take the place of a musician in a pit at an operatic performance where the orchestra was on strike, and AGMA members would not be allowed to pull up curtains and shift scenery in opposition to striking stagehands. All this has been thoroughly discussed at AGMA Forums and in prominent issues of "AGMA" Magazine and it has been pretty generally understood that beyond this there is no other obligation enjoined.

Affiliated organizations may form, by regular vote of their membership, policies in regard to any professional problem and they usually do form such policies since this is the reason for the organization's existence. For instance, in this particular matter the American Federation of Musicians has as its policy that houses that are labelled "Unfair" must not be patronized and its members are requested not to play in them. An "Unfair" house is one which has made a contract with a union and then violated the terms of the contract. In this connection an "Unfair" house must be distinguished from a "Non-Union" house. A "Non-Union" house can never be an "Unfair" one because, by its very name, it has never made a contract with a union and consequently has never broken one. The American Federation of Musicians does not require its members in the terms of Mr. Schang's letter, to "boycott" or "Non-Union" houses; in point of fact, members of the American Federation of Musicians regularly play in non-union houses throughout the country.

There is very little discrimination in the matter of auditoriums at all. Mr. Joseph Weber, President of the American Federation of Musicians, told Mr. Leo Fischer, Executive Secretary of AGMA, in a recent conference that in all of last year, in all of the extensive jurisdiction of the A. F. of M., there was not one single case of strike or "boycott" against an "Unfair" house and that in the year before there were only three. All of the while, it must be remembered, American Federation of Musicians members regularly accepted employment in "Non-Union" houses.

All this explanation of the policy of the American Federation of Musicians in regard to auditoriums is to show how these matters work out in practical application and to unequivocally demonstrate that affiliation with the Four A's or with the American Federation of Labor most certainly does not mean "boycott" of "Non-Union" houses.

Whatever policy the members of AGMA may adopt will be adopted by them without any pressure from within or without the American Federation of Labor and, as we assured Mr. Schang, will be calculated to work to the "best possible interest of Guild members and of the concert business in general." To continue further with Mr. Schang's letter, we find in the third paragraph the statement that "it is a settled policy of the Boards of Education throughout the United States to maintain these high school auditoriums as non-union houses."

This is, we think, another error of statement. We have been assured by the Building Bureau of the Board of Education of the City of New York that there is no policy, settled or otherwise, on the part of the Board of Education in New York regarding union labor and that, to the best of our informant's knowledge, no such policy existed on the part of other Boards of Education throughout the country. In New York City the maintenance of school buildings is conceded upon contractual bids of independent contractors and the contractor is in no way obligated by the Board to employ either union or non-union labor. As a result both union and non-union labor are employed in the New York City schools. Furthermore, it seems likely, as our informant in the New York Board of Education assured us, that this same policy in regard to union labor is pursued by Boards of Education throughout the country, since the labor union is an established institution and legislation has been passed in most states to aid it in obtaining its objectives.

Finally, we must assume that when Mr. Schang refers to "Union" and "Non-Union" high school auditoriums, he means auditoriums in high schools which do or do not employ union superintendents, furnace men, cleaners, etc., etc. Now, whatever may be the relations between these high schools and their employees, AGMA has and can have nothing to do with the policies on either side. AGMA's affiliation with the Four A's will not create any connection with these matters or impose any obligation in relation to them. In the matter of high school auditoriums, AGMA members will still make individual rental arrangements in individual cases. If it is true that clients of Mr. Schang and his colleagues have received "threats of boycott" in labor disputes of this sort, it seems likely that AGMA's affiliation with the Four A's will put an end to these threats for AGMA members by establishing cordial relations between them and members of these unions.

Whether or not the rental of union halls is consistently $150 greater than that of non-union halls has not been definitely established and it has not been clearly demonstrated that the increase, if any, is not due to higher real estate values or greater services rendered rather than to the fact that the hall is a union hall.

We should very much value the cooperation of Mr. Schang and his fellow members of the Concerts Association of America in arriving at some conclusion in this question. And if the members of the CAA can figure out some method of saving AGMA members $150,000,000 annually it is their job as business representatives of AGMA members to do so and AGMA will certainly cooperate to the fullest possible extent.

For the present Mr. Schang, by his misconception of the situation, has given rise to the possibility that AGMA members and those artists who are considering becoming members of AGMA may be confused in the matter. We hope that this explanation will set affairs aright.

April, 1937
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Thinking that it might be of interest to the membership to examine a thing about which so many curious things have been said, we herewith print a copy of the Dickstein Bill in its final form together with an analysis of AGMA’s attitude toward it.

The Dickstein Bill

To protect the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States for American actors, singers, dancers, solo instrumentalists, and orchestral conductors, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

That no alien, singer, dancer, solo instrumentalist, or orchestral conductor seeking admission to the United States for professional engagement or engagements shall hereafter be admitted to the United States if the country of which such alien is a citizen or subject does not afford, both in law and in fact, substantially similar rights and privileges to citizens of the United States, who are actors, singers, dancers, solo instrumentalists or orchestral conductors seeking engagement (professional) or engagements in such foreign country as the United States afforded citizens of such foreign country of the same vocation in their various professional capacities, and a finding that such is a fact has been made by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with section two of this act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Labor, after full investigation and hearing, shall determine whether any foreign country does not afford citizens of the United States the rights and privileges described in section 1 of this act. Such investigation or hearing may be instituted by the Secretary of Labor upon his own motion or upon complaint by reputable organizations and associations of artists, actors, singers, dancers, solo instrumentalists or orchestral conductors, or of managers or producers or by others having a managerial interest, and at any such hearing such organizations, associations or persons and any representative of such foreign country or of any artist therein, shall be given an opportunity to be heard. The findings of the Secretary of Labor shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review.

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section one of this act the Secretary of Labor may authorize the admission (for a temporary period or for permanent residence) for the purpose of professional engagements of any alien actor, singer, dancer, solo instrumentalist, or orchestral conductor, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws upon application made to and approved by the Secretary of Labor prior to the alien’s departure from any foreign country, and upon a finding after full hearing and investigation, that an artist having similar qualifications to the artist seeking admission under this section cannot be found among unemployed citizens or lawful (permanent) resident aliens. In reaching a determination under this section the Secretary of Labor is authorized to seek the counsel of reputable American organizations or associations of actors, singers, dancers, solo instrumentalists or orchestral conductors, and other interested parties.

Where temporary admission is authorized admission shall be under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, including, where deemed necessary, the giving of bond with sufficient surety to insure maintenance of status and departure from the United States in accordance with the terms of admission.

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing the admission to the United States of an instrumental musician who is inadmissible under the act approved March 17th, 1932 (47 Stat. 67).

Sec. 5. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe the rules and regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this act; but all rules and regulations insofar as they relate to the administration of this act by consular officers abroad shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State, on the recommendation of the Secretary of Labor. This act and rules and regulations issued pursuant thereto are in addition to and not in substitution for the existing immigration laws and shall be enforced as part of such laws, rules and regulations. (H. R. 50.)

Shortly after the formation of AGMA in the Spring of 1936, we received at the office a copy of H. R. 12325, a bill introduced by Congressman Dickstein in the 72nd Session of Congress.

H. R. 12325 was designed, according to its preamble, “To protect for American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers and orchestral conductors the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States.” In this first form, the bill did not include instrumental soloists and solo dancers in its provisions.

Section 1 of H. R. 12325 provided that all alien musicians in the classifications enumerated in the preamble should hereafter, before being admitted to the United States, be required to secure permission for entry from the Secretary of Labor.

Section 2 provided that the Secretary of Labor should issue such permits for entry to all applicants who, as vocal musicians, orchestral conductors, etc., were generally recognized as artists of distinguished merit and ability; it was further provided that an artist should be considered of distinguished merit or ability if he had, continuously, for a period of five years prior to his application for entry to the United States been employed by a recognized and established musical or theatrical group abroad.

Section 3 provided that the number of artists admitted to the United States from any country in any year should be exactly equal to the number of American artists admitted to the same country in the same year.

The remaining part of the bill was designed to guide the Secretary of Labor in his issuance of entry permits under the provisions of the bill and instructed that:

The Secretary should issue permits to applicants in cases where it was demonstrated that an artist having similar qualifications to the applicant was not available already in America.

Permits should be issued where it was shown that the admission of the applicant would not displace an artist already employed in the United States.

The Secretary of Labor, in determining the situation in regard to the two previous provisions should seek the advice of American organizations of artists.

A summary perusal of H. R. 12325 will show that its primary and almost sole aim was to exclude ordinary “run-of-the-mill” musicians who could easily be duplicated in the United States and whose entry was not necessary either from an economic or an artistic point of view. Despite the horrified howlings about the exclusion of “Toscaninis and Kreislers” the bill, it will be seen, expressly provided in Section 2 that “This act shall
not be construed to limit or restrict the entry into the United States under contract or otherwise of any alien . . . who is generally recognized as of distinguished merit and ability professionally and who seeks entry to fill engagements in the United States of a character requiring superior talent.”

Far from excluding Toscanini or Kreisler or Rachmaninoff, this section could easily be twisted by a half clever lawyer to admit a trained seal.

As it then stood, the Dickstein Bill, H. R. 12325, was intended by its framers to put a curb to the entirely unlimited flow of mediocre musicians who came to this country with nominal short term contracts and remained in the country upon speculation after the contracts had expired and as such, in spirit if not in letter, it was, perhaps, to be applauded.

However, it was not in any restrictive feature of the bill that AGMA was interested. It was the opinion of the Board of Governors that this unnatural and wasteful influx of persons who had no reason for being here was the result of the unbalanced condition which obtained with relation to immigration provision of this and other countries. The United States had no immigration restrictions; nearly all countries had very strong restrictions. It was the belief of the Board that if these restrictions of other countries could be broken down the influx of mediocrity would automatically stop because it would no longer be profitable for it to continue in competition with recognized and distinguished American and foreign artists and the Board preferred this method of breaking down barriers to the method of counter restriction which the original framers of the Dickstein Bill had decided upon.

The Board then set to work to prepare a redraft of the Dickstein Bill, which would make the reciprocity clause (Section 3) the most important part of the bill so that countries which persisted in excluding American artists would find it more difficult to continue their unfair practices.

In this task they faced many grave difficulties. As has been pointed out in a previous “AGMA” article on this same subject, the United States Government cannot bring any direct pressure to bear on these foreign countries to induce them to temper their immigration regulations. The only thing which could be done was to provide for some direct form of reaction against the particular countries which offended and the Board believed that some form of reciprocal arrangement would best serve this purpose. Thus, if a European country refused to allow the admission of an American artist, under the new form of the Dickstein Bill which the Guild drew up, the citizens of that particular country would find it more difficult to enter the United States. At the same time the new form of the bill would not have prevented the entry of anyone in actual fact. Its sole effect would have been, if passed, to act as a sort of official protest to those countries which imposed restrictions against American artists and in this way, possibly, to bring about the abolition of all restrictions. Incidentally, it may be remarked that if the bill had had this desired effect it might have resulted in the breaking down of the immigration barriers for artists between the European countries themselves and thus become an incalculable boon for European artists.

In its new form, as AGMA prepared it and as Congressman Dickstein so helpfully cooperated in drawing it up, the Dickstein Bill (newly introduced as H. R. 12913) was as follows:

Its provisions were extended to include solo instrumentalists and solo dancers as well as actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers and orchestral conductors. The reciprocal clauses with the same qualifications and the same plan for administration were retained.

In testifying for the Guild before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Lawrence Tibbett, heading an AGMA committee composed of Charles Hackett, Don Voorhees, Efrem Zimbalist and Leo Fischer, said in connection with the Dickstein Bill: “We fully believe that the passage of this bill would, in great measure, bring about the tearing down of these existing barriers by giving rise to the necessity of reciprocal agreements between nations. Nothing is further from our minds than to urge a ban on alien artists. RECIPROCITY IS THE KEYNOTE OF OUR PLEA—NOT RESTRICTION.”

This statement of Mr. Tibbett perfectly outlines the Guild’s stand then and the Guild’s stand now. This stand has not been contested by foreign artists of distinguished merit and ability in the United States. These artists have been welcomed here and treated with hospitality and adulation. They know how different immigration conditions are here in comparison to immigration conditions in some countries of Europe—in many cases in their own countries. We think that they must be grateful to the American people for their wholesome and rational outlook in these matters and we hardly suppose that they can resent the efforts of American artists to gain for themselves the same rights in Europe which they enjoy here.

The opposition which came to H. R. 12913 was not from foreign artists in America but from American managers and producers in America. These persons can be supposed to have an immediate financial interest in preserving the unfair and unbalanced immigration situation although in the long run their financial interests must suffer by its preservation. However, consideration of their financial interests must be left to themselves.

H. R. 12913 passed the House of Representatives and was sent to the Senate Committee with two days for its passage before the end of the session. In the late afternoon of the second day, as the bill was being polled out of committee for a vote in the Senate, a telegram arrived from Henry Moskowitz, now deceased, then president of the League of New York Theatres, who asked for extensive hearings in the Senate Committee before the bill was sent for vote to the Senate Chamber. With the session ending in a few hours the bill died.

(Continued on Page 12)
The Dickstein Bill
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When the bill was reintroduced into this session of Congress as H. R. 30, AGMA sent its committee to Washington with further amendments which were calculated to improve the bill as an instrument of protest and to remove any possibility that if passed it could be administered as a restrictive measure. These amendments were offered by Mr. Tibbett and adopted by Mr. Dickstein. They provided as follows:

That the numerical reciprocity clause be discarded and that instead a very elastic feature be incorporated, incapable of practical application but designed to bring a protest to the attention of foreign governments. This feature provided that “No alien artist be admitted to the United States... for professional engagements... unless the country of which he is citizen affords both in law and in fact substantially similar rights and privileges to citizens of the United States seeking admission (to the foreign country in question) as are afforded by the United States to the applicant seeking admission.”

This is a purpose which none can openly challenge. The entry of no artist would be hindered unless the country of which that artist were a citizen were actively engaged in enforcing restrictions upon citizens of the United States and in withholding rights from them which were offered by the United States to the citizens of that country.

However, to make doubly sure that, even in cases where restrictions were enforced against Americans, the bill could act only as a protest and not as an exclusive measure, the following sections of the bill provided that such an applicant might even yet be admitted from such a country if he were of outstanding ability and if his admission would not displace an American artist holding an engagement.

The campaign of publicity which was carried on against this bill and against AGMA’s stand on the bill is well known to everyone. This campaign made use of all of the most advanced forms of bad taste, recrimination, misrepresentation, lies and ignorance. It was backed by large expenditures of funds. It was successful. AGMA now stands where it has always stood. It still holds up as its objective the ideal of complete international freedom of art and artists, still pledges itself:

(1) To further the development of musical art and culture in the United States.
(2) To foster and advance the musical professions.
(3) To help open the doors in foreign countries for American musical artists as America has opened its doors to artists from other nations.
(4) To help establish free interchange of artists among the nations of the world so that universality in music may become a present reality instead of a distant ideal.

The keynote of AGMA’s plea is still reciprocity—AGMA will still never be satisfied until all of the great artists—native and foreign—who are its members have the freedom of the world.

AGMA’s First Year

(Continued from Page 5)

country or from America as it is for that artist to enter America from Europe. I am confident that you are all with me when I say that AGMA will never be satisfied until all of the great artists—native and foreign—who are its members have the freedom of the world.

One of the most brilliant things which we have accomplished in this last year is the AGMA-Red Cross Flood Relief Concert which was presented at Carnegie Hall on February 20th. This was a benefit unique among benefits—one at which all of the artists advertised appeared and performed the numbers printed in the program. The box office receipts topped $31,000—a record at Carnegie—and we turned over to the Red Cross over $25,600.00. Our Flood Relief Concert presented the AGMA ideal perfectly to the public—the ideal of cooperation and collaboration between all artists—native and foreign—for a common cause.

The prospect for the next year is, if possible, even more gratifying than the retrospect of the last. Following the overwhelming results of the referendum submitted to the membership we hope within a few weeks to have completed negotiations for AGMA’s affiliation with the Four A’s. When this step is accomplished we will have taken our place as the representative of music among the representatives of the other arts, to guide its policies and shape its courses.

And we will continue to grow until in a short time we will have enrolled all of our colleagues among us. We went into our first meeting with twenty-two members; we now number over two hundred and fifty. That is a good percentage of the whole profession. Let us hope and above all let us work for the completion of our growth in the new year.

We are all conscious of the great possibilities of AGMA. To bring these possibilities to brilliant consummation it is only necessary for us all to work together—to attend all meetings and to interchange information and ideas. Besides the regular meetings of the membership we have now our magazine, “AGMA” and I am glad to see that the membership is already contributing to it in the form of letters and articles.

We can look forward to a year in which, through AGMA, musical artists in America will labor in the interests of musical art; in which they will eradicate some of the abuses and ignorances which have been weighing upon its development; a year in which young artists will be encouraged and new ventures supported.