

10-14-1967

Henri Temianka Correspondence; (gebauer)

Werner Gebauer

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/temianka_correspondence

Recommended Citation

Gebauer, Werner, "Henri Temianka Correspondence; (gebauer)" (1967). *Henri Temianka Correspondence*. 1127.

https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/temianka_correspondence/1127

This Letter is brought to you for free and open access by the Henri Temianka Archives at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Henri Temianka Correspondence by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact laughtin@chapman.edu.

Henri Temianka Correspondence; (gebauer)

Description

This collection contains material pertaining to the life, career, and activities of Henri Temianka, violin virtuoso, conductor, music teacher, and author. Materials include correspondence, concert programs and flyers, music scores, photographs, and books.

Keywords

Henri Temianka, Werner Gebauer, October 14, 1967, virtuosity in musical performance, culture, violinist, violin, chamber music, camaraderie, discontent, music education, funds, legal matters, money, concert tour



CHAMBER SYMPHONY SOCIETY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

SPONSOR OF THE CALIFORNIA CHAMBER SYMPHONY
HENRI TEMIANKA FOUNDER AND DIRECTOR

Officers

President

Mr. Joseph M. Davis, Jr.



Past President

Dr. Robert J. Stoller



Administrative Vice President

Dr. Werner G. Bauer



Vice Presidents

Mr. Irl Korsen

Chairman Executive Committee

Mrs. Alfred M. Klein

Dr. Vern O. Knudsen

Mrs. Chester I. Lappen

Dr. Ruben F. Mettler

Dr. Franklin D. Murphy

Mr. John Van der Zee



Secretary

Mrs. Frederick R. Waingrow



Treasurer

Mr. Paul Shaw



Legal Advisor

Mr. George L. Hecker



President Auxiliary

Mrs. Floyd M. Estess



Board of Trustees

Mrs. Willard Coe

Mr. Mack David

Mr. Joseph M. Davis, Jr.

Mrs. Lawrence Dobkin

Dr. Glenn S. Dumke

Mrs. Floyd M. Estess

Mrs. Michael J. Fasman

Mr. Alex J. Fishbein

Mr. Moe Greendale

Mr. George L. Hecker

Mr. Ronald A. Hecker

Mr. Peter Kahn, Jr.

Mrs. Alfred M. Klein

Dr. Vern O. Knudsen

Mr. Irl Korsen

Mrs. Chester I. Lappen

Dr. Edward A. Lasher

Mr. Gordon G. MacLean

Dr. Ruben F. Mettler

Dr. Franklin D. Murphy

Mrs. Saul Pick

Dr. Simon Ramo

Mrs. Arthur N. Reicher

Mr. Richard J. Riordan

Mr. Paul Shaw

Mrs. Albert F. Sperry

Dr. Robert J. Stoller

Mr. Henri Temianka

Mr. John Van der Zee

Mrs. Frederick R. Waingrow

Mrs. Irwin Weinstein

Mrs. Herman Weiss

October 14, 1967

Mr. Henri Temianka
2915 Patricia Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90064

Dear Henri: (Henri- as in friend... not Henri as in business-ally)

We have, in our close working relationship over recent months, become attuned to each other's moods-- and you are reading mine like an open book.

Your comment of yesterday that "Joe was furious" over my "ill-advised" (or rather non-advised) letter of October 9, had a debilitating effect on me.

I am genuinely fond of Joe and I respect him-- I am also disappointed in him; specifically, his curious proclivity for passing judgement based on rule-book text and tin-imagery, is as unbending as it is irritating.

So that at least you understand, let me take the contentious letter apart and tell you how I feel about it. If I am wrong in my thinking, I shall listen to you.

Without editorializing, the face-value of the letter reads as follows:

- a) I have car problems-
- b) car problems which could impede my mobility in behalf of the Society-
- c) I cannot afford to lease a new car-
- d) I asked for a \$ 100.- mo. salary raise-- and to pave the way for executive consideration of said request, I suggested to
- e) cut the/a Secretary's salary by \$ 50.- mos.

Plainly, paragraph e) set of the explosion, and a rush to the rescue of the poor working girl ensued.

Joe even felt impelled to ask his secretary how she reacted to it (although my letter was clearly marked PERSONAL).

What, in heaven's name, did Joe expect to hear ? It is like asking a Waiter- who does not know you- "HOW IS THE SOUP?" -- What is the man going to answer ? " IT'S NO GOOD "-- ??

It should be self-apparent that my sole motif for volunteering means to implement a raise, was to avoid an impractical burden on the Society Budget and, by the same token, effect somewhat of a relief for me on the home-front.

My reference to "Secretary" was strictly in the sense of Clerical Help and not Personality.

Miss Susmanhas turned out to be a very capable secretary, taking on responsibilities beyond office hours and being motivated by a genuine interest in the Society.

On a basis of Returns For Value Received- and those seem to be the views of the Society's policy-makers-- :

a) we pay the Secretary adequately for a job well done-

b) we pay the Administrator inadequately for a job well done.

To spell this out a bit more detailed, there is little equity in a system which advocates \$ 750.- compensation for an Executive who is called upon to be the pivotal source of inspiration and energy for many, and to allocate \$ 450.- for his clerical help.

When we advertised for a secretary last April, there was a definite need then for an executive secretary-- greater a need than be have today.

I am sure that you can recall the chaos that I inherited at the time I took office. We have come a long way from those dark days; we have established an up-to-date filing system, time-saving office routines, a written manual- minutely detailed- as reference guide for secretarial procedures of all Society business etc. etc.; all of which de-emphasizes a current need for an executive-calibre girl with commensurate salary requirements. Not that our operation does not welcome or benefit by a competent girl with initiative at all times.

So-- before LIT-NING struck- I had intended (with presidential approval) to ask Susan to either accept or reject the projected salary adjustment, also intending to inform her of the reason for such a necessity.

The upshot of the whole matter is not as much the issue of a raise-- the Society may not, with all good intentions, be able to pay more at this time, and this I could understand and accept.

But the Society cannot afford to doubt me at this stage-- that, I cannot and will not accept !

Have I earned the right to be understood-- after 8 months in a glasshouse for anyone to take potshots at me; can anyone point to a solitary instance when I failed to place Society interests before my own ? Or, do I have to continue to couch each and every issue as if it were an exercise in diplomacy-- for fear that my motives may be misinterpreted ??

To be sure, Henri- I see the necessity of a carefully balanced relationship with most of the members of the Society-- but to have to walk on eggs with my closest collaborators seems a needless burden.

Joe and I, after an hour's friendly telephone conversation before he left, did agree to table the issue; we haven't resolved it, though.

Now, that I feel better, having bared my soul, I am perfectly willing to forget the whole bloody mess.

But does, or will Joe ?

Best-

