

The Daily Tar Heel

OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE CAROLINA PUBLICATIONS UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Published daily except Mondays, Examination periods and the Thanksgiving, Christmas and Spring holidays.

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C., under act of March 3, 1879.

1941 Member 1942
Associated Collegiate Press

REPRESENTED FOR NATIONAL ADVERTISING BY
National Advertising Service, Inc.
College Publishers Representative
420 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK, N. Y.
CHICAGO • BOSTON • LOS ANGELES • SAN FRANCISCO

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
\$1.50 One Quarter — \$3.00 One Year

All signed articles and columns are opinions of the writers themselves, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the DAILY TAR HEEL.

For This Issue:
News: WALTER KLEIN
Sports: EARLE HELLEN

Editor
ORVILLE CAMPBELL
Managing Editor
SYLVAN MEYER
Business Manager
WILLIAM SCHWARTZ
Acting Circulation Manager
HENRY ZATTOUN
Associate Editor
BUCKY HARWARD

EDITORIAL BOARD: Mac Norwood, Henry Moll.
COLUMNISTS: Marion Lippincott, Walter Damtoft, Harley Moore, Elsie Lyon, Brad McCuen, Tom Hammond.
NEWS EDITORS: Bob Hoke, Paul Komisaruk, Hayden Carruth.
ASSISTANT NEWS: A. D. Currie, Walter Klein, Westy Fenhagen, Bob Levin.
REPORTERS: Jimmy Wallace, Billy Webb, Larry Dale, Charles Kessler, Burke Shipley, Elton Edwards, Gene Smith, Morton Cantor, Nancy Smith, Jule Phoenix, Janice Feitelberg, Jim Loebe, Lou Alice Taylor.
PHOTOGRAPHER: Hugh Morton.
ASSISTANT PHOTOGRAPHERS: Tyler Nourse, Bill Taylor.
SPORTS EDITOR: Harry Hollingsworth.
NIGHT SPORTS EDITORS: Earle Hellen, Mark Garner, Bill Woestendiek.
SPORTS REPORTERS: Ben Snyder, Stud Gleicher, Thac Tate, Phyllis Yates.
ADVERTISING MANAGERS: Jack Dube, Bill Stanback, Ditz Buice.
DURHAM REPRESENTATIVES: Marvin Rosen, Bob Bettman.
LOCAL ADVERTISING STAFF: Jimmy Norris, Buddy Cummings, Richard Wiseberg, Charlie Weill, Betty Booker, Bill Collie, Jack Warner, Stan Legum, Dick Kerner.
OFFICE STAFF: Bob Crews, Eleanor Soule, Jeannie Hermann, Bob Covington.
TYPIST: Ardis Kipp.
CIRCULATION OFFICE MANAGERS: Rachel Dalton, Harry Lewis, Larry Goldrich, Bob Godwin.

YOURS...

Tomorrow night the Student Legislature meets to decide whether next year the campus will have one new magazine or the two current publications. Since you must pay for next year's publications, since the Student Legislature represents the campus, it is your right to communicate your opinion on the issue to your Legislature representative.

Word has drifted up to the Tar Heel office that many students are tired of reading about the problem. They are no more tired of reading about it than we are of writing about it. But since it is now certain

that legislative action will be taken, it is the least that the Daily Tar Heel and the student body can do to try to effect an understanding of what the facts are.

We turned over the page today to those students who have a real interest in combination versus the status quo. Embroiled in a three-months dispute, they have had the opportunity to crystallize their arguments which now they present to the campus. In addition, we have reprinted directly below an impartial and thorough financial report on the issue.

Take a few minutes off to read the page. The money and the magazines are yours.

New Mag Would Have More Cartoons, Photos, Eight Less Pages Than Separate Publications

Here are the cold figures on the issue of establishing one campus magazine to take the place of Tar an' Feathers and the Carolina Mag.

These budget estimates are not hidebound. They are just as stable as next year's enrollment and the state of next year's business, nothing which could be more elastic. There are two facts certain. First, the income estimates, if anything, are optimistic. Second, if income should fall below the estimates on which the prognostications below are based, then all three publications—the Combination magazine and Tar an' Feathers and the Carolina Mag—will all be affected proportionately.

Look over these figures and facts, then study them closely. An effort has been made to translate the figures concretely, to show what they will mean in number of pages and amounts of engraving.

When Editor Henry Moll put out his Baby-Esquire last month, he was trying to show that the best elements of both the humor magazine and the former literary magazine could be combined successfully in one publication. Whether he was successful or not was for you to decide. Editor Moll, however, in desiring to prove feasibility of combination, combined one and one-half times more material which would be possible next year, gave the campus a magazine which was too costly even as a combination publication for next year. Printing and engraving costs of the experimental Baby-Esquire, when multiplied by eight issues, would lose \$1,735 next year for the Publications Union. A complete Baby-Esquire as it stands now, would be out of the question.

But there is a bright side for proponents and students for one campus magazine. A combination publication, somewhat less expensive, can be printed. It would contain 36 pages instead of Baby-Esquire's 48. It could spend \$200 per issue on engraving. That is enough to furnish the same amount of photography that appeared in the "College Aviation" Mag of last May, Moll's first attempt at a campus magazine. That is also enough to furnish the number of pictures in Baby-Esquire, minus the number of cuts in the introductory fictitious advertising section and two of the full page photographs.

The makeup, on which in Baby-Esquire Moll did a professional and lavish job, would not be so complex or give the Orange Printshop worker so many migraine headaches. The editor and his staff on the new combination magazine would receive a total of \$35 a month. Probably split would be \$15 for the editor (mag editors now re-

ceive \$20) and \$10 for an art-humor editor, \$5 for a literary editor and \$5 for a managing editor. This would take the place of the two \$20 editor's salaries that are paid now. The business manager would probably earn about \$250 a year.

The new combination Magazine would cost a total of \$6,166, would leave \$198 to take care of unforeseen expenses and to counteract our optimism on income.

Alternative, of course, would be two separate magazines reduced in size and costs from their present appearance.

Tar an' Feathers will have 20 pages instead of the present 24. It could spend \$80 per issue on engraving instead of the current allotment of \$125—which would mean about two-thirds as much engraving as has appeared this year. The editor would receive \$20 a month, the business manager about \$200 a year. Tar an' Feathers would cost a total of \$3,598 next year, lose \$17, which would have to be made up by shaving minor expenses.

The Carolina Mag would be cut from its current 32 to 24 pages. Makeup would be simplified just as in the combination. Engraving would drop from the present allowance of \$80 per issue to about \$50, permitting the use of less than two-thirds the cuts as appeared in any issue previous to Christmas, since which time Moll has gone both below and above the \$80 mark. (Last year's completely literary Mag spent \$40 an issue for drawings.) The editor would receive the current \$20 a month, the business manager about \$200 a year. Total cost of the magazine would be \$3,624 a year, leaving a reserve of \$18.

Here are two more brief comparisons that provide a thread through the labyrinth of figures. If both magazine are kept, together they will contain eight more pages than the combination mag. Cost per page of the combination throughout the year would be 91 cents more per page, than that per page if both publications were retained. Explanation lies in the fact that the combination will be able to spend \$1,600 for engraving, over a third more than the humor and literary magazines together.

There are the figures. Take your choice. One campus magazine—a Baby-Esquire of 36 pages instead of the 48, but a publication with more engraving than either publication at present is able to afford or both would be able to afford next year. Or instead the second choice—two magazines, one humor and one literary, both totaling eight more pages than the combination, but having less engravings.

Set Up One New Magazine

BUNK . . .
"Humor and literary will not mix . . . placing cartoons and literary work on the same page will cause a conflict . . . it will never be a combination because the editor will lean either one way or another. . ."

. . . BECAUSE
The separationists forget that it "mixed" in the trial "Baby-Esquire," that it has mixed very successfully in the original Esquire, in other magazines such as *Collier's*, *New Yorker*, *Punch*, and any of our favorite magazines. The *norm* seems to be a combination of material instead of separation. Esquire magazine has serious literary work with the usual embellishment of a cartoon on same page. Esquire's editor does not lean one way or another because he merely integrates material from both literary and humor editors under him. To the philosophy of the "literary" and "humor" editorships will have to be added that of the integrating of "newspaper editor" who cannot lean either way because he is neither a humor nor literary man.

BUNK . . .
The question of combination is a false one, in reality it will turn out to be a Big Tar an' Feathers . . .

The question of combination is a false one, in reality it will turn out to be a Big Carolina Magazine . . .

. . . BECAUSE
The separationists, wishing merely to preserve themselves, say that (from Tar an' Feathers) that it will be a big Mag, and (from the Mag) that it will be a big Tar an' Feathers. This is the old feud of last quarter between the humor and literary mags. Disgusted with it, the proponents of a Baby-Esquire type combination are against either a "big" humor or literary magazine, desire a new type campus magazine that is neither of the two. It can be observed that both the Mag and Tar an' Feathers are bitterly against combination, hence the Baby-Esquire solution can be of neither of these two groups who attempt to cloud the issue by throwing the combination supporters as belonging to either the "completely humor" or "completely literary" factions.

BUNK . . .
It may be true that Baby-Esquire was neither a humor nor literary magazine, and that it was a "fairly good" example of combination, but nevertheless, wasn't it after all published in the set-up of what had formerly been the Carolina Mag? This proves that it will be just a big Mag.

. . . BECAUSE
Back in January, the supporters of Combination urged both the humor and literary staffs to throw over their old set-ups and get together. Both staffs refused point-blank, the "completely literary" and "completely humor" men. The combinationists did what they could and overthrew the literary men to then install the first combination magazine. The dispossessed literary men write in the next columns against the present possessors of the Carolina Mag and yet the Tar an' Feathers men would like to give the impression that the Mag staff is still the literary staff of last January. When supporters of the literary Mag and of Tar an' Feathers attack the combinationists, it seems foolhardy to accuse them of being one-sided. Combination should not be accused of being one or another because its birth had to necessarily come from one of the two present publications, it could just as well have come out of the Humor or the Literary magazine. The combinationists prove that they don't favor either of the former by asking both to be abolished.
Henry Moll

I, in my present state of physical hospitalization and mental impotency, see no new way to present the fight for combination. I see all arguments against it repudiated.

Combination is the practical solution to a mongrel problem of reduced, untrained personnel, less funds; combination is achievement and progress in that it utilizes better talents, more money at greater long-run economy, and gives the campus a better product.

It is futile and dangerous to let matters ride when we see trouble looming. Chamberlain let it ride in 1934, Congress let it ride in 1938. We must act decisively now! If the die-hards want to stand firm impeding the march of progress they have their right to do so.

But let them consider without prejudice or favor. What do they lose by ONE good magazine replacing two mediocre ones. NOTHING! What do they gain? 1. Economy. 2. Consolidated talent. 3. Save energy formerly wasted in competition. 4. Pictures. 5. More magazine. 6. More readers.
Sylvan Meyer

Keep the Status Quo for humor mag . . . for literary mag . . .

I am thoroughly opposed to combination of the two campus magazines for reasons stated previously in the Tar Heel. I don't think that the trial "New Carolina Mag" had appeal equal to that of separate humor and literary magazines. Nor was its budget sufficiently reduced to make it a fair example for next year. If you have enjoyed Tar an' Feathers this year and the good Carolina Mags of last fall, I feel sure that we can give you two separate magazines of practically the same caliber next year on the reduced budget.

Hunt Hobbs

It is a proven fact on college campuses that humor magazines are popular, more popular than literary magazines. The well known campus publications are the humor magazines: The Harvard Lampoon, The Texas Ranger and Tar an' Feathers to name only three. And T&F is rated up among the highest ones.

You've got to have humor on a college campus because the students demand it. On the other hand, there are some who prefer strictly literary material including plotless stories. For those who like humor, we have Tar an' Feathers. For those who prefer the literary, we had the old Carolina Mag and the library and now we have the revamped Carolina Mag, which is more widely read than the old one, I believe.

There are two definite, distinct, separate divisions of campus readers. What happens to Tar an' Feathers after it has been read? It goes to your girl, or to some good friend, or to your family. What happens to the Carolina Mag? Frankly I don't know but I can't picture anyone sending it to his mother or girl friend to read "Highway 321" and "A Roof to Cover Our Heads." This is one important reason for keeping the status quo—the extreme difference in the magazines and the difference in readers.

Before election, Henry Moll asked me if I would be satisfied, if elected to T&F editor, to work as humor editor on a possible combination. Would I? You bet your life I wouldn't. This very question reveals what would happen to T&F humor in case of a combination. The result would be a glorified Carolina Mag. Throw in a few cartoons and call it a combination. Henry did not ask me if I would be willing to be associate editor or co-editor. People don't consider this question as a question of combination, they consider it as a question of whether or not to abolish Tar an' Feathers. Slapstick and Literary won't jive in a campus publication. You can't mix dogs and cats!

Look at Baby Esquire, the glorified Carolina Mag, which is certainly a poor example of combination because it cost much more than it was supposed to and figures prove that eight similar issues would lose \$1,735 next year for the Publications Union. How many laughs did you get out of it? When you pick up Tar an' Feathers, you are ready to be amused. When you want something more serious, you pick up the Carolina Mag. When I want something funny to read, I buy a funny magazine. I don't attempt to buy a medium and search out the humor. Well then, why make our students do the same thing? Give them two different magazines to suit their two different moods.

Economy is argued by the combinationists. We all realize that these are not normal times and we are preparing to meet them that way. When we can have two magazines which are good enough to please all the students, why should we create one magazine which may please most of the students or may not please
See HUMOR, MAG, page 4

The choice usually presented the student body in the past has been between a large combination magazine, Tar an' Feathers, and a smaller Carolina Magazine. This cannot be called the final word for changes in publications. Obstacle to the understanding of this problem is the general prejudice and misconception concerning the effort to restore the old Carolina Magazine. Less understood is the serious magazine toward which a small group is driving.

Consider a serious magazine as to content. Most opposition to the Carolina Magazine comes from opposition to "long-haired" writing which has characterized it in the past. Those of us wanting a rejuvenation sincerely regret this tendency of former staffs. All proponents of such a publication must realize that it is to be written for the understanding of the average student. This does not mean oversimplification but more originality and freshness in style and theme.

In this proposed magazine, higher standards of poetry would prevail and non-fiction articles would deal chiefly with campus activities and some cosmopolitan subjects. Book reviews would be included if possible. To cut expenses, illustrations would be held to a minimum. Thus there would be a magazine not so pictorially as lavish as Henry Moll's, but nevertheless appealing in regards to writing.

Mention should be made of the cost and technical problems of this theoretical magazine. Erroneously it has been stated that if a combination mag is out of the question, the only choice is the Carolina Magazine and Tar an' Feathers as they existed last year. The model for the Carolina Magazine may be found further back than last year, when it was printed on rough paper, slick paper being a recent innovation. It is an unnecessary expense and small but substantial savings could be gained by abolishing it for rough paper which is as easily read.

Cutting or eliminating engraving expenses would ease expenses. Engravings of Moll's pre-Baby-Esquire mag cost \$80 an issue. Last year it was \$40 an issue and in 1938 about \$15. Reducing expenses to this level or abolishment would effect a large saving.

Greatest saving would result from cutting pages not to a proposed 24 pages but to 20 or even 15. It has been stated that an independent magazine for next year would cost \$3,624. To put it more fairly, it should run about \$2,500 with rough paper and less engravings. The 1936 expense for such an issue was \$2,854 with more pages than the proposed magazine. This magazine as compared with this year's Carolina Mag would save considerable money.

That the final decision rests with the student body does not alter the situation in any way. Those who attack a serious magazine because they believe that it will not interest anybody should realize that those favoring such a mag are determined that it would be generally interesting. They also believe that a serious magazine would be a greater credit to the campus both on and off. If it appeared that such a publication served no purpose at all, there would be no reason for adopting one. This stand is taken because it is felt that unless in the future, our campus
See LITERARY MAG, page 4

**Mother's Day Cards
Ledbetter-Pickard
BUY NOW**

★ ★ ★ **FREE** ★ ★ ★
A Lovely Beauty Gift

FREE 50¢ LOTION with purchase of WOODBURY COLD CREAM the delicious beauty shop

With your purchase of the economical large size Woodbury Cold Cream we will give a bottle of Woodbury Lotion absolutely free.

50¢ WOODBURY LOTION
75¢ WOODBURY FACE CREAM
Value for 59c

BERMAN'S DEPT. STORE
CHAPEL HILL