Cola. Magazine not up to par

By LAMAR LARU
Gamecock Staff Writer

Hit there mag hags! Well as we all know, for many months there has been much fanfare and hoopla about the new Columbia Magazine. It along with the second printing of "Pug" have been heralded as the great events in South Carolina history for 1975. Well, Pug came and went, but Columbia Magazine never made it out of the falloff tube.

We were all led to believe that Columbia Magazine would be bright, sharp and biting, thought provoking, and that you as the reader would want to throw away your Earth Shoes. But what received in actually was Pepsi with no fizz.

As I SEE IT, there are only three things in Columbia Magazine worth your attention, and two of these are ads. To put it mildly, Columbia Magazine would be a disappointment to a man in a depressor, and it is tacky. It's like wishing for a bicycle for Christmas and getting a toothbrush. But then a toothbrush is usable. I would not say that Columbia Magazine is like a cold bowl of cream of what, but the temperature is far off.

The guiding philosophy of Columbia Magazine, at least from this point of view, seems to be: cover our butts with the Columbia business community, let's do anything to offend the Barnards, the Hamp- toms, the Gibs, the Bessingers, the old guard Columbia Merchants who might spend $500 for a full page black and white ad. The end result of Columbia Magazine is a rather bland mixture of old ads, produced in the old overworked newspaper format, using old news, and very little imagination or inspiration. In other words, those same tired old ideas only this time in a new saging bra.

But let's be honest people, what can you say about a magazine that died with its first issue? That it was gray; that its copy was uninspired; that its graphics were rejects from the Yellow Submarine: that it was young, that it cost 75 cents? Try as I might, I can find nothing in print to compare Columbia Magazine. Unless, of course, I refer it to the yellow submarine. If Messrs. Calabrese and Haught had done what they said they were going to do, I would not have been able to write this review. And that would have made me very happy. If in fact they are not reaching for the million-dollar, the intelligentsia, that 10 per cent of the population that really does read and think, then they will not do it with uninspired copy about things that have been covered elsewhere newspapers to college yearbooks.

Have they not heard of George Bernard Shaw, Dorothy Parker, Oscar Wilde, Nell Coward, Garry Truda, Nichols, von Hofmeister? We have been served very poor imitations of David S. Broder, John Kenneth Galbraith, Kate Millet, Toxley Columbia Magazine needs to walk into '65. They need to think about their audience. They need to entertain not insult their audience.

What about specifications? The copy is at best bland. The graphs that are available are printed in black and white. The full page art works only two are postioned wrong. Both pieces lead away from the respective articles.

But MULL not had Columbia Magazine. Previously I mentioned that this new literary effort did have three good items that might be worth your time.

First is the full page ad for Maxim's on page one. It has graphics quality that the rest of the magazine does not live up to. It is really sad state of things when the advertisers have better art work, better layout, better design than the magazine itself. Next, on page 24, I have a rather double entendre ad for Britton's. Yet another example of the advertiser being better than the vehicle in which it appears.

And saving the best for last. "Play it Again, Pug" is the only article that offers any promise for the future of this magazine. Written by Bob Craft, who understands that writing for a magazine is much different than writing for a newspaper, the article attempts to be the things that Columbia Magazine fails at. However, it is only fair to say, that from my point of view, this article has also suffered from an editorial hatchet job. I have been told not to graciously with a pick ax. Being familiar with the Craft style of writing, I was able to count for the top switch effect as editorial mandate. But in spite of the hatchet job, the article does flow, is rather humorous, and is one of the things that Columbia Magazine is not.

Thus far they have only produced one issue but it is past time for Columbia Magazine and its people to clean up their act. That is if we wish to publish a good magazine and not to be a tax write off for our corporation. It is obvious that something is wrong in what the magazine holds in store. I suggest that everyone invest in several copies of the AP's by line look and say that new material game is "a Magazine or is It A Newspaper?"

In the final analysis print freaks when it comes down to the bottom line: the only question that is really important is: did you enjoy reading it? Do you want to read it again? Was worth the 75 cents? Do I know what you want, but I would rather spend my 75 cents on a good comic book. Truth would have to expend a little energy, but that's better than wasting your time reading.
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