

Editorials The Louisiana Weekly Features

PAGE 12 NOVEMBER 26, 1960

Published Every Saturday by The Louisiana Weekly Publishing Company, Inc.
Established 1925 • 440 S. Roosevelt St., New Orleans 12, Louisiana • P.O. Box 1565
Business and Advertising Offices JA. 2-5676 • Editorial & News Offices JA. 2-5697

C. C. DEJOIE, JR., Editor

Special Class Mail privileges authorized by the United States Post Office
Member of the Associated Negro Press
National Newspaper Publishers Association and Audit Bureau of Circulations
ASSOCIATED PUBLISHERS, INC., NATIONAL ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVE

55 West 42nd St., New York City, N. Y. 36-2100
WEST COAST REPRESENTATIVE, ROBERT C. WHALEY CO. 2100 Montgomery St., San Francisco 11, Calif.
5513 Hollywood Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. 451-1000

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

ONE YEAR - \$6.00	SIX MONTHS - \$3.50
-------------------	---------------------

OUR PLATFORM: - The Louisiana Weekly shall work relentlessly for human and civil rights for all citizens and will oppose those who appeal to prejudices rather than reason in their approach to problems concerning human relations. The Louisiana Weekly shall strive to mold public opinion in interest of all things constructive.

"Thanksgiving-For All America"



Between The Lines

The views expressed in this column do not necessarily express the editorial opinion of The Louisiana Weekly.

By Dean B. Hancock, for ANP

MONOPOLIES ARE DANGEROUS

In the last analysis monopolies

are intrusive and abusive.

Monopolists have long since set

forth in decisive terms the

virtue of monopoly and as a

consequence there are stern

and rigid laws enacted to save

the nation from the dreadful

ills of monopoly.

As a serious student of

economics, this writer has long

been prejudiced against

monopoly, for as a native,

of the South he has long since

seen the abuse of the Negro

because the white South

has a monopoly on privilege and

privileges.

In 1936 Harvard University

observed its three hundredth

anniversary with pomp and

plendor. A Harvard graduate

was then President of these

United States. In 1936

Harvard was celebrating its

three hundredth anniversary, a

Harvard man was President.

In 1960 in one of the closest

residential races in history, a

Harvard man was running for

President on one ticket and

another Harvard man was running

for Vice-President on the other

ticket. We wonder if this means

years to come that because

Harvard has an endowment of

\$650,000,000 and a reputation of

being the richest university in

the world and rated as one of the

three finest universities of the

United States, Harvard will

therefore furnish

presidents.

Although the writer is a

member of Harvard he is un-

derstandably opposed to seeing

Harvard with a monopoly on

the presidency of these United

States. Then there is the mat-

ter of another trend in politics

that smacks of monopoly. I refer

to the newest trend in which

our wealthiest men are seeking

to our highest public offices.

Within recent years we have

seen the election of Harriman

to the governorship of New York

State. Harriman is a multi-

millionaire. After Harriman

came Rockefeller as Governor

of the Empire State.

Rockefeller is a multi-

millionaire, and now comes

John Kennedy a millionaire to

be President. This new trend

and trend are just ap-

pearing on the political horizon.

This writer is opposed to any

such trend and tendency. Until

such correlation can be found

between the dollar and integrity,

his will oppose the monopol-

ization of our highest offices by

the men with the most dollars.

This writer wants to see a

residency open to Lincoln,

the railroader, as well as

the man who makes the dollar

the writer knows enough about

history to know that nobody has

found any correlation between

wealth and integrity.

There should never come a

time in this country when a poor

man must cease to aspire to the

presidency because he is poor

and pined against a wealthy

man.

In a previous release we re-

quested the tendency of our

institutions of learning to give

degrees to the sons of the rich

and the highest grades. There

are today a plethora of indu-

ments for students of "A" grade

and a depressing scarcity of

incentives for students with

average academic grade but

with "A" grade characters.

We are just as opposed to a

monopoly of the brightest

as we are the monopoly of the

wealthy. The writer was once

invited to address a grammar

class in one of our fine

colleges. When degrees had been

awarded, then came the time

for awarding prizes; and all of

the prizes, with no exception,

were offered for students of ex-

ceptional intellectual abilities.

There was no prize for that

average student with im-

peccable integrity. This col-

lege was symbolic of our

respect of the awards of their

alma mater.

Those who are ruling this

country are not all Phil Beta

Kappa men and women, as

many in general, will empha-

sized.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified

for scholarship aid in their

times. The monopoly is a per-

petuous arrangement wherever

found.

It is not a happy thought that

Kennedy might have won the

presidency because he had the

dollars; and to imagine that

these wealthy men are according

to office without spending their

money is fallacious and

specious reasoning.

As I remember Edison and

Ford would not have qualified