

# Editorial Page

## Nixon's Chances

Few seasoned political observers doubt that the presidential bug still is biting Richard M. Nixon, despite his most ardent protests of disinterest in the 1964 Republican nomination.

Both Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona, the present front runner, and New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller are political realists — and they say they think Nixon is a candidate. Many another politician believes the same.

There can be no question that certain aspects of Nixon's situation "position" him for such consideration.

He is the middle-road man always acceptable, on paper at least, to both conservative and liberal wings of his party. This would have been an immensely strong point for him had he won the California governorship last fall and gained that great power base.

Not having gained it, he moved to New York. He could not have hoped thereby to find a new power footing. What he did seek was a chance to get into the brighter spotlight which shines on politicians operating in the Washington-New York orbit.

This he has managed. The public prints are currently alive with accounts of Nixon's views and doings. He is being talked about. He is trying to cast his influence over public discussion of the great issues and to affect the tone of his own party's efforts.

Yet it is one thing to say Nixon is interested and available, quite another to argue that the Republican party might nominate him in 1964.

Nothing in politics is so fixed or so set together that one could fairly rule him out of altogether. Convention deadlocks are extremely rare. But if the 1964 GOP convention at San Francisco got into some kind of stalemate, it might in its extremity turn to Nixon as a man palatable to all wings.

Nevertheless, the likelihood of this happening is not great. The basic reason is that a high proportion of GOP professionals are quite disenchanted with him.

Their recriminations against him for alleged political misjudgments in the 1960 campaign linger on and on. Some of this bitterness, it now appears, existed covertly in the years up to and including 1960 — at a time when these professionals were publicly lauding Nixon.

The deep source of this attitude seems to be their inability to warm up to Nixon. In 1960 their disgruntlement was founded more practically in the fact that Nixon refused to listen to them but insisted on pursuing what they saw as an inflexible course toward defeat. On top of all this lies wide conviction that, since he lost to President Kennedy in a year when maximum advantage appeared to rest with Nixon, the former vice president would only be beaten more easily another time. They have little taste for a Kennedy-Nixon rerun.

Surely Nixon's name will continue to be high in public notice in the big political months to come. But there is no evidence that it is high in either the hearts or the minds of Republican president-makers.

## 'You'd Better Come In, Mr. Nixon! These New York Electrical Storms Can Be Pretty Bad!'



IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Goldwater Facing Problems In Ohio

By RALPH de TOLEDANO CINCINNATI — This is probably the nation's largest Republican city, if consistency is a gauge. It is also the citadel of Taft sentiment. The late and great senator is not forgotten, and his disciples are everywhere. Normally, this would make Cincinnati a natural for Sen. Barry Goldwater.

And if you talk to rank-and-file Republicans, as well as to those in the working echelons of the party, this is so. But Cincinnati is also a great industrial and commercial center. The corporations that dominate it bear names like Kroger and Procter & Gamble. Among those who contribute to the Ohio GOP's coffers are men like Neil McElroy, one of President Eisenhower's defense secretaries.

It is among these people that Mr. Goldwater has yet to find enthusiastic backing. Not that they prefer Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. Far from it. In this part of the country, Rockefeller sentiment is notable only for its absence. But for non-ideological reasons, what may be called the "Cincinnati interests" have not yet cottoned to the Arizona front-runner. This, of course, is not unanimous. According to reports, George Humphrey, Mr. Eisenhower's first Treasury secretary, is devotedly in the Goldwater corner.

But by and large, reports support this explanation for the aforementioned reticence in declaring for Mr. Goldwater. Among those not yet committed to the Goldwater candidacy, there is a tendency to speak in somewhat nostalgic terms of former Vice President Richard Nixon. He is more their dish of tea, if only because they always had the comfortable feeling that they could influence him more directly. They were, I believe, wrong, but they thought of him as their creature.

It is generally conceded, however, that when the Ohio delegation is counted during the convention's first tally, it will vote exactly as Gov. James Rhodes and State Chairman Ray Bliss dictate. Mr. Rhodes has been promoted to the position of "favorite son," which gives him bargaining power if there is something to bargain for. But this can come about only in a deadlock convention, and as



EDSON IN WASHINGTON

## Drug Clouds Mount

By PETER EDSON Washington Correspondent

Newspaper Enterprise Assn. WASHINGTON (NEA) — The 13-year-old medical battle that has been fought over the so-called "anticancer drug" Krebiozen is coming to a climax within the next few weeks.

The issue is whether Krebiozen, having now been found to have caused cancer regression in two out of 504 cases on which records are available, should be tested further.

On the other hand, U.S. Food and Drug Commissioner George P. Larrick has asked the drug's discoverer, Stevan Durovic, and his scientific adviser in the Krebiozen Foundation, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, to show cause why they should not be prosecuted in criminal court.

The drug has been administered to more than 4,200 patients on payment of a \$9.50 contribution for each injection ampule containing one part Krebiozen to 1,000 parts mineral oil.

Some patients are reported to have paid out thousands of dollars for treatment. The total receipts could conceivably have run into millions of dollars.

Dr. Stevan Durovic, of Yugoslav birth, developed Krebiozen from an extract of infected horse blood in the Argentine before bringing it to America. He has claimed it cost \$170,000 a

gram to produce. Food and Drug Administration laboratory tests have identified Krebiozen as creatine, costing 30 cents a gram to produce, or eight cents for the amount in each injection.

The developers counter that Krebiozen is not 100 per cent creatine and that it contains an added factor not yet identified. Food and Drug Administration field investigators collected medical records on 504 patients identified by the Krebiozen Foundation as having received treatments. FDA is now assembling information to see if there has been violation of the law.

Points covered by the investigation include the possibility of misbranding through incorrect labels, the shipment of impure or adulterated drugs not up to standard, shipment in interstate commerce of a new drug without authorization, the making of false statements as to its efficacy.

After assembling all the evidence, it will be presented to the Krebiozen distributors at an informal hearing. A decision would then have to be made on whether the case should be referred to Department of Justice for criminal prosecution in what might be the biggest medical case in history.

The fact that a panel of 24 cancer specialists has just branded Krebiozen "ineffective as an antitumor agent" in man is not deterring Durovic and Ivy in the slightest. They are going ahead with demands for new, joint chemical analyses of Krebiozen and further clinical tests.

The Krebiozen backers base their case on a finding that natural regression of cancer without drugs, X-ray or surgery occurs in one out of 50,000 cases. National Cancer Institute's advisory council found two cases out of the 504 reviewed in which the council says regression could be attributed to Krebiozen.

On the basis of these two cases, it is argued that Krebiozen is 200 times more effective than nature and therefore worth further research.

The whole controversy, which has raged for years, was given a public airing when two rival medical meetings were held in Washington Oct. 25-26. The Food and Drug Administration and the American Medical Association are sponsoring their second National Congress on Medical Quackery at the Sheraton - Park. At the same time the National Health Federation for Maintaining Medical Freedom of Choice is sponsoring a First National Conference on Health Monopoly at the Sheraton - Carlton.



WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK . . .

## What Makes Her Tick?

By WASHINGTON STAFF Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Ireland's Prime Minister Sean F. Lemass, visiting this country to promote the Emerald Isle to expansion-minded American industrialists, has repeatedly denied that his trip has any political overtones.

When a reporter asked him, "If Barry Goldwater visited your country, would you give him equal time and the same enthusiastic reception you gave President Kennedy last June?" The prime minister answered smoothly, "If he were elected president, yes."

Latest anti-Goldwater gag: "He has been eating so many of his own words lately that he's likely to go into the 1964 campaign with ulcers."

The Pentagon takes seriously its job of feeding 30,000 or more people daily.

In addition to the many sandwich lines, snack bars, steamship roast beef lines, regular cafeterias and officers' cafeterias, the Pentagon has an Executive Dining Room, a General and Flag Officers Dining

Room, and special kitchens for the Chief of Naval Operations, the Army Chief of Staff, the Air Force Chief of Staff and various service secretaries.

Finally, there's the Band Food Line, which caters to workers with ulcers.

Rep. Odin Langen, R-Minn., gives this view on the Russian wheat deal:

"It's like someone offering you a real bargain on a four-legged animal providing you promise to keep it in the house. What you don't know is whether the animal is a dog or an elephant."

Undersecretary of State Averill Harriman picked up a new Khrushchev story during his last visit to Moscow:

First Russian: "What will be the biographical appraisal of Khrushchev by historians in 2500 A.D.?"

Second Russian: "An insignificant art critic who lived in the time of Mao Tse-tung."

To keep pedestrians from cutting across the grass, the U.S. National Institutes of Health has

put up signs reading: YOUR FEET ARE KILLING ME

Speaking of Sen. Maurine Neuberger, D-Ore., James Meredith, University of Mississippi's first Negro graduate, says:

"I can understand a Senator Eastland (Mississippi reactionary) and I can understand a Senator Hart (Michigan ultra-liberal). But I can't for the life of me understand what could put a woman together to make her a senator."

The president of a woman's organization recently wrote Sen. Ken Keating, R-N.Y., asking him to suggest a possible guest speaker for a luncheon. She noted:

"We've just had the privilege of hearing a renowned historian who has told us the past, and we've had a distinguished economist who told us the future. Now only the present is confusing. Whom can you recommend?"

Keating promptly wrote back: "If you ever come up with a guest who can fill this bill, I'd like to attend myself—just to listen."

WASHINGTON CALLING . . .

## Republicans Try Hard



By MARQUIS CHILDS McCOMB, Miss. — There is something new under the political sun—a Republican candidate for governor running in the fall election in Mississippi with every outward determination to win.

Rubel Phillips and the candidate for lieutenant governor, State Sen. Stanford Morse, are carrying their campaign to the farthest boondocks. Nothing like it has been seen since Reconstruction days and then Republican governors were imposed under the rule of Yankee bayonets and not lawfully elected.

The clique that has dominated Mississippi for so long under a one-party system doesn't like it at all. As Phillips tells every audience, if he had not become a Republican and issued the challenge it would have all been over on Aug. 27. That was the date of the Democratic primary, one of the bitterest in Mississippi's history, with Lt. Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr. winning over former Governor J. P. Coleman by a landslide majority.

Phillips, an attractive-appearing, corporation lawyer, links himself with Sen. Barry Goldwater. As at his evening meeting here in the football stadium before a crowd of perhaps 600, including many teen-agers, the loud applause comes when he says Goldwater will be the Republican nominee and pledges himself to vote and work for him. It was on the occasion of Goldwater's fund-raising dinner in Mississippi a year ago that Phillips saw the light. And on a visit to Washington in March he was persuaded to get into the race.

His contention is that the plan of the Mississippi Democrats to put up a slate of unpledged electors will simply be throwing away the state's electoral votes. In the unlikely event that the Presidential election a year from now is so close as to be thrown into the House of Representatives, President Kennedy would win in a walk since 65 per cent of the Democratic state delegations in the House are pro-Kennedy.

This may be a subtlety over the heads of his listeners but they are left in no doubt that he is against the Kennedys and all their works. Warning up the crowd before the candidate arrives are singing stars of the Grand Ol' Opry who play from a lighted stage that lets down from the van in which they travel. Their most rousing song is "Knock Out the Kennedys."

The Phillips-Spence billboards generously sprinkled along the highways carry the caption in big letters "K. O. the Kennedys." The most devastating

Phillips charge is that Johnson and Gov. Ross Barnett made a deal with Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy at the time James Meredith was admitted to the University of Mississippi. So the picture Johnson used in his primary campaign showing him defying the United States Marshals was, in Phillips words, "just rooster fighting."

To prove his case he has been quoting from the partial transcript published by Newsweek of the Kennedy-Barnett-Johnson long distance conversation on the eve of the Ole Miss showdown. Along with transcripts of other conversations published later this has had an echo in the remotest villages. If Phillips has a chance to defeat the long-entrenched Democratic powers, and the odds are long against him, it will be because the great Johnson-Barnett defenestration of the federal tyrant is now seen to have been a piece of prearranged stage play.

Governor Barnett in his homespun fashion likes to say that Look is a magazine for people who can't read, the Saturday Evening Post a magazine for people who can't write and Newsweek for people who can't either read or write. But neither Barnett nor Johnson has denied the authenticity of the transcripts.

Perhaps the blow that rocked

Phillips herald is the charge in full-page advertisements that he was a "moderate." The ad carries quotations of earlier years counseling moderation on race questions and accusing him of voting for Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and '56. Yes, Phillips says, making a clean breast of it, I did vote for Adlai Stevenson. What is worse, in 1948 I voted for Harry Truman. And so, he adds, did Paul Johnson, but he will not have the courage to tell you.

The slogan of the opposition is "Bury the Scalawags." You have to be born a Southerner to understand how sinister is the word scalawag—a term applied to the Quilings who cooperated with the Yankee invaders in the Reconstruction era. But Phillips turns the knife by charging his opponents with borrowing the slogan from Khrushchev.

He assails the one-party system. He says this is why Mississippi is No. 12 among the 12 Southern states in per capita income and in almost every other measurement. The crowd sitting under the stadium floodlights is not overly responsive. They file out as the Grand Ol' Opry gives out again with "Knock Out the Kennedys" and this unique Republican show is on the road for another set of appearances.

## BERRY'S WORLD



"Just bring me a fortune cookie that says someday I'll be secretary general of the U.N."

## Letters To The Editor

### Trick Or Treat

Should we help the Communists? Is it right before God to cooperate with a godless conspiracy which on every hand repudiates and blasphemes the name of God and has announced its determination to destroy the United States of America?

The answer of every God-fearing American should be an emphatic "No!"

Now a great avalanche seems to have hit us, especially since the President, on Sept. 20, 1963, speaking to the United Nations, called for a program of "peaceful cooperation" with the Reds as the sure pathway to peace.

One of the areas where cooperating with the Communists and assistance for the Communists has been effectively presented to the American people is in UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund). UNICEF is an agency of the United Nations which reaches the American people directly at Halloween through its "Trick or Treat" money collection "by and for little children," and through greeting cards, especially Christmas cards.

What is so significant is the UNICEF officials not only do not deny that they are operating with the Communists, but that they defend this cooperation.

"UNICEF," Facts and Fallacies, speaking of its staff, says, "Some" come from countries with Communist governments." But it is the Communist governments which appoint those who represent them in the affairs of the U.N. Communists don't appoint "non-Communists."

The Communists have complete responsibility for all UNICEF's projects in Communist lands.

"In 1961 contributions to the central account of UNICEF totaled \$22,389,736" according to "UNICEF, Facts and Fallacies." "The U.S. contributed \$12,000,000 of this amount. Other governments contributed \$10,389,736."

UNICEF cooperates with the Communists. That is the truth and the defenders of UNICEF must conjure up false statements in order to relate this and make it appear that they have been misrepresented.

It is true children need to be helped, but they should be helped in the name of Jesus Christ and not in the name of United Nations with the cooperation of the Communists.

We recommend therefore, that those who love freedom do not in any way purchase cards or support UNICEF to collect funds at Halloween.

Mrs. E. Rogers.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

## Dangerous Moonshine

By WILLIAM S. WHITE

WASHINGTON—The most important election campaign to the people and government of the United States save one—our own Presidential test of next year—has now been opened in England.

The issue is whether Britain is to remain in the control of the Conservative party of such men as Winston Churchill, Harold Macmillan and Sir Alec Douglas-Home or is to be turned over to a Labor party headed by the erstwhile ban-the-bomber and quasi-neutralist, Harold Wilson.

Among the elaborate fictions theoretically maintained in international affairs is the genteel pretense that what happens politically in one country of the Western alliance is no business of the others in that alliance. The simple truth is that this is invariably a lot of precious moonshine and that in this particular case it is also dangerous moonshine.

For the repudiation in England of the Conservative party newly led by Sir Alec, in succession to the tired and gallant Macmillan, would create profound shock all over the Western world precisely at a time when that world, under American leadership, is groping in a risky way, for some basic accommodation with the Soviet Union. "Dangerous" is the word for this shock. There is legitimate cause for concern that already the West has made too many concessions in this at-

tempt at a more stable international life.

Even the British Conservatives have been ready enough to press the United States into overtures to Nikita Khrushchev. The mind shudders to think how very far a Labor government under a Harold Wilson would insist upon going in trusting the intentions of Moscow in this fateful matter.

In a word, it is obviously in the highest interest of the United States that one set of British politicians which has urged us on to concessions to the Russians is far more inclined in this direction.

The distinction between the two sets cannot be measured so much by public attitudes as by private and personal qualities. The Conservatives, while ready to trust Moscow to a point and only because they think they must, are not and never will be ready to leap into that glad, evangelical buddy-buddyism which is the tendency of the Wilson leadership in England.

Again, the Conservatives like and support their association with the United States as the very foundation of their foreign policy—even though at times they get annoyed as the devil with us and we at them. But powerful forces among the Laborites—though not perhaps Wilson himself—neither really like nor really trust the United States. An alliance with them could never sustain the old intimacy and easy mutual confidence with which these two

great Western nations have so long confronted the outer world while conservatism has ruled in London.

There is, moreover, a very human issue involved here. By and large the Conservative party in Britain stands for the conservation, among other things, of old values and traditions whose loss would be a great pity—not a moral catastrophe—in a West already far too infected with a vulgar, two-bit, cynicism and a spirit of rejection of such ancient concepts as duty, manners and responsibility.

Already, the Labor party is signaling that it is preparing to run a campaign of demagogic class-splitting against the Conservatives on the claim that these, the Tories, are cold and arrogant "aristocrats," and so on. The new head of the Tories, Douglas-Home, is, indeed, an aristocrat, but in the old and good sense of that term.

Though he cannot deny having been "well-born" — which is perhaps not yet a punishable crime—no man against him can fairly deny that being well-born in his English sense means being trained from babyhood to do his duty, to avoid the cheap and easy ways to success, to live in fairness to those about him, and to die, when the time comes, in honor but without suggesting that his sacrifice is unique among all mankind.

And, after all, who but the "well-born" have again and again saved England, from the Battle of Hastings to the Battle of Britain?