metals, fertilizers, fuels and turnkey manufacturing plants to the Russians.

“Our government is currently considering renewal of the Export Administration Act,” stressed Brown. “President Reagan supports inclusion in the new Act of a provision of contract sanctity,” i.e., a provision designed to underscore America’s desire not to punish the Russians again with any

These actions take place against a backdrop of earlier Administration decisions to lift the grain and pipeline equipment embargo, and a refusal to declare Poland in default on its debts. In addition, the export control program, which regulates the flow of security-sensitive technology to our adversaries, has been allowed by Commerce to fall into disarray since the departure of hardline Assistant Secretary Larry Brady. (Efforts to replace him with another hardliner, Office of Personnel Management Deputy George Nesterczuk, have fallen through the cracks. The conservatives, however, have not surrendered, and are now lining up behind Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce Ted Wu, a tough, no-nonsense enforcer of export controls.)

Capitol Hill insiders say that Commerce and State have been pressing ahead with the new policy because they have become emboldened with the success of their pro-China trade policy. As one source put it, “If [Secretary of Commerce Malcolm] Baldridge can sell nuclear technology to the PRC and only Democrats like Senators Proxmire and Cranston complain, then he believes that Republicans have become neutralized on East-West trade issues and will not oppose these initiatives.”

The program is now being directed by liberal career bureaucrat William Archer, who is openly fighting with Von Raab and Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle, both of whom are committed to staunching the flow of illegally exported goods to Communist countries.

Yet these initiatives should be opposed, say strategic trade experts. Impeding East-West trade, they contend, would also fail the President’s efforts to keep the Soviets out of Latin America. The Soviets subsidize Cuba to the tune of $4 billion a year, but they seem less inclined to support Nicaragua with the same generous sums, largely, it is said, because they are financially strapped.

Nevertheless, State and Commerce seem intent on pressing for trade expansion.

Metzenbaum’s Unusual Finder’s Fee

Sen. Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio), the millionaire liberal who is leading a “moral crusade” against the nomination of Ed Meese to be attorney general, last year accepted a $250,000 “finder’s fee” from a long-time political friend.

The payment surfaced in times income disclosure statement required of all senators and released last week by the Senate. It raised immediate questions of conflict of interest and ethical propriety.

Under Senate rules, employees of the Senate may not practice a profession for compensation to any extent during regular office hours.” No problem. Metzenbaum explained that he earned his quarter-million dollars on a “Wednesday evening” in June 1983.

“T here is no conflict of interest,” he added.

Metzenbaum received the fee for helping Jeffrey I. Friedman, head of a Cleveland-based investment company, sell Washington’s Hay-Adams Hotel to David M. Murdock, a Los Angeles developer.

Friedman, who has helped finance previous Metzenbaum campaigns, reportedly mentioned to the senator that while “the hotel wasn’t on the market,” he might sell if he received a certain price.

According to a Friedman spokesman, Metzenbaum then interrupted and asked if Friedman “would be willing to pay a finder’s fee if the senator could provide a bona fide buyer.” Friedman said yes and named his price.

Within 24 hours after Metzenbaum gave Mur-
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Committee Chairman Charles Manatt and others regard LaRouche and his program as apparently striking a responsive chord among disillusioned Democrats who are apparently unaware of his erratic past record and just like his conservative-sounding platform. During the month of March, for example, his campaign brought in more than half-a-million dollars, according to records at the Federal Election Commission.

A list of contributors includes engineers, professors, pilots, computer programmers, medical examiners, stockbrokers, physicians, investors, contractors and physicists.

LaRouche’s name is on the presidential primary ballot in 14 states, including New Jersey and California, and his campaign aired several times on the major commercial television networks, with another series scheduled to begin on May 31 on ABC.

As LaRouche’s voter totals in the primaries have so far only been in the 1-2 per cent range, some of his followers, known as “LaRouche Democrats,” have had greater success. The most significant was the victory of Donald Scott in the Democratic congressional primary in Ohio’s 7th District over the party-endorsed candidate, Dennis Graham. Scott will face Republican incumbent Rep. Michael DeWine in November.

Scott campaigned on a four-point program of (1) “federalizing” the Federal Reserve, a scheme designed to control and cut interest rates; (2) re-industrializing the nation through debt reorganization, a return to a gold-backed currency, and development of high-technologies; (3) assuring “fair credit” policies for agriculture; and (4) developing a defensive weapons system to counter the Soviet nuclear threat.

The Scott victory was even more significant in light of the fact that State Democratic Party Chairman Nam Murray paid political broadcasts have already aired on May 31 on ABC.

While LaRouche’s half-hour paid political broadcasts have also aired several times on the major commercial television networks, with another series scheduled to begin on May 31 on ABC.

“LaRouche is trying to rebuild the Roosevelt coalition by putting together the productive farmers, entrepreneurs, the working men and minorities behind a program of high-technology development, agri-industrial business revival, and re-industrializing the small stock industries.”

Goldstone said LaRouche’s controversial political broadcasts, which included the charge that Henry Kissinger is a “Soviet agent-of-influence,” are also meant to “weaken the influence” of Kissinger and his associates in the Reagan Administration and the Republican party.

More recently, LaRouche declared that President Reagan was not “morally fit” for re-election because, he, LaRouche, had been denied Secret Service protection by the U.S. government. LaRouche charged that Reagan had become “a mere puppet of Henry Kissinger.”

The NBC television network is one of the few national news organizations to have covered LaRouche’s current presidential campaign. Last March, its now-defunct program, “First Camera,” aired a report, “Leader LaRouche,” which generated a $600,000 libel suit against NBC.

The basic theme of the program was that LaRouche operates a bizarre political cult which makes threats, intimidates people, and has run into trouble with the law. The producers and writers of the report made it clear that they regard LaRouche as a kooky, right-wing figure, an alleged anti-Semite.

The program also alleged that “in the United States LaRouche and some of his closest associates had met on numerous occasions with officials of the State Department, Drug Enforcement Administration and CIA.” It added that, “We have also learned that LaRouche has easy access to high-ranking members of the Reagan Administration.”

Norman Bailey, who served as a special assistant to President Reagan on the National Security Council, told NBC that he found meetings with the LaRouche people useful “because they have in my view one of the best private intelligence services in the world” and “they also are very strongly in favor of certain programs that the Administration is very much in favor of also.”

DNC Chairman Charles Manatt has cited the NBC program as evidence that members of the LaRouche organization have “some degree of influence” over the Reagan Administration. He called on President Reagan to end “this shocking White House involvement with this bizarre, extremist cult of Lyndon H. LaRouche.”

What the “First Camera” program didn’t make clear was that there are conservatives who believe the “conservatism” of LaRouche is not authentic. The only hint of this came when retired Gen. Daniel Graham was briefly interviewed. He called LaRouche a “phony,” adding, “I think the man is picking up issues that people of my conservative stripe tend to support and then [he’s] making a mockery out of them.”

Graham was undoubtedly referring to President Reagan’s March 23, 1983, initiative for an anti-nuclear defensive weapons system. Graham, who is planning his own “High Frontier” project, has criticized LaRouche’s proposal for a system using lasers or particle beams as impractical at the present time.

“First Camera” noted that in the 1960s, LaRouche was “the leader of a splinter group in the left-wing Students for a Democratic Society.” John Rees, publisher of Information Digest, told NBC that he knew LaRouche in New York in the late 1960s “when he was clearly a Marxist and teaching at a left evening class organization called the Free University of New York.”

After that, “First Camera” reported, LaRouche broke with SDS and formed an “even more militant left-wing group: the National Caucus of Labor Committees.”

“In the late 1970s,” the program continued, “LaRouche became an extreme right-winger.”

In fact, however, LaRouche became a right-winger in 1976, when he ran for President as the candidate of the U.S. Labor party.

LaRouche has since been making strong attacks on a variety of left-wing causes, such as the nuclear freeze, he has continued to denounce respected conservative personalities and institutions.

Gen. Graham, for example, has been a favorite target. And so has the Heritage Foundation, which published a report critical of LaRouche in 1978. Both have been accused by the LaRouche forces of having connections to the Soviet KGB.

But LaRouche’s own attitudes toward the Soviet Union remain suspect. When Leonid Brezhnev was in power, a pro-Soviet line was evident in many of the materials published by the LaRouche organization. This line, according to the Soviet Union, was a mixture of anti-U.S. and pro-Soviet sentiment.
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