

ing to 35 young plasma physics students at the Indian Institute of Technology in Delhi, LaRouche called for India to “develop a better high-temperature gas-cooled reactor than any present design.” If it does so, “India could become the world’s leader in the thorium-cycle-based HTGR—not only for domestic use but also for export,” LaRouche said. India has the world’s largest reserves of thorium.

To develop the scientists who will achieve these future breakthroughs, LaRouche emphasized, educational curricula along the lines of the Humboldt classical education system in Germany—based on geometry and philology—must be established. To pursue this interest in philology, LaRouche visited Pune to meet several leading Sanskrit scholars to discuss the high-level development of this most ancient Indo-European language and how to expand its philological study.

### Malvinas crisis

Given the escalating crisis in the South Atlantic, it was LaRouche’s analysis of the current international strategic situation which received the most prominent coverage in the Indian press. A front-page article in the New Delhi daily, *The Patriot*, titled “U.S. Faces Foreign Policy Crisis on Falklands,” quoted from an exclusive interview with Mr. LaRouche on the Malvinas crisis in which he warned that “the entire international strategic situation would deteriorate” if the United States did not oblige the British fleet to turn back (see *EIR*, May 11).

LaRouche’s explanation of how Americans are being manipulated by the British and by anglophile groupings in the United States around the Malvinas crisis was quickly understood by people in India, who often complain that American foreign policy is too strongly influenced by British views and geopolitical methods. As LaRouche pointed out during his visit, this influence has been reflected over the past few years in U.S. policy toward this region. Among the examples he cited were: Henry Kissinger’s support for Pakistani genocide in Bangladesh in 1971; the refusal to fulfill a contract to supply enriched uranium for the U.S.-built Tarapur Atomic Power Station; and the current support for the regime of Pakistani military dictator Zia ul-Haq.

There should be no illusions in India, LaRouche warned, about the efforts by Anglo-American zero-growthers to provoke war with Pakistan, break up India into several smaller nations, and reduce the population through famine, war and pestilence.

That India is committed to improving relations with the United States despite current tensions was reflected not only in the warm reception given to Mr. LaRouche but in the announcement that Prime Minister Indira Gandhi will visit Washington later this year—an announcement which caught most observers by surprise.

## Anti-drug victory in French libel suit

*Reprinted below are excerpts from a precedent-setting decision rendered by the 17th Correctional Court in Paris on Jan. 11 against Dr. Claude Olievenstein, director of the largest treatment center in France for drug abusers and addicts, the Centre Marmottan.*

*In February 1981, Olievenstein went on French radio to charge that the French Anti-Drug Coalition was a front for a “Nazi grouplet,” the European Labor Party (POE). Both organizations are associated with EIR founder and U.S. Democratic Party leader Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. The POE promptly took Olievenstein to court for libel; the decision in the POE’s favor included an award of monetary damages.*

*During the trial it came out that Olievenstein was peddling a line based on what he knew were lies spread by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL) against the Anti-Drug Coalition in several countries.*

*This was the doctor’s attempt to counter the effect of the French Anti-Drug Coalition, which had exposed him for advocating unrestricted “recreational” drug use. A more intensive Chicago-based campaign to stop the National Anti-Drug Coalition (NADC), the U.S. sister organization of the French coalition, is now the subject of a \$70 million suit in Federal District Court. Named as defendants in the NADC suit are the Illinois Attorney General, the Illinois heads of the ADL and NORML (the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws), respectively, and the Chicago Sun Times.*

*The translation which follows was done by EIR’s Dana Sloan. Olievenstein was misspelled in the original.*

The European Labor Party, certified association, represented by its President, Mrs. Claude Albert and its Secretary Mr. Jacques Cheminade . . . plaintiffs represented by J. M. Varaut, attorney-at-law;

*versus:*

Olievensztein, Claude, born June 11, 1933 in Berlin [Germany], . . . doctor of French nationality;

*versus:*

The Société Nationale Radiodiffusion Radio-France . . . represented by its President, Mrs. Jacqueline Baudrier. . . .

By writ dated May 16, 1981, the European Labor Party cited Mr. Olievensztein [sic] and the Société Na-

tionale de Radiodiffusion Radio-France in front of this court of justice for the offense of libel . . . and requested payment of the sum of 50,000 francs in damages, the broadcasting of the court's decision on the next possible radio broadcast of Radio-France, and the publication of the decision in three dailies and weeklies at the expense of the defendant. . . .

By writ dated May 25, 1981, Mr. Olievensztein offered to prove the veracity of the alleged facts and by writ dated May 29, 1981, the European Labor Party offered to prove the contrary . . . . The affair was heard on December 14, 1981. . . .

After hearing the parties directly concerned, the court heard Mrs. Kanter, without her being sworn in, by virtue of her position as a journalist for the European Labor Party and Mr. Golub, under oath. . . .

The European Labor Party reproached the defendants with the fact of Mr. Olievensztein's having pronounced the words "Nazi grouplet" in reference to the above-mentioned party on the airwaves of Radio-France during the course of the "Parlons Clair" broadcast of February 17, 1981.

### **On the libelous character:**

It is evident that the term "Nazi," which is the contraction of the name of the political party created by Adolf Hitler, now having become an adjective, applied to a physical or moral person, is to charge that person with implementing all the theories called for by the Nazi party, not only anti-semitism, but also racism, totalitarianism or religious hatred.

This charge therefore undermines the honor and the consideration of the European Labor Party by making it the heir of the Hitlerian party.

### **On the charge:**

While Mr. Olievensztein has admitted to having made these libelous statements, on the other hand Radio-France has concluded and pleaded that this action was not admissible against a moral person, on the penal level, and that it was not the accessory of Mr. Olievensztein.

The European Labor Party did not contest this line of argument. . . .

### **On the offer of proof:**

In an attempt to establish the veracity of his libelous allegations, Mr. Olievensztein submitted several documents.

These were first reviews or brochures not written by the European Labor Party. Their authors reproach either the European Labor Party, or the U.S. Labor Party or the National Caucus of Labor Committees for their anti-Semitism and their anti-Zionism without this being sufficient to establish this accusation, which does

not anyway include the "Nazi" charge. In addition, some of them accuse these parties of close relations with Iraq and the U.S.S.R. specifying that they are a "branch of the political extreme left with a Marxist ideology," which is in contradiction with the charge of Nazism.

The writings emanating from the European Labor Party or from parties with which the plaintiff recognizes having close ideological relations, contain severe criticisms of Zionism or the policy followed by governments of the State of Israel. But this is different from anti-Semitism and can even less be proof of ideological affiliation with Nazism.

As for the decision of the Supreme Court of New York, not only does it concern the U.S. Labor Party, but also and especially it does not establish proof of the libelous charges alleged against the European Labor Party.

The defendant did not bring proof of the libelous facts. There was therefore no cause to examine the offer of contrary proof.

### **On good faith:**

Mr. Olievensztein pleaded that a dispute opposed him to the European Labor Party, which reproaches him for his approach to the drug problem and his favorable attitude to so-called soft drugs. Indeed, he was severely criticized in issue No. 2-3 of *Guerre à la Drogue* [published in November 1980—ed.], the review edited by the Anti-Drug Coalition. Not only is this a different legal entity than the European Labor Party, but this attack, which had not given rise to any action on Mr. Olievensztein's part until February 17, 1981, was no longer near enough [in time—ed.] defendant to plead that his response of February 17, 1981 should be seen in the framework of a polemic. In addition, the question posed by the [Radio-France—ed.]

made by a leader of the Communist Party who was putting Mr. Olievensztein into question by name, and it is to another party that Mr. Olievensztein directed his libelous statements, to wit, the European Labor Party. None of the conditions of time, place or means relative to polemic between the parties existed.

Mr. Olievensztein did not establish that he acted in good faith.

### **On damages:**

The European Labor Party suffered certain damages which shall be repaired by the allocation of a sum of 5,000 francs and by the publication of this decision in two newspapers or reviews, the cost of each advertisement not to surpass 4,000 francs.

"Radio-France" not being involved, there is no cause to order the broadcast of the present decision on its airwaves. . . .