

## LaRouche: a modern 'War of the Roses'

*In a radio interview with "EIR Talks" on Sept. 16, Lyndon LaRouche was asked about the claim by TV personality Barbara Walters, that Princess Diana was estranged from her family, the Spencers, and especially from her brother Earl Spencer. "What's going on here?" asked interviewer Mel Klenetsky. "Is this just another symptom of this fight between the Windsors and the Spencers, or is it something else?" Here is LaRouche's reply:*

No, there is that aspect of it, but it's not that simple. What you're looking at is a tragedy, like *Richard III*, or *Hamlet*, like Shakespeare's *Richard III*, in which they're all killing each other off. The reason they're killing each other off, is because they all represent a doomed system, and they're fighting over seating positions, and a course of action under a doomed system. They're fighting over who's going to control the helm and choose what course in a ship of fools—or the famous German story "Narrenschiff," on which the various stories of "Ship of Fools" were based—so that none of these guys really are heroes.

What happened is that Diana—the murder of Diana, and the fact that the whole thing smelled like a murder, and it *was* a murder. You've got the French government, for example, covering it up for the British monarchy—not that I'm saying the British monarchy *killed* Diana—but they sent out signals which others would have exploited, to kill her. But the British monarchy's interests, the Windsors' interest, is in getting this thing quieted down as fast as possible. Because the House of Windsor could go. No question about it.

Look at the minds of the people who are engaged in this, and none of them are lovable characters—they're just like the people murdering each other in Shakespeare's *Richard III*. It's a tragedy, in which there are no heroes on that side.

What's in process at the present, is that coinciding with the financial crisis, and the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet system, some people, including people represented by Margaret Thatcher, George Bush, François Mitterrand, then President of France, in the 1989-91 period, used the occasion of the collapse of the Soviet system, to try to set in motion a kind of one-world government, a world-government system, in which the British Commonwealth, not the United Kingdom, but the British Commonwealth, would become the dominant institution on this planet, coordinating a number of supranational agencies, like the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization—this international alphabet soup of supranational agencies. So what's afoot is that the United Kingdom, with its semblance as a nation-state, is more or less

to be dissolved, not all at once, but step by step. As a matter of fact, all other national borders are effectively to be dissolved. . . .

To understand the British system—the British system has gone through a number of evolutions since the sixteenth century. Essentially the modern British system takes its start, following the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, when Britain emerged as a maritime power, or London emerged as a maritime power, together with the Dutch, and later the British took the top position in wars with the Dutch in the eighteenth century. But it went through an evolution in the seventeenth century under the Stuarts and Cromwell. And then, in 1688, a century after the Spanish Armada's defeat, you had this goon, this hooligan, this tyrant, William of Orange, who invaded Britain from the Netherlands, became a virtual dictator, and reshaped Britain's politics, so that his political organization in Europe was called the "Venetian party."

He came to power then, and brought, in 1714, his protégé of that time, George of Hanover, ascended the throne of England as the first monarch of the United Kingdom, as George I.

Now, from George I through George III, England was essentially run by a corporation, typified by the British East India Company, which is modelled upon the Venetian corporate model, that is of wealthy oligarchical powers with all kinds of concessions, running maritime operations, or interfaced with them, and they ran England.

Then the process went through a second phase during the nineteenth century, in which the British East India Company, while still a factor, was more or less phased into what became the Victorian system of empire, which persisted until World War I, and slightly after that.

Then, there was another phase in the postwar period, where Britain as an economic power was greatly weakened and overpowered by the power of the United States. But Britain managed to keep control of most of U.S. policy, after the death of Roosevelt, with a few brief exceptions, under the case of President Kennedy, and a threat to British supremacy over U.S. policy by President Clinton, though he sometimes vacillates on that.

What's happened with the post-Soviet period, is the drive is on to create world government, as I indicated, or institutions of world government, dominated by the British Commonwealth. So that this group of people, these wealthy families, typified by the South African companies of Oppenheimer-DeBeers, Anglo American, that sort of thing, or Rio Tinto Zinc, as it was once called, the London petroleum marketing cartel—that sort of thing—these fellows who control about 50-60% of the world's finance and trade, form a corporation based in the British Commonwealth, but extending in part into Europe, and in part into the United States. This is the constituency that actually runs the British Empire today, which is called generally, the Commonwealth, the British Commonwealth. The present tendency is to try to phase out the United Kingdom, but keep it within the Commonwealth, and make the British *Commonwealth* and the monarchy of

the Commonwealth, as the controlling dominant institution on this planet, as the new government.

This creates a situation which reminds us, in English history, as I said, of the Hundred Years' War between France and Britain, which is rather like an internal war, because you had the noble families—some English noble families were French, like the Beauforts, and the Lancaster family, and some French families were British. Then, later the Wars of the Roses, which culminated, of course, in the mutual slaughter with Richard III. And what you have now, is a kind of homicidal frenzy, like a bunch of sharks out of control in a feeding frenzy, among these powers, with shifting alliances, reminding us of feudal times when barons would make an alliance with another baron today, and then make an alliance with a different baron against the [other] baron's alliance tomorrow. And that's what's going on.

You're seeing that the British oligarchy, the financier oligarchy, and many of the aristocratic families who are attached to that, including the Royals, are chopping each other up, in something which reminds us, in English history, most closely of the Wars of the Roses. And *that's what we should see*. Don't get fascinated with the soap-opera features. Princess Diana was a significant person. Historically significant. Her murder came in such a way, and at such a time, that it threatens to blow the system up.

## Evidence of cover-up by French officials

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Although much of the "official" French media—led by the right-wing "newspaper of record," *Le Figaro*—has been fully complicit in the French government's cover-up of the death of Princess Diana, some media have provided information that proves the lie of the official story. Here are several of the most glaring accounts that contradict the official verdict—that Diana's death was simply an accident.

**Sept 7:** *Journal du Dimanche* reports that two anonymous witnesses to the crash said that a car driving in front of the Mercedes may have played a critical role in the crash. The first witness told the newspaper, "The Mercedes was driving on the right hand, shortly before the entry of the tunnel, preceded by a dark-colored automobile, of which make I cannot say. This car clearly was attempting to force the Mercedes to brake. The driver of the Mercedes veered into the left-hand lane, and then entered the tunnel." A second witness, walking along the riverside, said he heard "the sound of a motor humming very loudly." He saw the Mercedes "traveling behind another automobile. I believe that the reason the Mercedes accelerated so suddenly, was to try to veer into the left lane, and pass that car."

**Sept 9:** An AP wire story by Jocelyn Noveck, datelined Paris, reports that Bernard Darteville, attorney for the Ritz Hotel and the al-Fayed family, said on Sept. 8 that two photos taken just before the fatal crash show Henri Paul dazzled by a camera flash. The photos confirm other accounts that either a car or a motorcycle was in front of the Mercedes. "One sees very distinctly the driver dazzled by a flash. One sees very distinctly the bodyguard at his side, who with a brisk gesture lowers the visor to protect himself from the flash, and one sees very distinctly Princess Diana turning to look behind the vehicle, and one sees very distinctly the yellow headlight of a motorcycle." Darteville adds, "The photo taken before the first photo of the accident shows the Mercedes taken from very close." He adds that witness accounts indicate that a car was working in tandem with a motorcycle, trying to slow down the Mercedes. "A driver, who is maybe a photographer, and a motorcyclist, also perhaps a photographer, are very directly implicated in this accident." The film, according to Darteville, was confiscated by police at the crash site, from one of the photographers named as a suspect in the crash. Darteville is a party to a civil suit over the circumstances of the crash, and is, therefore, privy to some of the police investigation.

**Sept. 10:** *France Soir* publishes testimony by a taxi driver, that he saw the police radar cameras along the road near the entrance to the tunnel where the crash occurred, flash as the Mercedes sped by. However, the Paris police prefect handling the investigation denies that the radar cameras took any pictures of the Mercedes in the seconds before the crash. The radar cameras activate automatically when a car drives by at high speed, and, theoretically, should provide a time-sequence account of the entire incident.

**Sept. 14:** Michael Cole, spokesman for Mohammed al-Fayed, appears on ABC-TV's "This Week" to denounce the "piecemeal and partial reports" coming out. Asked about the reports of blood alcohol tests done on driver Henri Paul, he says, "We haven't seen those results. We've only seen press reports of them. The lawyers for the Ritz and, indeed, the forensic pathologists retained by Mr. al-Fayed, haven't seen those reports. . . . He just wants to know what happened, how it happened. He just wants an exhaustive and complete investigation into all the facts behind this. . . . What we can't have is what happened in Dallas, Nov. 22, 1963, where, for reasons which perhaps were apparent at the time, the body of the late President was hurried back to Washington and buried with a state funeral. And then we've had a third of a century of unanswered questions. We cannot allow the conspiracy theorists to take hold of this. We want the most thorough-going and exhaustive examination of all the facts so that we can know exactly what did happen." Cole cited one example of the "piecemeal" nature of the information coming out: the report in the French press that "parts of another automobile, specifically a wing mirror and part of a tail light, were found in the tunnel, in the underpass there. Now this may be true, but is this any way to proceed with an investigation, which the whole world is hanging on the results of?"