

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?"

Sept. 15: *Focus* magazine in Germany reports that the Mercedes was left unguarded outside the Ritz Hotel for 80 minutes on Saturday night. *Focus* also reports on a dent on the right side of the Mercedes, apparently caused by another car, which may explain why the Mercedes plowed into a tunnel pillar.

Sept. 15: A London *Daily Telegraph* story, by Julian Nundy in Paris, reports that the French police no longer fully reject the idea of a second car being involved in the crash. "Paris police investigating the crash . . . have found a mysterious scratch along the right-hand side of the tangled wreckage of the Mercedes in which she was a passenger. Although investigators say they had '98 percent' dismissed theories that another vehicle ahead of the Mercedes might have caused it to swerve out of control, they say the paint stripe along the side of the car, could indicate a brush with another vehicle." Nundy also reports that Alexander Wingfield, a bodyguard protecting Princess Diana at the Ritz Hotel, told ABC-TV that the report that Henri Paul was drunk that night is preposterous. Wingfield said that Paul "looked and behaved perfectly sober to me. Over a period of about two hours, I was within a few feet of him on several occasions, and never smelled drink on his breath."

Sept 15: France 2 television reports that several unidentified witnesses described a second automobile that vanished immediately after the crash. "At that time I saw two cars. One a sedan-type, of a dark color, accelerated sharply, and from that moment the Mercedes seems to have lost control. I think the Mercedes, which was going very fast, bumped into the sedan, and lost control," one witness said. France 2 reports that investigators found signs of the involvement of a second car at the crash site. One side of the Mercedes was scratched, and the cover of one of its outside rearview mirrors was found ahead of the crash site.

Sept 16: A spokesman for Mercedes-Benz confirms to *EIR* that French authorities rejected their offer to assist in the probe of the crash. "The company confirms that it has offered to assist the Paris police in investigating the accident, and has an experienced team of experts on standby. However, this is solely a decision for the authorities in Paris." The Mercedes-Benz offer was made to relevant French officials on Sept. 1.

EIR's competition joins the lying

by Scott Thompson

Newsstand copies of the largest-circulation magazines in the United States have joined the French cover-up into the circumstances surrounding the probable assassination of Diana, Princess of Wales, including *Time*, *Newsweek*, *U.S. News &*

World Report, and the *New Yorker*. Not one of these magazines raised even the slightest doubt about the official French government line.

Sept. 15: By far the most lurid and pornographic coverage of Diana's death, came out in the article by Salman Rushdie in the *New Yorker*, entitled, "Crash." Rushdie mentioned the foolishness of entrusting one's security to a drunken driver at least three times, while describing Diana as fleeing from the "phallic symbols" of camera lenses. Another cover-up story appears in the same issue of the *New Yorker* by Tina Brown, entitled, "A Woman in Earnest."

Sept. 15: *Time* joined in the cover-up to protect the British royal family. In its "Commemorative Issue," there is a section entitled: "Who Shares the Blame" which reads: "Rapacious paparazzi may be important parts of the puzzle. But how much did Dodi's driver, heavy drinking and high speed have to do with it?" While noting that the paparazzi have been the chief suspects from the start, the article then focusses almost entirely on the alleged intoxication of driver Henri Paul. Only in passing does *Time* report the view of a world-renowned forensic expert hired by Mohammed al-Fayed, that the blood samples of the driver could have been tampered with.

Sept. 15: *U.S. News & World Report* devotes an entire section of its reportage on Princess Diana's death, to an article entitled, "Who's to Blame for Diana's Death? By the Millions Britons Mourned—And Angrily Tried to Determine Who Was Responsible." The article starts out by pointing responsibility at the alleged drunkenness of the driver. At one point the magazine virtually pointed the finger of guilt at Diana herself, stating: "As it was the kind of invasion that had come to play a major part in Diana's daily life—Earl Spencer called her 'the most hunted person of the modern age'—no one could fault Diana for wanting to flee. It was the high-speed driving, not the flashbulbs, that threatened Diana and innocent bystanders—it was only by chance that the careening Mercedes did not collide with other cars and raise the death toll."

Nor does *U.S. News & World Report* leave the bodyguard unscathed: "Trevor Rees Jones' . . . share of the blame may in a sense turn out to be largest, by the simple measure that the bodies he was assigned to protect are now cold."

Sept. 22: *Newsweek*, which had largely published pabulum in its preceding issues, finally cut loose with the full-blown French cover-up line, in an article entitled "A Needless Tragedy." "The princess was the victim of the wrong man at the wheel," the article said. "Who was he, and how did he get so drunk?" The article dismissed out of hand the idea that one of the pursuing motorcycles cut the car off and that there was an explosion before the crash. The article did report that any doubt that Paul was intoxicated was eliminated by a third test by French authorities, taken at the request of the Fayed and Paul families; but it then adds to the French cover-up "drunk driver" line by pointing out that the third test discovered Prozac and a tranquilizer, tiapride, in the driver's blood, even though these would not mix with any alcohol in his system to enhance intoxication. Without advancing any proof, it states