French police hush up new leads on Diana’s murder

by Jeffrey Steinberg and Allen Douglas

For four weeks, French police investigating the Aug. 31 car crash that killed Princess Diana, Dodi Fayed, and driver Henri Paul, have failed to provide investigating magistrate Hervé Stephan with a single shred of new evidence—despite the fact that dramatic new details of the tragic incident have surfaced, potentially implicating several British intelligence agencies in the deaths, and further exposing the French authorities’ own cover-up.

Sources close to the French probe have told EIR that the French police do not wish to provide civil parties to the case—including the families of the deceased—with any of the new leads, which strongly support the view that the fatal crash was a highly professional vehicular homicide, not a case of drunk driving, as the French government continues to claim. Under French law, civil parties to a preliminary criminal probe are entitled to full access to the magistrate’s working file, as the case proceeds.

Sources familiar with the withholding of the new evidence told EIR that they do not exclude the possibility that magistrate Stephan, and a second magistrate, Marie-Christine Devidal, are themselves complicit in the concealment. In a highly unusual move, immediately following the crash, French officials named Devidal as a second magistrate to “oversee” the Stephan investigation. She has been identified as a hard-line Socialist Party operative, associated with the late President François Mitterrand, and is believed to be a key player in the cover-up.

As EIR first detailed on Nov. 21, the French authorities have been carrying out a cover-up of the circumstances surrounding the crash—intimidating witnesses, burying crucial evidence, and feeding out a steady stream of disinformation through an all-too-willing Paris media. Despite these efforts by the French government to cover up the evidence that Princess Diana and Dodi Fayed were targets of a murder plot, there are still gaping holes in the French cover-story, centered around two aspects of the case: the vehicles involved in the crash, and the delay in providing medical care for Diana, who was still alive after the crash.
“Off with her head!” screamed the Queen, in Lewis Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. At the time of Princess Diana’s death, Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip had been conducting a covert war against Diana, Dodi Fayed, and Dodi’s father, Mohamed al-Fayed. New evidence is coming to light in the case, even as the French authorities’ cover-up continues.

First, there is the issue of the missing Fiat Uno, which collided with the Mercedes carrying Diana and Dodi, causing the fatal crash. A half-dozen witnesses have told French authorities that the Mercedes was being chased and harassed by several cars and motorcycles in the moments preceding the crash; and several of those witnesses specifically described a dark-colored Fiat Uno as one of the cars involved. After one month of denials, the French authorities were forced to admit that paint from a Fiat Uno was found on the side of the Mercedes, and other parts of the Fiat were found at the crash site.

Ultimately, the police also admitted that they had identified the Fiat as a turbo model, built between 1984 and 1987. That model was faster than the Mercedes 280-S carrying Diana and Dodi, and had greater acceleration.

**Early leads on a second car**

On Dec. 3, 1997, Associated Press issued a news wire, reporting that on the day of the crash, French police investigators were already convinced that at least one other car had been involved. A drawing prepared by investigators, done to suggest how the crash had occurred, was revealed by AP, after it had been suppressed by French police for months. According to AP’s Deborah Seward, “Within hours of the accident that killed Princess Diana, French investigators thought a second car might be involved in the crash, the first official sketch of the scene shows. The detailed diagram obtained Wednesday by The Associated Press from informed official sources was made Aug. 31, the same day as the crash along the Seine River.

“The drawing is interesting,” Seward wrote, “because it offers a detailed look at the crash site, and it shows ‘a probable collision zone’ between Diana’s Mercedes and another car in the Place de l’Alma traffic tunnel where the princess, her companion Dodi Fayed, and their driver Henri Paul died. . . . The diagram shows red glass found at the scene of the ‘probable collision zone’ between the two vehicles, where a 19-yard skid mark was indicated. While the drawing shows other cars or motorcycles traveling in the tunnel at the same time, it does not indicate how investigators thought the small Fiat entered the tunnel—or got away.”

Seward added, “The diagram also shows a second 32-yard skid mark, ending at the 13th pillar where the Mercedes crashed, killing all but bodyguard Trevor Rees-Jones.”

**Was the Fiat modified?**

On Nov. 23, a 2-million-circulation British weekly, The People, reported that further forensic tests on the Mercedes suggested that the missing Fiat Uno had been weighted down. According to a British law enforcement source working in liaison with the French investigators, who spoke to The People, “When police found the Fiat had been weighed down, they knew they had unearthed a crucial ‘piece of the jigsaw.’ At first they couldn’t understand how a ten-year-old Fiat Uno had the speed or bulk to knock the Mercedes into a fatal spin.” A British Special Forces veteran, aware of the new details,
told The People, “If this is true then the ambush was a very professional job.”

Murder by delay

The second critical aspect of the tragic events of Aug. 31 is the circumstances under which Princess Diana died. Two of the passengers in the Mercedes — driver Henri Paul and Dodi Fayed — died instantly, when the car rammed head-on into the 13th pillar in the center of the short tunnel. Bodyguard Trevor Rees-Jones, who was seated in the front, survived. Princess Diana also survived the initial crash. She was suffering from serious internal bleeding, according to initial testimony of the first qualified medical expert to arrive on the scene, Dr. Frédéric Mailliez.

However, as Dr. Mailliez originally told a French medical journal, Princess Diana had a very real prospect of surviving the crash — if she had received proper medical care. A number of emergency medical specialists interviewed by EIR’s Paris bureau, by editors of The Scotsman, and by other investigators, all confirmed that the only proper medical treatment for internal bleeding is to get the victim immediately to a hospital for surgery to repair the damaged veins and arteries, and administer blood transfusions.

Yet, in the case of Princess Diana, it took one hour and 43 minutes from the time that emergency rescue teams arrived at the crash site to get her to La Pitié Salpêtrière Hospital. For more than one hour, Princess Diana remained inside the tunnel. Contrary to initial lying French government claims, she was not pinned inside the rear compartment of the Mercedes. In fact, one of the paparazzi who had been stalking Diana and Dodi all day, Romuald Rat, was seen and photographed by other eyewitnesses, leaning over Princess Diana in the back seat of the car, moments after the crash. The rear door of the Mercedes near where Princess Diana was still sitting, was opened, and rescue workers had easy access to her.

Once Princess Diana was taken from the tunnel — one hour after rescue workers got her out of the car — it took another 43 minutes to drive her four miles to La Pitié Salpêtrière!

What is worse, there were five other hospitals — all capable of carrying out the emergency surgery — that were closer to the crash site than La Pitié Salpêtrière (see Figure 1). Three of the hospitals — Hôtel Dieu, Val de Grâce, and Cochin — were along routes between the tunnel and the hospital where she was eventually taken. One leading Paris emergency medical professional explained to EIR’s Katharine Kanter that VIPs are normally taken to Val de Grâce Hospital, which is a military hospital with an outstanding emergency medical staff, state-of-the-art operating facilities, and a Medivac helicopter, capable of rushing crash victims to the facility in moments.

In the case of Princess Diana, whose life hung in the balance, everything was done wrong. When the ambulance finally got within 500 yards of La Pitié Salpêtrière — after having driven directly past Hôtel Dieu Hospital — the driver pulled over to the side of the road, and sat for 10 minutes in front of the Natural History Museum. By the time Diana finally arrived at the emergency room — nearly two hours after the crash — she had already bled to death.

Who was in charge?

As the EIR probe of the circumstances of the death of Princess Diana zeroed in on the complicity of the French authorities after the fact, contributing editor Lyndon LaRouche insisted that one vital question be answered: Who was in charge of the so-called rescue effort? It was critical, he argued, to determine whether the fatal mishandling of the
emergency medical treatment of Princess Diana was the result of bungling or panic by low-level emergency rescue workers, or whether more senior government officials were on the scene, calling the shots.

A variety of sources ultimately confirmed to EIR that very high-ranking French government officials and bureaucrats were on hand. Philippe Massoni, the Paris Police Chief, was at the Place de l’Alma tunnel sometime shortly after the crash. And French Interior Minister Jean-Paul Chevènement arrived at La Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital *long before the arrival of the ambulance carrying Princess Diana!* Within moments of the arrival of the first fire trucks at the tunnel site — approximately 16 minutes after the crash — every hospital in Paris was informed, in detail, about the crash. According to one senior French emergency medical specialist, the “entire system” knew that Princess Diana was one of the surviving victims.

Had the incident occurred in the United States, both Massoni and Chevènement would probably have already been indicted on manslaughter or murder charges, for their roles in Princess Diana’s death.

**British dirty tricks and surveillance**

While the French government, at the highest level, has been directly implicated in the circumstances of Princess Diana’s death, there are also growing indications that the British monarchy had its agents swarming around Diana and Dodi in the days leading up to their murders. In another stunning revelation, *The People* reported on Nov. 30 that GCHQ, Brit-
Hollinger hit-man targets al-Fayeds

After six months of absence from the pages of the Hollinger press, the Telegraph newspaper’s leading poison pen, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, has surfaced with a series of vile slander stories, targetting Mohamed al-Fayed, the father of the late Dodi Fayed, and the owner of Harrods Ltd. department store.

From 1993 to the summer of 1997, Evans-Pritchard was the Washington bureau chief of the Sunday Telegraph, in which capacity he led a non-stop effort to destroy the Clinton Presidency — on behalf of the British Crown and British intelligence. In a candid 1994 interview with a Washington journalist, Evans-Pritchard boasted that he worked closely with MI6 station chiefs in every country where he was assigned as a “journalist.” His father, Sir Edward Evans-Pritchard, was a cultural anthropologist who worked for British Military Intelligence and the British Colonial Office in Africa.

Ambrose Evans-Pritchard first surfaced against the al-Fayed family in the Dec. 1, 1997 issue of the Daily Telegraph, co-authoring a story with the paper’s chief City correspondent, Philip Johnston. The story was a fabrication, which claimed that unions representing workers at Harrods were planning to sue Mohamed al-Fayed over alleged “phone tapping.”

On Dec. 5, Evans-Pritchard wrote another slander, which sought to portray Mohamed al-Fayed as paranoid about threats to his life. The story gave details about the security arrangements of the Harrods owner, based on information provided by a disgruntled former security director, who has been otherwise implicated in the recent deployment of House of Windsor thug Tiny Rowland, against the al-Fayed interests. — Jeffrey Steinberg

that any revelations about Dodi and drugs would force the Princess to break off her relationship with him.”

A leading British security specialist, interviewed by EIR following the publication of the Nov. 30 The People story, would have all the necessary technology in-house to monitor all of Dodi Fayed’s mobile phone conversations in Britain, they would have to obtain the cooperation of the French authorities to carry out similar monitoring while he was in France. Such cooperation is routine, the source pointed out. “You go in with an official piece of paper and you wave it, saying, ‘I am from GCHQ, or MI6, or whatever, and we are interested in these particular numbers. . . .’ You are working as a foreign agency in another country. In order for them to monitor a phone in Europe, they would have to have the assistance of the local authorities.”

The source reiterated that GCHQ, in order to monitor Dodi Fayed’s mobile phone, had the cooperation of the French, “without a doubt. If we can tie this down, it proves them as being totally complicit.”

Documentation

Royals were steering MI6 campaign vs. Diana, Dodi

On Aug. 31, the day of the crash that killed Princess Diana, Dodi Fayed, and Henri Paul, the London Sunday Mirror published a brief news item, by Andrew Golden, under the headline, “Queen to Strip Harrods of Its Royal Quest.” The article established that, at the time of Princess Diana’s death, the Windsors had been conducting a covert war against the former wife of Prince Charles, her friend Dodi Fayed, and Dodi’s father, Mohamed al-Fayed, already a longtime target of Windsor venom, and of dirty tricks by royal asset Tiny Rowland.

“The royal family may withdraw their seal of approval from Harrods as a result of Diana’s affair with the owner’s son Dodi Fayed,” the Mirror story began.

“Senior Palace courtiers are ready to advise the Queen that she should refuse to renew the prestigious royal warrants for the Knightsbridge store when they come up for review in February.

“It would be a huge blow to the ego of store owner Mohamed Al Fayed—and would infuriate Diana, who was yesterday understood to be still with Dodi aboard his yacht, near the Italian island of Sardinia. But the royal family are furious about the frolics of Di, 36, and Dodi, 41, which they believe have further undermined the monarchy.”

The Mirror singled out Prince Philip as one architect of the Windsors’ campaign against Diana and Dodi. “Prince Philip, in particular,” Golden wrote, “has made no secret as