

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

that Paul had lied about his background, when every other report is that he was a highly trained security officer. *Newsweek* also covers up reports that Paul was only seen having one drink at a nearby bar after he got off duty, before he was called back to drive Dodi and Diana.

Sept. 18: The *New York Post*, owned by London press baron and Fox-TV owner Rupert Murdoch, published a column by Ray Kerrison, attacking al-Fayed family spokesman Michael Cole for refusing to back off of his criticism of the official French story, that Henri Paul was the culprit in the death of Princess Diana. In a column headlined “Spin Doctors the Truth: Driver’s to Blame,” Kerrison lied: “By now, there cannot be any reasonable person who does not understand that the principal agent in the princess’ fate was her drunken, doped-up driver, Henri Paul, hurtling at breakneck speed through a Paris tunnel. . . . Yet Cole is still shamelessly peddling the line that the Fayed bears no responsibility for what happened. . . . In the death car were three men on the Fayed payroll — son Dodi, the drunken driver and an inept security aide. The liability is monumental. . . . But the cause is not best served by promoting a high-powered, worldwide public-relations campaign to focus attention on everything but the direct cause — drunken driving.”

Psychologist: People prefer ‘virtual reality’

On Sept. 16, *EIR*’s Mark Burdman conducted a phone interview with a prominent British psychologist, with long-standing ties to the London Tavistock Institute. In the discussion, a partial transcript of which follows, the specialist, who asked to remain anonymous, discussed the death of Princess Diana, and the public response to her untimely and violent end. He also commented on a recent proposal by Lyndon LaRouche, that LaRouche be named by President Clinton as his new vice president, should the ongoing fundraising scandals force Al Gore to resign.

Asked for his views on the impact of the death of Princess Diana, the expert began: “This is *terribly important*, touching on something I’ve been writing about for the last 2-3 years, and nobody’s been listening. Maybe now, they’ll listen. Diana personified, symbolized a projective identification for the British people. They converted all their *personal* tragedies, onto her. This is especially true of the British middle classes, which, frankly, took a beating in the 1980s and into the 1990s. Until now, they had no way of expressing it. But now, Diana becomes sanctified, as she represents *all the private tragedy, now expressed in a public way*. What is happening here, is *not* hysteria, as you hear all the time now. It is *far from* hysteria.”

He went on: “Now, people are aware: Tragedy can strike anywhere, even at somebody so rich and privileged as her. Now, all the shitty things that have happened to people, can

be put into place. It’s very much in accordance with the book by that Spaniard, Unamuno, *The Tragic Sense of Life*. You would be surprised, how many people have read that book. The fact is, and people now are seeing this, *life is tragic*. And with that recognition, a person *begins to be in touch with reality*. Otherwise, the denial of that, of reality, leads to *psychotic* behavior. Diana’s death has kicked out what might be called the virtual reality of people’s lives, and brings in reality.”

Then he introduced a certain specific qualification: “Hopefully, this is a lasting change. It’s been a brutal kick into reality. But the problem is, people *hate* reality. That’s the basis of psychosis, you know.”

With no further comment by the interviewer, he continued: “LaRouche’s reality can not and will not be heard.” Why that, the interviewer asked? “People ultimately prefer illusion to reality. Of course, that *could* be shattered, but I see coming up, instead, a *regression*, into some kind of *illusionist* thinking. What do you think all this talk about, and preparations for, the millennium, are all about?”

He went on: “I’m not saying I agree with LaRouche, but what I am saying, is that LaRouche has consistently tried to present things as they really are, underneath the facade. LaRouche has always tried to identify the *implicate*, in contrast to the *explicate*.” Asked to clarify, the psychologist continued, “They’re not being used as verbs, but rather nouns. The implicate is the reality behind what we see. Here we have a man, LaRouche, who says doom will strike the financial markets. LaRouche says that all that has been happening up to now, cannot go on forever. The Explicate Order will react with *hysteria*. In their hysteria, the question is whether they will try to *shut LaRouche up?! I would put my bets on it: These people don’t want to hear what he has to say, they want to shut him up.*”

Asked whether he was making an evaluation, or comment, on the security situation facing LaRouche, the psychologist said, “I don’t know about security affairs, I am talking about an attitude. They don’t want to hear what he says.”

Asked, “Who is ‘they’?” he replied: “What you would call the ‘Establishment,’ of various sorts, that don’t want to hear him. Let me put it this way: Clinton and his people won’t now say, ‘We were wrong, and LaRouche has been right.’ It won’t happen, on this matter of LaRouche and the vice-presidency that you mentioned.”

“It would be wonderful if there would be a change, but there won’t be,” he continued. “The evidence is, that people are too inclined to say, ‘To hell with reality!’ If they do something, that’s fine. . . . It’s not so easy to get the right emotive reaction here, as money and what it represents, is far less tangible. I could foresee something else, a kind of joining hands across borders, like things that happened before the collapse of the Berlin Wall. That would be wonderful, but I doubt it.”

Asked to comment on the growing evidence that the death of Princess Diana was the result of a murder plot, not an accidental instance of drunk driving, he concluded: “That is a tenable hypothesis, in my view. All I can say, is that her death solved a lot of problems with the royal family.”