

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."