

## Was MI-6 stalking Diana and Dodi in Paris?

On Nov. 9, the London weekly *The People* charged that “Six MI-6 agents were stationed at the British Embassy in Paris during the weekend of the crash” in which Princess Diana, Dodi Fayed, and Henri Paul were killed. The weekly said, “At least one officer had been detailed to shadow Diana and lover Dodi Fayed after they arrived from Sardinia by private jet.” The report also claimed that the heads of MI-6 and MI-5, Britain’s equivalents of the CIA and the FBI, “had held meetings” about Dodi Fayed and his father Mohamed al-Fayed’s “relationship with Diana in the weeks before the crash. . . . The involvement of the secret services has added fuel to the theories that the deaths of the couple and their chauffeur were no accident. The secret services have been known to hire snoopers who act as paparazzi to spy on targets.”

Independent of the charges published in *The People*, *EIR*’s own investigation has confirmed that the MI-6 station in Paris, consisting of at least six agents operating out of the British Embassy under consular cover, does indeed operate a string of front agencies that hire some of the

paparazzi, including several who were among the gang stalking Diana and Dodi in Paris. Following the fatal crash, eight of the paparazzi — Romuald Rat, Christian Martinez, Stephane Darmon, Serge Arnal, Nicolas Arsov, Jacques Langevin, Lazlo Veres, and Serge Benamou — were investigated on charges of possible criminal complicity in the deaths. They worked for the following press agencies: Stills Press, Angeli, Sipa, Sygma and Gamma. It is not known at this point if any of these agencies are fronts for MI-6. Rat has been singled out by British sources familiar with the fatal crash as a particularly suspect character. He was seen by eyewitnesses leaning over Diana’s body in the back seat of the Mercedes, moments after the crash.

A British intelligence source interviewed by *The People* added: “The intelligence services knew Diana was in Paris. All anyone had to do was wait for an opportunity. That underpass would be a perfect spot. Even at reasonable speeds, a serious accident would occur.”

One senior British police source said to *EIR*, “Was MI-6 carrying out surveillance? The French judge should ask them. If they say no, it has to be a lie, because they always did when Diana was on the continent. You have to understand MI-6. They recruit entirely from within, never advertise from without. Entirely a closed group. Who controls them? The order for such a thing as this could come from only one source in Britain: a royal.”

But, the first post-mortem report was *only* conducted on the blood taken from the contaminated chest cavity.

French authorities had leaked to the press that there had been two “independent” post-mortems conducted, and both had revealed the same presence of large amounts of alcohol in Paul’s blood. The report provided to the families revealed that the so-called independent tests had been performed on the identical contaminated blood sample from the chest, which had been divided in half and given to two separate laboratories to test. So, in reality, there was only one test. Furthermore, French officials claimed that a urine sample had been taken as well. But the report showed no results of urine tests.

Dr. Vanezis and his associate prepared a detailed memorandum, raising all of their concerns about the forensic report. Their memorandum was passed along to the magistrates in charge of the investigation, Hervé Stephan and Marie-Christine Devidal. Dr. Vanezis’s report demanded answers to a dozen or more disturbing questions he had posed. The family of Paul and other victims of the crash demanded that they be authorized to have an independent, outside autopsy done on Paul’s body. The French authorities would only allow a French doctor to perform such an outside test; and, not surprisingly, not one qualified French forensic patholo-

gist was willing to get involved with such an independent test.

A second team of prominent forensic pathologists in Lausanne, Switzerland, in the meantime, had been sent the original forensic report. They drew almost identical conclusions to those in the Vanezis report. They, too, were horrified over the outright incompetence and violation of the most elementary procedures by the French government personnel. A third independent audit of the first post-mortem was conducted by a team at St. Georges Hospital in London, and their results were the same.

So, at best, the only forensic evidence — the *only evidence period* — that showed Henri Paul to have been drunk on the night of Aug. 30-31, was incompetent, insofar as it was thoroughly unreliable. At worst, it was another instance of willful sabotage and cover-up by the French government. And, this was not the last of the French misconduct and lying.

---

### 4. A tissue of lies

---

There are many other willful lies that have been told by the French authorities and dutifully put out by the world media. Each of these lies, taken individually, could be written