

The Duggan Case

Jeremiah Duggan committed suicide by throwing himself in front of three cars on Federal Highway 455 near Wiesbaden, Germany, in March 2003, dying on the third attempt. According to the Wiesbaden police report and a statement to the BBC in February 2004 by Wiesbaden prosecutor Dr. Dieter Arlet, Duggan died as a consequence of his own behavior and with no one else involved. “We are 100% certain that it was a suicide.”

Duggan’s mother, Erica Duggan, appealed the prosecutor’s decision to close the investigation in the German court system. In 2006, the Regional Appeals Court Frankfurt am Main rejected her application, finding it without merit; and on Feb. 4, 2010, the Federal Constitutional Court, Germany’s highest court, sustained the original police finding.

In April 2007, Hartmut Ferse of the public prosecutor’s office in Wiesbaden showed a reporter for the *Wiesbadener Kurier* ten thick folders of documents related to the case, telling him that no other suicide had caused so much work for his office. He suggested that

contrary theories had developed because Erica Duggan could not accept that her son committed suicide. The newspaper referred to the various theories put forth by the Duggans and their British government supporters as myths, which gained adherents without any evidence.

In its decision, the Constitutional Court stated: “There are no indications that the son of the appellant was not killed by the accident on Federal Highway 455 which he caused himself.” Noting the counter-argument by Erica Duggan that Duggan was killed by an

unknown party at another location and then, to cover up the crime, was taken to the scene of his death, the Court said, “The correctness of such an assumption implies and presupposes that several drivers (who saw Duggan in the road or who Duggan attempted to throw himself at and who gave statements to the police) who were out and about at various times, would have colluded and at least would have participated in the construction of the accident event found by the police and the expert.” The Court portrayed this assumption as absurd and completely unsubstantiated.

British Royalist Circles’ Death Threat vs. LaRouche

May 21—The British monarchy’s current operation against LaRouche and his associates follows a long history of such attempts to shut down the LaRouche movement as a perceived threat to its power. One of the most striking examples came in August 1999, when a widely read British women’s magazine published an unmistakable death threat against LaRouche.

The magazine in question is *Take a Break*, a gossip magazine, which is published by the Bauer Publishing House, headquartered in Hamburg, Germany. In its Aug. 5, 1999 edition, its cover was dominated by a large photo of LaRouche’s face, with the large print titled “Shut This Man’s Mouth.” The piece featured an array of commentators, all unnamed, who ranted about how LaRouche and his associated publications were becoming dangerous to the monarchy.

In his coverage of the piece, *EIR*’s senior intelligence specialist Mark Burdman noted at the time that “best estimates are that the article . . . was planted by Britain’s MI6 secret service and/or senior advisers to Queen Elizabeth II at Buckingham Palace.”

Take a Break author Katie Fraser characterized LaRouche as “dangerous,” and claimed that Buckingham Palace had become “increasingly alarmed” at the fact that exposés by LaRouche’s publications, on matters such as the murder of Princess Diana, “are being spread around the globe.”

Burdman’s report continued: “Fraser quoted an unnamed commentator, declaring that LaRouche’s claims represent ‘the biggest threat ever to the reputation of the Queen worldwide. . . . Something has to be done.’ Another commentator asserted: ‘It is vital to protect the Queen as a symbol of decency in a sometimes wicked world. She is a figurehead for all that is good about Britain. That must be protected at all costs.’

“Fraser claimed that ‘until recently, the British establishment has ignored’ LaRouche’s claims, ‘hoping they would fade quietly away. But they have not faded away. In fact, they are continuing to grow like a virus. Now the question is: Can they be ignored any longer? . . . Politicians and commentators alike are waiting to see what course of action the Queen’s advisers are likely to recommend.’

“Fraser concluded: ‘*Take a Break* says it’s time that Lyndon LaRouche was told to shut his evil mouth once and for all.’”

At the time, Lyndon LaRouche was a pre-candidate for the Democratic Party nomination for President in 2000, and the campaign issued a statement saying that it was treating the piece as a “cover for an MI6 order, probably with direct backing from someone in the royal household, to assassinate Lyndon LaRouche. . . . The inflammatory article . . . reflects a growing hysteria round Buckingham Palace, over the growing global influence of LaRouche’s ideas and his continuing exposé of the British oligarchy. . . . The appearance of such a highly politicized piece, that is so violent in tone . . . signals that this crowd is out for blood.”

The full article can be found in [EIR](#), Aug. 13, 1999.