

taken from very close. . . . A driver, who is maybe a photographer, and a motorcyclist, also perhaps a photographer, are very directly implicated in this accident.”

Sept. 8: English attorney Gary Hunter is interviewed by NBC TV in Paris. He tells NBC that, when the crash occurred in the Place de l’Alma tunnel, he was with his wife in their room at the Hotel Royal Alma nearby. He rushed to the window when he heard the crash, and saw two cars speed past his hotel in tandem, their bumpers nearly touching, at 60-70 mph. One car was small and the second car was a white Mercedes. Hunter tells NBC that the cars turned onto a traffic circle at the end of the Rue Jean Goujon and disappeared from sight. Hunter tells NBC, and later repeats to the London *Sunday Times* (Sept. 21, 1997) and *EIR* (Nov. 12, 1997), that he, too, was rebuffed several times by the French police, when he volunteered to come in and report what he saw. Ultimately, Hunter gives a statement to attorneys for Al Fayed, and they pass it along to French officials.

Sept. 11: The *Daily Telegraph* fuels the “blame Henri Paul” offensive, reporting, “Diana’s Driver Took Drug Causing Dizziness.” Colin Randall reported that “Henri Paul . . . had taken two drugs—one of them commonly used to treat chronic alcoholism—as well as being more than three times over the drunk-driving limit, French officials disclosed yesterday. The Paris prosecutor’s office indicated that both medications were capable of impairing the ability to drive. Confirmation of Paul’s unfitness to drive when he tried to shake off paparazzi in the early hours of Aug. 31 appears to end days of speculation about primary culpability in the crash.”

Sept. 21: The *Sunday Times* publishes an interview with Gary Hunter.

Sept. 23: The London *Evening Standard* publishes a slanderous attack on Hunter, citing unnamed sources in the French investigative squad who dismiss his account of the two fleeing cars as “ludicrous.” One official is quoted that he is “tired of the meddling” in the investigation.

Sept. 29: *The Scotsman* publishes an account of the bungled French rescue effort following the crash, citing an interview with Dr. Frédéric Mailliez with a medical journal, in which he is quoted saying, “I thought her life could be saved.” Mailliez had concluded that Diana was bleeding internally. The first ambulance doctor to arrive on the scene tells *The Scotsman* the same thing. “She was sweating and her blood pressure had dropped. She had the external signs of internal hemorrhage.” *The Scotsman* details the long delay in getting Diana into the ambulance, and torturously slow ride to the hospital. “What is puzzling about the treatment,” they write, “is that she was not hospitalized until her condition had deteriorated to a critical extent.”

Oct. 27: The *New York Post* publishes a Neal Travis column, headlined “It’s Open Season on Dodi’s Dad,” which begins with the announcement, “The grieving is over and gloves are off in the case of the British establishment vs. Mohamed Al Fayed, father of the playboy in command of the car in which Princess Diana died two months ago. . . . At first,

after the tragedy in Paris, he was left alone, because he lost his son, Dodi, in the crash. But now the claws are out and many letters are being sent to him along the lines of, ‘You and your son killed our princess.’ . . . The establishment is now seizing on this terrible incident to drive Mohamed Al Fayed out of Britain. It’s not about Diana at all. It’s just blood sport—the kind the Brits play very well.”

Nov. 9: The Sunday weekly *The People* publishes a story that “six MI6 agents were stationed at the British embassy in Paris during the weekend of the crash. . . . At least one officer had been detailed to shadow Diana and lover Dodi Fayed after

Monarchy’s toadies howl: ‘Off with her head!’

Long before the London *Sunday Mirror* advertised Prince Philip’s bouts of murderous rage at Princess Diana, and years before her relationship with Dodi Fayed became the subject of MI6 snooping, the House of Windsor had targeted Princess Diana as a potentially dangerous adversary. While no “smoking gun” proof yet exists that the royals sought to eliminate Diana from the world stage, any effort to get at the truth behind the events in Paris on Aug. 30-31, 1997 cannot ignore the fact that Princess Diana was already on a British establishment “endangered” list for several years.

Things turned particularly ugly in November 1995, when Diana went on national television in Britain and the United States to declare the Windsors unfit to rule.

The first barrage of threats against Diana came immediately after her interview with the BBC “Panorama” program on Nov. 19, 1995, in which she declared war on the British royal family. Among her more startling pronouncements, was that, in her view, Prince Charles had neither the inclination nor the ability to be King. She intimated that Charles should be skipped over in line of succession, in favor of their son, Prince William.

Princess Diana said about her then-separated husband: “Because I know the character, I would think that . . . [being King] would bring enormous limitations to him, and I don’t know whether he could adapt to that.”

“I shall not go quietly,” Princess Diana said in another part of the broadcast. “That’s the problem. I shall fight, and I believe I have a role to fulfill with two children to bring up.”

A series of threats followed:

Nov. 20, 1995: Lord William Rees-Mogg, the former editor of the London *Times*, wrote in that newspaper, referring to Princess Diana’s Stuart heritage: “Like other historic co-inheritors of the Stuart PR gene, the Princess is

they arrived from Sardinia by private jet.” A senior British police source tells *EIR*, “‘Was MI6 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 MI6. 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.”

Nov. 21: *EIR* publishes an exclusive account of the deaths of Princess Diana, Dodi Fayed, and Henri Paul, headlined “French Cover-Up of Diana Assassination Exposed!”

The article reveals: that the autopsy on Paul has been sabotaged, making it impossible to reach any clear conclusions about whether he was drunk; the extent of the non-stop harassment by the paparazzi; and, the failure of all surveillance cameras in central Paris to capture a single frame revealing the high-speed chase and the events leading up to the tunnel crash.

Nov. 28: *EIR* publishes an interview with a distinguished French emergency medical expert who designed the Paris medical response system. The doctor states, “I would have taken her within a quarter of an hour to Val de Grâce, which

brilliant at the kingcraft of public image building. . . . The unfortunate Prince of Wales seems only to have the Windsor gene to guide him. . . . If one takes the long view, and tries to see the Princess of Wales as her role may appear in a hundred years’ time, she will then be seen as the great royal star of the late 20th century, the most famous member of the royal family since Queen Victoria.” However, Stuart brilliance “almost always ends in personal tragedy,” like that of Mary Queen of Scots, who was executed. The Windsors, he concluded, have a long future ahead of them.

Nov. 24, 1995: Germaine Greer wrote a commentary entitled “God Help the Princess of Wales,” written amid a number of warnings to Princess Diana “not to go too far.” Greer outlined the misfortunes of various Princesses of Wales, especially those who suffered at the hands of the Hanoverian dynasty. She noted the career of Princess Caroline, wife of George IV, who was thrown out of England by her hateful husband. Caroline, however, refused to give up her right to be crowned Queen when George III died, and returned to London to the overwhelming welcome of the general population. The House of Lords passed an act depriving her of her rights and divorcing her from the King; when she tried, with public support, to enter Westminster Abbey for the coronation, she was physically prevented. “Ten days later, Caroline was dead,” Greer wrote. Soldiers fired on London crowds who gathered for her funeral. “If Lady Diana Spencer had known the record of this family, if she had had a history [diploma], she might have learnt that the Princess of Wales is a title written in tears.”

Nov. 24, 1995: John Keegan, former defense correspondent for the *Daily Telegraph* and military historian, went one step further. In a commentary on the editorial page of the *Telegraph*, under a cartoon of Charles looking up, suddenly inspired, at a portrait of Henry VIII (who executed two of his six wives), Keegan wrote: “The important thing is that [Princess Diana] should set limits to her ambitions. She has said she will not ‘go quietly.’ She must, however, not go too far. . . . The people know how much change in the system they desire. If the Princess

exceeds their wishes, it is she who will become the casualty, not the monarchy.”

Nov. 25, 1995: British author A.N. Wilson, in a commentary in the *New York Times* entitled “What the Princess Is Up To,” emphasized that the fight between the royal couple was much bigger than a royal soap opera:

“No one can doubt that this was a skillfully organized attack on the institution of the monarchy itself. Not just on Prince Charles. Not just on the Queen, whom Diana obviously hates. But on the monarchy. . . . But then, nor had anyone supposed that she would be so self-confident and so well-groomed in her answers.”

Wilson concluded with a pointed warning to the Princess: “The war is not about individuals. It is about the oldest and most durable constitutional monarchy in the world. The example of Wallis Simpson and Edward VIII should be enough to tell Diana that when it comes to fighting a war, the Establishment can get very nasty indeed, and that for all her undoubted popularity, if she continues to rock the boat in this way, the Establishment will simply get rid of her, as they got rid of Edward and Mrs. Simpson.”

The second round

August 1997: The French press issued a curious “pre-warning” that the British royal family was prepared to move ruthlessly against Princess Diana and Dodi Fayed. *Le Monde* published a full-page feature entitled, “When the Court of St. James ‘Flirts’ with the Al-Fayed Family.” After reviewing the “Dodi-Diana friendship,” London-based journalist Marc Roche concluded:

“Mohammed Al Fayed is not at the end of his troubles. If Diana were to marry ‘Dodi,’ and become Lady Diana Al Fayed, this union risks undermining the worldly capital amassed by the owner of Harrods. Prince Charles would be aghast at this, and, in a ricochet effect, so would the entire royal family. As a ‘Buckinghamologist’ in the know indicates, ‘The problem for the Windsors is not to forgive this type of thing; the problem is, that they never forget.’ Clearly, the British royal family has a long and merciless memory.”