

Suppressed Film Exposes Royal Stonewall of Diana Murder Probe

by Robert Barwick

Unlawful Killing

Keith Allen, Director Associated-Rediffusion
Allied Stars Ltd May 2011

This May 2011 documentary video on the murder of Princess Diana, and the subsequent cover up by the French authorities and the British Royal Coroner of the true events surrounding her death, has been suppressed for the past three years. In it, director Keith Allen provides extensive background on the Nazi links of British Royal Consort Prince Philip, including an exclusive photograph of the Prince, marching in a funeral procession for his brother-in-law, a member of the Nazi Party, amidst men in SA and SS uniforms.

In the past month, however, the documentary video has been made available on the [Internet](#), and is getting wide attention globally. After its initial appearance at the Cannes Film Festival in May 2011, the video was made available to the public in a showing in Australia last year. The film was reviewed on Sept. 23, 2013, by Robert Barwick of the Australian LaRouche organization, Citizens Electoral Council/CEC (cecaust.com.au/). We re-publish that review here.

“Unlawful Killing,” the 2011 Keith Allen film that the British Crown establishment has suppressed world-

wide for more than two years, surfaced and was screened at the Sydney Underground Film Festival on Sept. 7-8. The British documentary on the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, in a car crash in Paris in the Summer of 1997, and on the 2007-08 inquest into it, leaves any viewer with indelible questions about the role of the British Crown: unmistakably involved in shaping the inquest, what was its role in the killing itself?

The Crown’s suppression of “Unlawful Killing” has been so complete, that its two Sydney screenings were the first anywhere since it premiered at the Cannes Film Festival and a festival in Galway, Ireland, both in 2011. Not only the film itself has been suppressed, but also any public reporting of its actual content. Instead, where the international media has deigned or been



All images are taken from the video, “Unlawful Killing.”

Princess Diana’s death, on Aug. 31, 1997, was found to have been an “unlawful killing” by the jury at the official Inquest, yet no one has, to this date, been arrested or charged for her murder. In this October 1995 letter to her brother, Diana writes, “My husband [Prince Charles] is planning ‘an accident’ in my car. Brake failure and serious head injury....”



At the Inquest, the experts agreed that Diana's life could have been saved, had it not been for the "suspiciously slow and furtive actions" of Dr. Martino, who supervised the ambulance, and his crew.

forced to mention it at all, they have uniformly denounced the documentary as "grizzly" and "salacious," usually citing a single, 3-second grainy black and white image of Diana in the back seat of her car after the crash, while excluding any coverage of the entire rest of the 78-minute film.

The "rest of the film" leads inexorably to chilling, still unanswered questions about a British Royal Family hand in orchestrating Diana's murder. Its title, "Unlawful Killing," refers to a type of verdict rendered under English law when a death is determined to have resulted from murder or manslaughter, but the perpetrators are unknown. Media coverage has left most people unaware that "unlawful killing" was the official verdict of the inquest concluded at the Royal Courts of Justice in 2008—the longest such hearing in British history.

An Inquest into the Inquest

On Aug. 31, 1997, a Mercedes carrying Princess Diana, her companion Dodi Fayed, bodyguard Trevor Rees-Jones, and driver Henri Paul crashed head-on at high speed into the 13th pillar of the Place de l'Alma tunnel in Paris. Paul and Fayed, the son of Harrods department store owner Mohammed al-Fayed, were killed instantly, and Rees-Jones was badly injured, but survived. According to expert testimony at the inquest, Diana, too, would almost certainly have survived, had she been taken immediately to one of the five major hospitals in the vicinity. Instead, she suffered an inexplicable hour and three-quarters delay from the time an ambulance arrived at the crash until she was delivered to a hospital only four miles away. "Unlawful Killing"



reviews these circumstances, together with eyewitness reports that the Mercedes had been chased into the tunnel by several motorcycles and a white Fiat Uno. Contrary to media assertions, none of these vehicles belonged to the paparazzi outside Diana's hotel that evening. Witnesses also reported that a bright light was shone into the tunnel from its far end shortly before the crash, while the Fiat Uno bumped Diana's vehicle and sped off, never to be traced by law enforcement.

The film highlights evidence of Diana's own concerns that she was under threat, at a time when even public accounts acknowledge that the Royal Family was conducting a vicious campaign against her. The opening footage includes an image of her handwritten message, dated October 1995, stating that "this particular phase in my life is the most dangerous—my husband is planning 'an accident' in my car, brake failure & serious head injury. . . ." Prince Philip had also written several threatening letters to her.

The crash occurred at 12:23 a.m. Diana was injured, but was conscious and alert. An ambulance soon brought Dr. Jean-Marc Martino to the scene, who took charge and made a series of inexplicable decisions that sealed Diana's fate. It took him 37 minutes to put Diana in the ambulance, though she was accessible because the back car door next to her opened readily. Only after 81 minutes had ticked away, did the ambulance finally set off for the hospital. And though Diana's identity and the nature of her injuries were by then well known, the ambulance made no radio contact with the hospital throughout the journey. Only after one hour and 43 minutes had elapsed, did the ambulance finally arrive at

the hospital, travelling at a snail's pace on empty roads. Allen reported, "At the inquest experts agreed that her life could have been saved, had it not been for the suspiciously slow and furtive actions of Dr Martino and his crew, the other members of which have never been officially identified, or interviewed."

While details such as these are crucial to unravelling the mystery of Diana's killing, film director Allen emphasizes at the outset that he constructed "Unlawful Killing" as an examination not of the event itself, but of the inquest into the crash. The vast majority of the public worldwide knows nothing of the testimony presented at that inquest, he said, or of its official findings. Based on media accounts, people assume that the inquest found the deaths to be accidental.

But the inquest found that there had been an "unlawful killing." As the film unfolds, it dramatizes the extent of the efforts made to prevent even that open-ended conclusion, through rigging of the inquest itself. Clearly, the viewer is left thinking that those with the power to orchestrate such a high-level, far-reaching cover-up would also have had the power to order the murder with confidence that they would get away with it.

Standing in front of the Royal Courts of Justice where the inquest took place, Allen observes, "The inquest was held in the Royal Family's own court, so is it any wonder that the Coroner, the Royals' representative in charge, decided that the key Royal suspects need not even appear at the inquest to be questioned?... Note that name: 'Royal Courts of Justice'—a sure sign of impartiality in a case where the credibility of the *Royal* Family is on trial in the Royal Courts of Justice, with a judge, or Coroner as he is called here, who has sworn an oath of allegiance to the Queen, and has Queen's Counselors on every side, and has already said that he is minded not to call senior Royals as witnesses."

Prof. Stephen Haseler, a founding member of the Republic organisation in Britain, is interviewed: "Historically, the relationship between the Royal Family and the Courts has been difficult, mainly because every judge has taken an oath of allegiance to the Queen. Now, if you've taken an oath of allegiance to the Queen, and you have that legal case involving the Monarchy, I mean, you're going to be biased, aren't you?"

Sure enough, the Coroner, Lord Justice Scott Baker, announced at the outset that he would not call any Royals to give testimony. And he clearly had advance notification about the testimony other Establishment

figures would present, including the Police Commissioner, allowing him to instruct the jury on how they should interpret such testimony. Before the jury retired for its final deliberation, Lord Baker tried to direct them to return a simple verdict of "accident."

Meanwhile, to make sure that little or no honest coverage of the inquest appeared in the press, most media, instead of sending their legal reporters to cover it, assigned their Royal correspondents. These are journalists who spend their careers "sucking up to the Royals," Allen notes, which guaranteed uniformly biased reporting. Indeed, Allen had sent his own undercover "mole" into the press gallery to take notes on the attitudes and behaviour of the Royal correspondents there, who were manifestly biased from the outset. As Allen observes dryly, "It's difficult to get a man to understand something when his salary depends on him not understanding it."

We summarise here some of the other key points of Allen's film on the inquest, along with related evidence which has emerged since it was made. These include evidence that Britain's MI6 and SAS were involved in the crash; that the French authorities falsified evidence and repeatedly lied, after having ensured that Diana would be dead before or soon after arrival at the hospital; that the Queen's Private Secretary lied to the inquest; and that the Royals had been conducting a long-standing vendetta against the al-Fayeds and Princess Diana.

The Inquest Evidence: No Royals Testified

Both in a handwritten note to her butler Paul Burrell, and in a conversation with her lawyer Lord Mishcon, from which he wrote down his recollection soon afterwards, Diana insisted that the Royals intended to kill or badly injure her in a car accident. Lord Mishcon's notes, which were available to the inquest (he had died in the interim), though withheld from the immediate post-crash investigation, recorded that he then spoke to Diana's private secretary Patrick Jephson, who told him that the threat was credible. Diana confided the same fear to her close friend Simone Simmons, who later said, "Of course Diana was bumped off. She knew she was going to be bumped off." Yet no member of the Royal Family was required to appear at the inquest. An observer noted, "What if this woman's name had been Diana Smith, and she'd written in a note which had been subsequently unveiled, 'My husband Charles Smith wants me to die in a car accident', and subse-

quently she did? In any other family, or any other country, surely Charles Smith would have been called to the witness stand at the inquest into his wife's death."

Three weeks after Diana's death, Lord Mishcon gave his written account of his conversation with her to Britain's top cop, Metropolitan Police Commissioner Paul Condon. Instead of handing the letter over to the French police investigation as

required by law, Condon locked it in his office safe for three years. His successor John Stevens kept it hidden for a further three years. Narrating the documentary, Allen observes, "Both men broke the law. Both men were [subsequently] made Lords by the Queen."

Secret Services Assassination?

The inquest ruled that Diana's death was caused not by harassing paparazzi, as universally portrayed by the media, but was an "unlawful killing"—in other words, an assassination. French police testified to the inquest that although the paparazzi assembled outside the Paris Ritz did initially follow Diana's Mercedes on their mopeds and scooters, by the time the car reached the tunnel where the accident occurred, they had been left far behind. They also presented eyewitness reports that as the Mercedes entered the tunnel it was chased and surrounded by several high-powered motorcycles and a white Fiat Uno, and that there was a bright flash. In this high-speed context, physical evidence showed that the Fiat had swiped the Mercedes, causing it to crash.

Former MI6 officer Richard Tomlinson testified via video link from France that he personally had seen an MI6 plan to assassinate a Serbian diplomat in an identical fashion: in a car crash in a tunnel caused by blinding the driver by flashing a very bright light. Anticipating the obvious question in the minds of the inquest jury, Her Majesty's Coroner asked incredulously, "Do MI6 kill people? Are they allowed to?" Baker then answered his own question: "Sir Richard Dearlove [MI6 chief,



Former MI6 officer Richard Tomlinson testified that he personally had seen an MI6 plan to assassinate a diplomat in an identical fashion to that which Diana had been killed: in a car crash in a tunnel, caused by blinding the driver by flashing a very bright light. Right: MI6 headquarters in London.

who testified at the inquest] said he was unaware of MI6 having assassinated anyone." Veteran TV host Piers Morgan, now a CNN anchor, when asked by Allen to comment on this claim, scoffed, "When you have the head of the British security services calmly announcing 'We have never killed anybody, in the last 50 years,' I laughed out loud—what's the point of them then? I didn't believe it. And so if you don't believe that, where does that leave the rest of the Establishment evidence?"

The account of the Aug. 31, 1997 events established at the inquest, which included numerous indications of a role played by the British secret services, dovetails with that just published in the Sept. 15 *Melbourne Herald Sun*, whose began, "A former SAS soldier confessed to his wife that Princess Diana was assassinated and that a bright light was shone into the Paris car she was being driven in. . . . The soldier, known only as Soldier N . . . told his wife that a former colleague, who had since left the SAS, was involved in the plot and that a motorbike and white car were used." Though sworn to secrecy, the wife confided to her mother, and the two women went to the police with what has been described as a "compelling account" of the events. As to perpetrators and their motive, Soldier N's wife "also told detectives that her husband had claimed that the 'hit' had been carried out on the orders of individuals within the royal inner circle because they didn't approve of Diana's relationship with Dodi Al-Fayed."

Certainly the British secret services were spying on Diana and tapping her phone, as she had confided to

close friends. The Allen documentary emphasizes that the U.S. National Security Agency has also admitted having 1,200 pages of transcripts of Diana's calls, but refuses to release them on grounds of "national security."

The French End of the Coverup

Normally, the traffic cameras in the Place de l'Alma tunnel in Paris operate 24 hours a day, and would have caught the murder on tape. On this particular day, however, they happened to be turned off. Within hours the French police inexplicably allowed a road-sweeping van to wash down the crash site, thus obliterating the crime scene. British Establishment figures quickly claimed that chauffeur Henri Paul had been staggering drunk and that this had caused the crash, though he appeared fully sober on the cameras at the Ritz Hotel, where his bill showed that he had consumed only two small drinks that evening. Following this "Paul was drunk as a pig" line, Her Majesty's Coroner reported to the inquest, "Two searches were made of Henri Paul's home by the French police. More alcohol was recorded as discovered on the second search, than on the first." Observed Keith Allen of these Inspector Clouseaus bumbling around Paul's apartment, "The first time, all the police found was an unopened bottle of champagne, and a quarter bottle of Martini, which hardly supports the claim that he was an alcoholic. So the police returned a few days later, and—would you believe it? This time, they claim to have found enough alcohol to stock an entire bar—beer, wine, Ricard, bourbon, vodka, port, champagne, cassis, pinot..." Even Her Majesty's Coroner was forced to admit to the jury that "There's no obvious explanation for this" astounding discrepancy, and instructed them, "You must consider whether there is any sinister implication."

The inquest heard Henri Paul's parents testify that in 2006 former British Metropolitan Police Commissioner Lord John Stevens had told them in front of other policemen, that their son was definitely not drunk; six weeks later, however, Stevens reversed himself in his official report. (In 2004, the Coroner of the Queen's Household, Michael Burgess, asked then-Metropolitan Police Commissioner Stevens to conduct an inquiry, "Operation Paget," into allegations that the Royals had conspired to murder Diana using MI6. Stevens retired as Police Commissioner in 2005 and was knighted, but continued to supervise Operation Paget, which in De-



Diana's chauffeur Henri Paul, shown here leaving the Paris hotel just before the fateful ride, was accused by Her Majesty's Coroner of having been "drunk as a pig." But hotel records showed that he had only two small drinks the prior evening.

cember 2006 concluded that the deaths of Diana et al. were the result of a "tragic accident.")

The French pathologist who examined Henri Paul's body and verified the "drunkard" line, was Prof. Dominique Lecomte, identified in the documentary as "a doctor who is notorious in France for covering up medical evidence that is likely to embarrass the state." Moreover, the documentary continued, "If her own account is to be believed, she coordinated the world's worst autopsy on Henri Paul, committing at least 58 basic errors." Indeed, every other scientist involved in the inquest signed a joint statement saying that Paul's blood test was "biologically inexplicable," and that Lecomte's report was "untruthful."

The inquest also heard expert testimony that the most likely explanation for the "lethally high levels of carbon monoxide" supposedly found in Paul's blood, is that it wasn't even his blood. Professor Lecomte refused to attend the inquest, even though under European law she was obliged to. The French Ministry of Justice excused Lecomte's refusal to participate, citing the French law covering "the protection of state secrets and the essential interests of the nation." When, in 2006, a team of scientists offered to carry out DNA testing on the blood samples to verify that they were indeed those of Henri Paul, they were told the samples no longer existed.

With all the resources of the French and British police and security services, authorities somehow never managed to locate the white Fiat Uno which had side-



James Andanson, a wealthy paparazzo based in France, owned a white Fiat Uno (shown in this photo), like the one identified in the tunnel at the time of the crash. He had been following Diana and Dodi earlier in the month. Andanson was later found murdered in his car.

swiped the Mercedes, causing the crash. They failed, even though a well-known millionaire paparazzo based in France, named James Andanson, owned a white Fiat Uno and had been following Diana and Dodi earlier in the month. He also, it emerged, had connections to the British security services. Though Andanson claimed he wasn't near the scene that night, neither among the paparazzi at the hotel, nor in the tunnel, he gave police two different accounts of his whereabouts, while his wife and son provided him with alibis that contradicted each other. A friend of Andanson's later said that he had admitted he had been present in the tunnel at the time of the crash. Three years after Diana's death, Andanson was found dead, locked inside a burnt out car on a Ministry of Defence firing range in France, with no keys in the car and two bullets in his head. The French police ruled it a suicide.

The Royal Vendetta Against Diana

The only senior member of the Royal household to appear at the inquest was the Queen's Private Secretary Sir Robert Fellowes (Diana's brother-in-law). Diana had told friends that Fellowes was one of the three men she feared, because he hated her and wanted to get her out of the Royal Family. To avoid answering questions about the Palace's actions relating to Diana's death, Fellowes testified under oath that he had been on holidays from the first week of August until after Diana's



The only senior member of the Royal household to appear at the Inquest was the Queen's Private Secretary Sir Robert Fellowes, Diana's brother-in-law. Diana had told friends that she feared Fellowes, because he hated her, and wanted her out of the Royal Family. He was later knighted by the Queen.

funeral, and therefore not involved at all in the process. He lied. In 2011, Tony Blair's press secretary Alastair Campbell published his diaries, which record that the Prime Minister's office was in daily contact with Fellowes to make all of the arrangements for the return of Diana's body, and for her funeral. In 1998, the year after Diana's death, the Queen made Fellowes a Lord.

The Royal animus against Harrods owner Mohammed al-Fayed and his son Dodi and Diana was well known in Britain. Typical, though not reported in the film, was an article in the London *Sunday Mirror* on the very day of the crash. Entitled "Queen to Strip Harrods of Its Royal Quest," the article, by Andrew Golden, began, "The royal family may withdraw their seal of approval from Harrods as a result of Diana's affair with the owner's son Dodi Fayed," noting that "the royal family are furious about the frolics of Di, 36, and Dodi, 41, which they believe have further undermined the monarchy."

The *Mirror* singled out Prince Philip as central to the Windsors' campaign against Diana and Dodi. "Prince Philip, in particular," Golden wrote, "has made no secret as to how he feels about his daughter-in-law's latest man, referring to Dodi as an 'oily bed hopper.'" But the Queen herself was intimately involved. Reported the *Mirror*, "At Balmoral next week, the Queen will preside over a meeting of The Way Ahead Group where the Windsors sit down with all their senior advi-



Mohammed al-Fayed has repeatedly charged that Prince Philip ordered the murders of his son Dodi and Princess Diana. Al-Fayed told an interviewer, “It’s not a murder, it’s a slaughter, by those bloody racist Royal Family.”

Prince Philip’s little-known ties to the Third Reich, including his education in Germany under the Nazis, and the marriages of his two sisters to high-ranking officers of Hitler’s SS and SA, are identified in the film. This is a photo of Philip as a young man, marching with a group of high-ranking Nazi officials, including his in-laws.

sors and discuss policy matters. MI6 has prepared a special report on the Egyptian-born Fayed which will be presented to the meeting. The delicate subject of Harrods and its royal warrants is also expected to be discussed. And the Fayed can expect little sympathy from Philip.”

The piece continued, “A friend of the royals said yesterday: ‘Prince Philip has let rip several times recently about the Fayed—at a dinner party, during a country shoot and while on a visit to close friends in Germany. He’s been banging on about his contempt for Dodi and how he is undesirable as a future stepfather to William and Harry. Diana has been told in no uncertain terms about the consequences should she continue the relationship with the Fayed boy.’” The article, which hit the newsstands almost simultaneously with the news of Dodi and Diana’s deaths, concluded ominously, “But now the royal family may have decided it is time to settle up.”

Indeed, Philip had written several menacing letters to Diana, but they were so heavily redacted when shown to the Inquest as to be meaningless. When Diana’s friend Simone Simmons wanted to testify to the content of Philip’s letters to Diana, she was forbidden to do so.

Mohammed al-Fayed has repeatedly charged that Prince Philip ordered the murders of his son and Princess Diana. For instance, in video clips of an interview between radio personality Howard Stern and al-Fayed, included in “Unlawful Killing,” the Harrods owner said

of the Aug. 31 crash, “It’s not a murder, it’s a slaughter, by those bloody racist Royal Family.” Stern queried, “Do you think Prince Philip is so smart that he could mastermind all this and orchestrate it?” To which al-Fayed replied, “Yeah, he’s vicious, of course. You think a guy like that would accept my son, different religion, different nationality, would be the future step-father of the future king? You think this bloody racist family will accept that?”

The film also documents Prince Philip’s little-known ties to the Third Reich, including his education in Germany under the Nazis, and the marriages of his two sisters to high-ranking officers of Hitler’s SS and SA. A photograph is presented of Philip as a young man, marching with a group of high-ranking Nazi officials, including his in-laws.

As al-Fayed said to Stern, “Powerful people in this country, my country, don’t want to hear me talking about Prince Philip’s Nazi background, but I have to, because it’s just 100% true. They wouldn’t accept me, or my son, and when he fell in love with Diana, they murdered them.”

Rumours had it that Dodi and Diana were about to announce their engagement, and that Diana may even have been pregnant. Although she had been stripped of her Royal status upon her divorce from Charles (while retaining the title “Diana, Princess of Wales”), the Royals immediately claimed custody of her body, and had it embalmed within a few hours of her death. This



The Queen and Philip hated Diana, and could not tolerate her alliance with Dodi Fayed, a Muslim. So they did what the monarchy has always done: They eliminated the problem. Right: Diana's coffin carried at her funeral.



made it impossible for a post-mortem to determine if she were pregnant, and was done even though Paris is a quick plane flight from London, so there was need to rush an embalmmnt.

The film presents evidence of Prince Philip's personal degeneracy, such as author Noel Botham's assertion that, "Certainly Philip's been in half the beds in England, including two of his wife's close family ... Princess Margaret and Princess Alexandra." Clinical psychologist Oliver James recounts, "I have a friend of mine who was at a party where he [Philip] was. He had to observe the disgusting sight of Prince Philip at a party wearing a leather jacket, dancing to a Stones song, with his hand halfway up the skirt of some young woman. That's not an unusual event at all for Prince Philip. He's done that kind of thing many times." More to the point is psychologist James' professional diagnosis of Philip: "I think Prince Philip is somebody who is devoid of any internal sense of right and wrong, so deep down he cares nothing about anybody else. He regards everybody else as potentially a threat. He is completely selfish. And that is very like [serial killer] Fred West, or any other psychopathic individual."

The Verdict, and Allen's Summation

After the longest and most expensive inquest in British history, Her Majesty's Coroner instructed the jury to find that the deaths were merely the result of an

accident. The jury, however, took its responsibilities seriously. They took a week to consider the evidence, and then delivered the strongest verdict not explicitly ruled out by the Coroner, that of "unlawful killing." They specified that the blame for this unlawful killing lay not with the paparazzi, but with the high-powered motorcycles and the white Fiat Uno, the "following vehicles" chasing Di-

ana's Mercedes. Despite this unambiguous verdict, the establishment news media continued their role in the cover-up by claiming that the jury had blamed the paparazzi.

Allen delivers a summation of what he discovered while making the documentary:

"There is no doubt that the entire inquest was skillfully manipulated by powerful, unelected forces, to the advantage of the Royal Family. This could only happen because Britain is, in essence, a monarchy, not a democracy. Much of Britain still operates on a system of unelected power, and at its centre are the Windsors, the old aristocracy, and their vast wealth. Just as in medieval times, the Royal Family live a life of unfettered privilege, the British taxpayers funding their lavish existence."

"Despite presenting itself as a charming and picturesque relic of the past," Allen continued, "the Royal Family retains a ruthless grip on power in 21st century Britain. It presides over a corrupt and corrosive honours system, that keeps tens of thousands of public officials in permanent obedience to the monarchy, all hoping for a knighthood, or an OBE, in return for a lifetime's loyal service. These are the people who operate Britain's system of government—judges, coroners, civil servants, police chiefs, permanent private secretaries, members of the secret services, and privy counsellors. ... The Royals don't only use honours and oaths of allegiance to preserve their power, they use intima-

tion too, as Diana found to her cost. They demand absolute secrecy and loyalty from their subjects, and they stifle dissent. . . . That's why many people regard them as gangsters—gangsters in tiaras. And given Prince Philip's Nazi background, is it so unthinkable that those at the top of the present day British establishment might go to any lengths to rid themselves of a turbulent princess?"

In conclusion, Allen says, "The British Establishment think that they have got away with murder. But then, what's new? They've been getting away with murder, for centuries."

Postscript: On to Prince William

Due in large measure to the relentless exposés conducted by American statesman and economist Lyndon LaRouche over the last several decades, Prince Philip is widely understood to be a mass murderer, one who intends to slash the world's population from 7 billion to 1 billion or less. He established the WWF [World Wildlife Fund] in 1961 for this purpose, and the WWF in turn spawned the world's entire "green" movement, including the Australian Conservation Foundation (see http://cecaust.com.au/main.asp?sub=pubs&id=NC_07_06.html). Notable in "Unlawful Killing" was the decision to feature the same quote which LaRouche has made infamous, Prince Philip's credo as he expressed it to the German Press Agency in August 1988:

"In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation."

Prince Charles has also taken a lead in coordinating the world's green fascist movement founded by his father. Indeed, the film features psychologist Oliver James' observation that "The Royal Family, it is true, are much more, at least in that generation, are much more interested in animals than they are human beings." Notwithstanding those "bloodlines," many credulous people believe that because he is Diana's son, Prince William will be different, somehow more human, a wish to which the film itself lends some credibility by opening with William's expressed devotion to his mother. On the contrary, William is clearly deployed to continue the family business of genocide under the rubric of "protecting endangered species"—the same slogan under which Prince Philip originally launched the WWF, notwithstanding his

own shooting of various [endangered species](#) in India and elsewhere.

The TV show Good Morning America on Sept. 15 [2013] reported on William's intended career plans, "Prince William says his concern for conservation and endangered species . . . will be one of his prime areas of focus now that he is leaving the military." An official statement from Buckingham Palace, said the show, announced that William will "expand his work in the field of conservation, particularly in respect of endangered species." Indeed, the first red carpet event which William and his wife Kate Middleton will make after the birth of their first son is a gala fundraiser for Tusk Trust, which funds "wildlife conservation" in Africa, the scene of innumerable crimes by the WWF, against both humans and animals. Evidently preparing their son, Prince George, to continue the family business, the show also reported that William and Kate have chosen to decorate his nursery with a safari theme.

Under the influence of Diana, whose own charity work defied the Royal Family's agenda, by emphasizing saving the lives of people, William conceivably could have turned out to be different. Absent Diana, future King William has conformed to his father's family and their agenda.

For Further Reading

Jeffrey Steinberg, "Battle Royal Shattering the British Empire," [EIR](#), May 27, 2011.

Jeffrey Steinberg, "Princess Diana Murder Cover-Up Turns Deadly," [EIR](#), July 7, 2000.

Jeffrey Steinberg, "Al Fayed suit targets intelligence ties to Paris crash, Diana's death," [EIR](#), Aug. 6, 1999.

Jeffrey Steinberg, "New Diana wars in Britain put focus on LaRouche," [EIR](#), June 19, 1998.

Jeffrey Steinberg, "New evidence emerges in Princess Diana murder plot," [EIR](#), Dec. 19, 1997.

Scott Thompson, Princess Diana's war with the Windsors, [EIR](#), Sept. 12, 1997.

Additional articles on this topic can be found at www.larouchepub.com