

JOHN MORGAN: A FRAUDSTER EXPOSED

IF ANYONE WISHES TO ASK QUESTIONS, OR MAKE A STATEMENT, I SHALL ENDEAVOR TO RESPOND TO YOU PERSONALLY.

May I first of all apologise to my readers for making any mistakes in my book, The Princess Diana Conspiracy. But I shall illustrate that Morgan's host of "errors" is a massive fabrication; necessary if he was to achieve his objective. Two possibilities; he is either a fool by believing what he says or a criminal by knowing his comments are lies; you decide when you have finished this dissertation.

I discussed my real errors with John Macnamara and completed a review, submitted a new PDF and published it as the eBook three weeks before this corruption from Morgan was published. A revised hardcover will be printed, with a new ISBN, soon but the points discussed herein will remain; they are not errors. Each one listed, according to Morgan, is at least one of my supposed "errors".

All provable thus completely dispelling Morgan's felonious suggestion I am associated with MI6, waving false flags or undermining a "worldwide Diana movement". Morgan tries to convince you of his laudable intent so you won't recognise him as a fraudster. Since I had already made these corrections, the notion I was disturbing anything is a proven falsehood (pathetic in any event) but this criminal's motives are illustrated. The man and his books are seriously flawed since he only espouses corrupt inquest evidence. He is illogical and incapable of abstract thought so is useless as an investigative author (There is nothing investigative about regurgitating corrupt inquest evidence). He is also unable to perceive issues from different perspectives. These are major flaws.

His latest book is a criminal fabrication and written to make money by creating awareness through association with "The Princess Diana Conspiracy" and also to put my book in the shadows; don't forget this latter objective is shared by MI6. MI6 would be delighted if you tried reading Morgan's indigestible stuff since that would spell the end of the Diana "problem" because people won't read it, despair and give up in disgust. Even Morgan's friend, Michael Nyman, admits Morgan's books are a technical morass and a bore; as does John Macnamara.

MI6 is terrified my book will be widely read because people will quickly realise the truth about Diana's murder. They tried to prevent its release earlier, as you already know, but Morgan's rubbish suits MI6 well because he constantly regurgitates corrupt inquest findings and nobody reads his books anyway. Perhaps MI6 flatter and persuade Morgan to assist by lying to the people and trying to destroy me when MI6 know I will respond by destroying him; clever.

But let me make an important and central point that you may believe is all you need when everything else should fall into place.

All Morgan's books, as he proudly proclaims, rely on evidence derived from the inquest

transcripts so, on criticising a point, he invokes inquest detail and says, “The Evidence” as though that settles it; it doesn’t. Morgan agrees the inquests were corrupt but still expects people to accept him using this corrupt evidence both to question my work *and write all his books*. He has no intellect or vision but regurgitates corrupt inquest detail, dumps it between some covers and calls it a book. He then expects people to consider him an expert. We must challenge inquest evidence, not accept it as sacrosanct, especially since this is the only route to justice. This earlier evidence that I have is vital.

Morgan criticises me when I attack MI6, the inquests or challenge changes of evidence from dangerous witnesses. He leaps to their defence and calls this earlier evidence my “Power Constructs”. But these are where I use this untainted pre inquest evidence and eviscerate attempts to evade the truth by comparing it with the inquest evidence. So why does Morgan disavow evidence that is central to achieving justice. This is my book’s essence and why it is considered so dangerous. Morgan ignores or attacks pre inquest evidence when it’s the bedrock on which the inquests evidence, that Morgan proclaims is corrupt, can be challenged; why?

Perhaps this is because Morgan didn’t research this pre inquest material so doesn’t recognise the numerous issues that arose during the inquests that were sidestepped; his ego is greater than his desire for justice (already proven by his attack on me) and he needs to re-think what he has written. I assimilated this earlier evidence (2003-6) and later struck a comparison with inquest evidence; essential for an intelligent critique (Morgan started in 2006 and doesn’t possess this earlier evidence). Morgan continues to espouse corrupt inquest evidence as sacrosanct so is a mouthpiece for the inquests’ and MI6; he must truly be supporting another agenda. You see my thinking.

It is useful to be reminded what our criminal “Mr” Morgan states as his purpose and realize his entire work is a total corruption; he says,

“All investigative books have errors, I include my own. That is not the issue. The issue here is the level and type of error.”

So neither his nor my errors are the issue; only “the level and type of error”. I ask that you please keep this thought close as you read through the examples of Morgan’s opinion of my “errors” shown here because they aren’t errors. Most so called “errors” are differences of opinion where he thinks his “Opinion” is irrefutable but most are his own errors through ignorance of the pre inquest detail. When I debunk a point, remember, this point is then identified as an error in Morgan’s boring tomes.

Morgan’s “Omissions” are issues that, in his self-opinionated view, I should have included. Other “Opinions” are where we disagree on a vast number of issues where Morgan prefers his opinion. He says these are my “errors” but are in the main what Morgan calls my “Power Constructs” i.e. evidence Morgan doesn’t have so his ego tells him they cannot, therefore, be true.

A large number of the other “errors” are where he disagrees but has no evidence (Morgan

thrives on his opinion) such as who was Spearman at the inquests, witness I or 6, where we can neither be certain. One of my apparent thirty one spelling mistakes is where I don't ascribe the coroner, Scott Baker, his full title and Morgan says I should refer to him as Lord Justice Scott Baker. Add some genuine errors corrected by me and published as the eBook before Morgan's "review" emerged and that removed real errors but he needed an excuse to write his nasty little book to launch this attack. But if it's an excuse, he knows what he is saying is a lie i.e. criminal; logical?

A few examples of pre inquest witness disclosures are London based French Sipa Agency Photographer, Lionel Cherruault, where police confirmed he had been targeted by MI5. At the inquests Scott Baker referred to this as some misunderstanding between the policeman Kemp and Cherruault. Karen Mackenzie, al Fayed's housekeeper said the bodyguard, Trevor Rees-Jones, who claims to have lost his memory, said to her "if I remember they will kill me"; ignored at the inquests. I have Mackenzie's witness statement.

I presume Morgan will call these "Power Constructs" and will again rely on corrupt inquest evidence to proclaim my fault. There are many such points but one must ask questions of this corrupt inquest evidence; essential to achieving justice. These are not "Power Constructs"; this man is a disgrace.

But also he doesn't mention any of the huge number of new points of evidence I disclosed through abstracting detail from the transcripts; not one and all are clearly visible. Isn't this another clear indication of his purpose? He doesn't want questions raised about why he wasn't able to disclose these points. If he researched the inquests as thoroughly as he claims, he could only miss them if he was incapable of abstract thought. My lawyers will be watching for any books from this criminal that might have new information i.e. the same as mine.

He published his odious little book on 29th November and two reviews from "Mr" Morgan's followers, stating how wonderful his new book was, appeared the next day on my site (both one star for my book of course). How could someone read this book, determine its value then post a review in 24 hours. These disappeared after I posted about them. You might wonder as to this man's stupidity and dishonesty. No reviews for many years on any of his tomes (Even his latest one was published about eighteen months ago) but then lots arrive with five stars; what a corrupt little man. Some honest reviewers were recommended to buy one of his books and say they were extremely disappointed. One says he didn't finish reading it because it was boring; not an uncommon response.

But without honest reviewers, people's true thoughts cannot be determined so all reviews become worthless. These reviewers are, in the main, the same few people who visit all Morgan's books and mine. Some will be family or next door neighbours but always giving five stars for Morgan and saying much the same thing. Several will say "A Customer" or "Avid Reader" but not be named. When these people post against my book, always one star, they laud the virtues of the fraudster and mention his new book (Have a look). Who are these people? One admits Australia but most were posted around the time of his nasty

little book. What do you think? Remember, reviewers who falsely persuade others to buy books by giving dishonest reviews are deceiving readers; this is a criminal offence.

Please remember, my novel is written to inform and excite you. Unlike Morgan I do not write loads of boring technical stuff such as in a dictionary or reference book and I use descriptive licence with certain events. But look at the errors that Morgan suggests confirm I am with MI6; once you have decided on this, I believe the point is made. Morgan considers that each point represents at least one "error" but Peyret counts as four, just to give you an idea and sometimes he even repeats the same "error" and counts it as another. He was clearly aiming for a nice round number of 200. But I am pleased Morgan recognises that he makes errors; he won't be surprised at the large number he gains after I have corrected his "misunderstanding" but he will need years to put it right.

I don't want to bore you with a huge number of these but you will appreciate I need to go through a sizeable number so you will realise this is a criminal attack, not a mistake. These supposed "errors" are not errors at all but a fabrication that is designed to destroy, not reveal.

The number of c.130 "errors" includes examples shown, Morgan's 31 spelling mistakes plus some "Omissions" or variances of "Opinion". But not corrections I made before this nasty book emerged and don't forget the "Power Constructs".

Once more, remember what Morgan says: *"The issue here is the level and type of error."* These errors need to convince you of my supposed affiliation with MI6 etc.; otherwise Morgan lies.

SOME OF MY "ERRORS" ACCORDING TO MORGAN

I described the Mercedes travelling towards the Alma Tunnel and said that it crashed into the "pillars of the Alma tunnel". No it didn't says Morgan that is false; it struck a pillar, not pillars.

I describe a threat from Nicholas Soames where I have, apparently, misled my readers. Soames threatened Diana with an accident that had witness support. Morgan says there was no separate evidence a witness supported this at the inquests but acknowledges Simone Simmons was a witness that gave supporting evidence. But that was what I said; she was a witness who gave supporting evidence. Do you see where this is going folks?

Dodi and Diana had intentions of living abroad and Malibu in California was an option. But it wasn't certain where they intended living; this is an omission according to Morgan. This silly little man would love for me to have written a million and a half to two million words also so people wouldn't want to read my book either. Diana and Dodi intended living abroad which is the main issue.

Morgan says MI6 didn't admit, at the inquests, to killing people (Morgan can't recall this major point; did he work on this material?). Sir Richard Dearlove, the Operations Director

for MI6 in 1997 (Later "C") stated that sometimes Section 7 of the ISB (Intelligence Services Bill) 1994 was invoked (where permission to murder is sought) but that "all these referrals went through him as Operations Director"; but they needed a minister's approval ("All" clearly suggesting more than one intended victim).

Morgan says I have twisted the following and deceived you; but it illustrates his stupidity. It is established the Order Book is where MI6 record their intended special operations abroad. They have a team called the Increment that we know consists of SAS/SBS troops. MI6 Witness E's evidence was that MI6 maintain "a capability to plan and mount special operations abroad". Why would one use Special Forces; to make the tea? We know one of their "archived" proposals was conceived to murder Slobodan Milosevic in a Geneva tunnel. MI6 admits another murder target was a Moslem leader, "...hell bent on wiping out much of the population of Serbia." Morgan says my comments about targets and violent actions abroad are not justified. Does this funny little man have a brain?

When describing MI6 evidence he never questions their purpose but supports them by debunking my evidence. But if he applied abstract thought he would see (perhaps not) that by combining evidence one is able to rationalise a great deal more than just a regurgitation of MI6' prevarication.

Alain Remy witnessed the Mercedes traveling at speed along the freeway, unaccompanied by other vehicles. The court said they couldn't secure his attendance. Earlier evidence is that the British police lost his initial letter, didn't receive his statement and didn't telephone him. If Remy gave evidence that no vehicles surrounded the Mercedes at this earlier stage, the paparazzi didn't enter the tunnel with the Mercedes since the vehicles by the Mercedes as it entered the tunnel all disappeared; so, murder. (Note the nature of sanitised evidence; dangerous.) Morgan supports MI6 by calling Remy a flawed witness and suggests Remy didn't think his evidence would stand scrutiny.

I falsely state MI6 didn't give alibis; rubbish. I read MI6 alibis but didn't accept their comment as honest so I questioned them. My dissertation on MI6 evidence remains unchanged. It is a pity Morgan didn't appear to question anything. It appears that, for his own reasons, our pompous "Mr" Morgan accepts these alibis because his corrupt inquest evidence accepts them.

Henri Paul took off like a plane at the Place de la Concorde traffic lights and overtook all other cars. No it didn't says Morgan; Jean Louis-Bonin was placed to the left of the Mercedes at the lights and said the Mercedes was being blocked by a dark car. But then the Mercedes pulled out, tyres spinning and rocketed down the freeway ahead of the other cars. That's what I said.

Morgan illicitly throws the words Fraudulent, False, and a lie etc. around; all untrue. But here he says that I don't mention Hackett in my book in point 51 of his corruption. A certain lie; I do mention him on page 198 of my current edition.

I say the police are fully aware the royals are bound by English law; he says they are not.

Again, according to Morgan, I have falsely stated this. All royals are bound by English law although, strictly speaking, the Queen alone can stand aside. But the last time a monarch, Charles I, tried to seriously ignore the people's will, his head was removed with several strokes of a rusty axe so perhaps "Mr" Morgan understands now.

Morgan says that at no time did "the authorities suggest" there was more than one crash between the Fiat and the Mercedes. Of course they don't you stupid man because that proves an ATTACK. Morgan's tomes consist of much the same pathetic state acquiescence; why does he bother? Is it any wonder people don't read his books?

Morgan says this is false. The Duke of Edinburgh has chaired a meeting of the "Way Ahead Group". This group is chaired by different people, including the Queen, Lord Chamberlain and sometimes has more than one chair, but I said Philip has chaired the meeting, not that he chairs it. Perhaps Morgan needs English lessons.

Diana and Dodi tried to eat at the Chez Benoit restaurant before going to the Ritz hotel. Rubbish says Morgan; this is a "Power Construct". If he had asked me I would have given him the source. They were prevented from entering by hordes of paparazzi so went to the Ritz hotel instead where MI6 wanted them. Dodi booked the Chez Benoit from his apartment; wrong again!

Trevor Rees Jones, Wingfield and Henri Paul met in the Ritz Hemingway Bar; Morgan says they didn't. My evidence is that they did but it wasn't inquest evidence that Morgan relies solely on. Corrupt evidence don't forget; by Morgan's own admission.

Kez Wingfield left by the back door of the Ritz with Diana and Dodi. No he didn't says our pompous "Mr" Morgan; he went out through the front entrance. I have a photograph of Wingfield standing by the Mercedes as Diana and Dodi are entering it from the rear of the Ritz; wrong again!

I talk of loitering vehicles near the tunnels entrance. No there weren't says Morgan; "There is not one mention of loitering vehicles in the whole of the inquest transcripts". Loitering is a descriptive word that I use but on the next page, continuing with his banal criticism, Morgan says. "...that gives a total of two vehicles witnessed *loitering* near the tunnels entrance", so he now uses the same word, loitering, to describe the same situation having just criticised its use; what a fool.

Another point is that having taken much energy to vilify my use of the word loitering, Morgan then says "Outside of the Blanchards and Laurent, the only other witnesses to describe what could be called "loitering vehicles" were Clifford Goroovadoo and Olivier Partouche". So Morgan, having vilified me, now changes his opinion and agrees with me; wow, a first. What a moron!

Getting bored yet; so am I but this is sadly necessary or the truth will be prevented from reaching you A bit more: please bear with me a little longer. I promise I won't go through his

whole “book”.

Two cars were parked by the side of the Alma Bridge on the embankment prior to the attack. This is more evidence Morgan doesn't have. None of the evidence the inquest tried to subdue or eradicate are known to Morgan; this is prime evidence (Power Constructs). Why does he bother?

Evidence of two collisions between the Mercedes and another vehicle in the tunnel, also stating the Mercedes straightened out after the first impact, is available. I have an expert report that illustrates this with supporting witness evidence. According to Morgan, this is a fabrication on my part and a “Power Construct”; it isn't. This is a critical point of evidence and shows a murderous attack that MI6 were very keen to dispel. The official inquest evidence, of course, doesn't reflect this.

Morgan questions my version of Levistre's evidence. My evidence was reported well before the inquests; it stands. Morgan, again, challenges this using his corrupt inquest evidence as always. But Levistre's change of evidence is disturbing because his first account is highly suggestive of an attack. He seems to have tempered his evidence as did many other witnesses (Including some well-known people) and demonstrates why my “Power Constructs” are so important.

Levistre initially said that a slitting of a human throat gesture was made by the motorbike rider who dismounted in the tunnel. No it wasn't, says Morgan. It was a job done gesture and apparently because Scott Baker made the same reference as me we must be in cahoots. Need I say it; yawn!

A good example of “Mr” Morgan's pompous opinions is where he questions my reporting evidence from Brenda Wells. He contradicts by saying “...it was not the single bright flash that Wells saw-it was “*probably*” the camera flashes”. He doesn't know but freely criticises me without having any evidence. There are many such “Opinions” and Morgan says they are all my “errors”.

Jean Peyret, a witness, was about 50 yards in front of the Mercedes. Morgan says this is a Power Construct; it isn't. I have the initial evidence given by Jean Peyret who made this statement. There are three or four more banal criticisms reference Peyret from Morgan and they are all false.

Peyret said a motorcycle passed him where the driver had a white helmet and dark jacket. No he didn't Morgan exudes; I say yes he did. Please Miss, may I be excused; soon. I have the evidence.

Peyret's comment about the sounds he heard have been manufactured by me according to our illustrious “Mr” Morgan. I stand by the precise comments I made. As usual, the problem is that Morgan doesn't have this evidence.

Apparently my comments are fictitious and I am a liar. You can see the Lawyers licking their

lips; especially where the point, with reference to the word liar, can easily be proven false. There are four “errors” under the Peyret topic but none are errors.

Gary Hunters account of what he saw moments after hearing the crash etc. No it wasn't; it was two minutes. It was actually stated to be “less than two minutes”. Do I show my affiliation with MI6 yet?

One of my omissions is Diana's treatment in the Ambulance. He describes this at length in a tome but there is no real evidence on this and I focused on what could be proven. Mind you, here we have the benefit of “Mr” Morgan's Opinions, don't we?

Morgan took over a page for this; he calls it “WORD MANIPULATION”. He says there is “a HUGE DIFFERENCE in meaning between these two words” used during the inquest, “Uncontroversial” and “Incontrovertible”. To the jugular; look up controversial in the Collins dictionary where a *synonym* shown is yes, you've guessed it, “controvertible”.

I say that “...when Diana found Dodi it was pure heaven for eight blissful weeks; until darkness fell.” No it wasn't, says our brainless “Mr” Morgan. It was just under seven weeks because Diana and Dodi's relationship didn't begin in St Tropez; it began a week later. Relationships in my view begin with a kiss, a glance, a smile. Sex between the parties isn't necessary for a relationship to begin and how the hell does this moron know anyway. They may not have bike sheds at AL Fayeds St Trop pad but I am sure Dodi was extremely resourceful; perhaps a helicopter hanger?

I use a phrase educed from MI6 evidence, “ephemeral is deletable and deletable is deniable”. This foolish man tries to say MI6 didn't say this during the inquest but, although accepting the words were used, Morgan says it was only Michael Mansfield's suggestions they were responding to; yes, so what. They accepted it and it reflects their thinking as witness X established and that is what I said. Lateral and abstract thought by Morgan; forget it.

I believe Richard Spearman was the MI6 man in charge of Diana's assassination program and was witness I at the inquests. Morgan says he was witness 6; fine. Neither of us has irrevocable evidence but our pompous “Mr” Morgan's arrogance holds sway. When unsure I say so or exclude; Morgan states his opinions as fact and expands them. He actually writes whole books on this basis e.g. on the ambulance issue.

Henri Paul drove VIP's around; Klein said this before the inquests; as he did on his last ever journey. No he didn't said Morgan, quoting from inquest evidence and in answer to the question of whether it was part of Paul's regular duty. I didn't say it was part of Paul's regular duty. I said Klein confirmed that Paul often helped out.

Henri Paul had phone numbers of various agencies in his apartment and office. Morgan says I am falsely stating Paul had numbers for the Elysée Palace (French President) and the DGSE (equivalent of MI6/CIA). I have this evidence; again, he doesn't. Morgan calls this another

“Power Construct”.

Henri Paul had changed his clothes before returning to the Ritz. No he hadn't says Morgan and quotes more inquest evidence. I have evidence to the contrary; Morgan is wrong.

Morgan says I have “fraudulently” claimed to have done ten years of investigating. I am easily able to prove this and it includes three years prior to the inquests that Morgan doesn't have. Perhaps that's why I am able to question much of the inquest evidence, through my “Power Constructs”.

Benoit Boura, a witness traveling from the opposite direction in the tunnel, said that having been in the army he thought the bright flash of light was like a military strobe gun. At the inquests he changed this to a bright flash of light; even the inquest lawyer clarified this discrepancy with Boura because Boura's initial comment was common knowledge. Morgan obviously missed it. I major on variances because this is the bedrock needed to prove corruption. MI6 had ten years to sanitize and corrupt much inquest evidence for Morgan to espouse and for me to question. Morgan calls this a “Power Construct”.

Partouche and Goroovadoo saw bright flashes of light coming from the tunnel. They didn't have a good view but light in the dark is more easily identifiable and this was before the paparazzi arrived. The evidence varies with regard to the number of bikes but Partouche initially said one, although the police muddied detail of many witness' evidence. Morgan as usual has his opinion. But the evidence of a strobe needed to be eradicated to lessen the likelihood of an attack. Guess what Morgan agrees with; inquest evidence.

Morgan says I have falsely stated Levistre saw only two motorcycles; this is my evidence. Morgan's support for his opinion is, “...unfortunately Levistre provided confusing and conflicting testimony at the inquests” but still he chooses Levistre's later statement that there were more than two. This is sufficient for Morgan's opinion once more to hold sway and call someone false.

Brian Anderson initially said he saw two motorbikes around the Mercedes; later increased to three. This is closer in evidence with Levistre and Hackett but not of those describing fleeing bikes or the number driving around the wrecked Mercedes. Evidence is not conclusive on several fronts, of course, but Morgan concurs with inquest evidence because he doesn't have anything to counter.

Morgan says I said James Anderson resigned from the Sipa agency before the attack; I didn't. I said that Anderson wrote his resignation letter (referred to as “La Lettre”) on the Saturday before Diana's murder and faxed it to Henrotte, his boss, on either the 5th or 6th September. It's in my book, current edition, page 162. Morgan didn't know the letter was written on the Saturday.

Erik Petel also mentions a bright flash of light, as do several witnesses, but MI6 also tried to reduce the impact of this evidence; as does Morgan.

I describe the stories horror, "The Mercedes was wrecked *almost* beyond recognition". No it wasn't, says Morgan; the rear of the car remained clearly identifiable.

A report stated Diana was bleeding from the nose and the ears. Not true says Morgan; only the nose. There was such a report.

Dr Elisabeth Dion is the French radiologist who told friends she had seen a foetus in Diana's womb. The police sidestepped this until 2006 when they secured a non-committal affidavit. By abstraction one sees the probable truth; police prepared the affidavit and Dion signed it. Morgan says, "So what part of that statement does Power not understand". Why doesn't this fool understand abstraction; without it one cannot function as an investigative author. I do not accept corrupt inquest evidence and I question all perceived flaws in evidence and seek the truth.

James Andanson's Fiat Uno was claimed to have been on blocks and another report said it was used as a chicken hutch but Morgan says no; this doesn't show in his corrupt inquest evidence and is another "Power Construct". I have the evidence.

Philippe Poincloux is a mystery man who hasn't been traced and whom I believe phoned James Andanson on the day before his death. Andanson's son James Jnr initially said he had never heard of him but this contradicted his mother's evidence. Jnr then said Oh yes, he was something to do with his motor racing but he cannot remember how he knew. Morgan says James Jnr knew him but without clarification.

James Andanson was not discussed during the inquests but all his family and friends were and at length. His wife Elisabeth also initially said she believed MI6 was responsible for his death but changed her evidence. Christophe Pelât the fireman who discovered Andanson's incinerated body with two bullet holes in his skull wasn't allowed to attend court because the judge said he was not "appropriate to these proceedings". These are not "Power Constructs" as claimed by Morgan.

Twisting a proclaimed twist; now, that's a new one. I say Michael Mansfield QC makes the point to Lord Stevens that the British police could have disclosed the Mishcon note to the coroner and the French authorities six years earlier and asked them to keep it temporarily hidden rather than not revealing it. This idiot says this only refers to conversations between the police and Mishcon. Mansfield actually asked Stevens this question and stresses that he could have suggested to the French and the coroner that they wished to keep the note temporarily hidden but at least they would have then complied with the law; got it Morgan. Not holding my breath.

Mrs Levistre says in her evidence that if you give a statement to the police and write down white, they write down black. I said that if you write down black they write down white. Oh dear, I am discovered, undone; it is clear I am in cahoots with MI6; that does it, all is lost. Morgan says by changing these around I have done the same that Mrs Levistre was accusing the police of; really "Mr" Morgan. You must be getting really bored by now folks but we are

almost home.

I said Levistre witnessed the Mercedes sliding and “at that moment” saw a bright flash. Strictly speaking there is a point but... a nana second (Light occurs a fraction of a second sooner than sound. I did illustrate this distinction earlier in my book when describing Brian Anderson’s evidence). This proves my association with MI6; an error?

Diana’s post mortem in France where I say there wasn’t one; Morgan says yes. I know Commander Mules, Chief of the “investigating” French police, confirmed there was no post mortem done on Diana and said there was no need because, “How could the greatest professors in France not know what she had died from”.

Did Henri Paul intend exiting the freeway at the last exit before the Alma. Morgan’s opinion is yes but the only evidence is one witness, Thierry Hackett, who said there “could have been” a motorbike on Paul’s right preventing it. This is sufficient for Morgan; not for me because the evidence isn’t strong enough. It is possible, but I leave Morgan to his opinions.

Photos of Andanson’s Becaud Corsica trip, Elisabeth Andanson didn’t initially have, suddenly turned up according to our gullible “Mr” Morgan nine years later, 2006; just before the inquests. Well to be fair I can’t refute this either but I smell a rat. She also initially said MI6 murdered her husband and then changed her mind in court.

I said the two dissenting members of the jury would “probably” have opted for a different verdict if they had had the option; check my book. Morgan disingenuously leaves out the word probably and says “...would have opted for a verdict of unlawful killing by persons unknown if they had had the option”. He then goes on to say, “...it is impossible to know what etc.” and changes the entire meaning of my comment. If he seeks the truth, I wonder why he is perverting it.

You see why MI6 want my book off the market and Morgan representing them; his mindless use and acceptance of corrupt inquest evidence makes him a useful ally because this is what MI6 want you to believe.

But you get this fraudster’s intent. My responding to this disgusting little man means he will now be better known but no “errors” above, just lots of Morgan’s baseless opinions, lack of pre inquest knowledge and keeping MI6 happy. I hope you agree his pathetic reason for writing this “review” and his banal justification for this attack is debunked. I repeat Morgan’s statement for you to reflect on. Remember he said:

“All investigative books have errors, I include my own. That is not the issue. *The issue here is the level and type of error.*” What do you think of the “level and type” of “errors”?

The only honest comment from this nasty criminal is he makes loads of errors but the issue is the “level and type of error”; precisely-his. Using the above examples he felt enabled to say I am in cahoots with MI6, damaging the worldwide Diana movement and have sinister

objectives. There are a few possible reasons for this vile attack; fraud, incompetence, another agenda or a possible mix?

Do you believe the examples shown, plus Morgan's opinions and what he calls my omissions together with some thirty spelling mistakes show my association with MI6? Don't forget the "Power Constructs" that are essential evidence and the genuine corrections I made weeks before this nasty book emerged. If you are not satisfied with Morgan's proclaimed motives, his corruption fails and illustrates that he is an incompetent conman and a pathological liar.

I have spent ten years seeking justice at some considerable risk and that I accepted as part of the course. But I didn't expect to endure criminal abuse from someone who purports to support Diana. Morgan's fabrication is a corruption of the most cynical kind and acts as a cover for his true purpose; to sell his unreadable tomes on the back of the Princess Diana Conspiracy's success and/or cooperate with dark forces. You will now understand why his 1.5-2 Million words of indigestible and useless rubbish hasn't sold since he merely regurgitates corrupt inquest evidence throughout his entire monstrous, boring collection of tomes and he has no intellect to apply.

But Morgan and his cohorts needed to put the idea in people's minds that there was an honourable and necessary reason for his vicious, criminal and commercial attack. Without this falsehood people would reject him as an incompetent fraudster and realize his objective is to sell his useless books using my book as the vehicle. But people will not be fooled; he has failed!

The following are the reasons our pompous "Mr" Morgan says the book had to be written. Do you think these reasons are believable or that there was another agenda?

MORGAN'S PURPORTED REASONS FOR THE ATTACK

He won't name anyone who has helped him with his review because of "electronic interference" whilst putting his lies together. He hasn't named them, if they exist, because they are not going to be put in the firing line for the oncoming legal assault. Please make your own judgement on this. (Perhaps he should pay his electricity bill)

My book, according to Morgan, was written to assist MI6; what abject nonsense. May I suggest that while reading you may well take my view that logic clearly suggests the alternative; Morgan is very likely in their pay (I am not)? His books have failed and he is broke so desperately needs money. He uses accepted, corrupt evidence and supports the inquests' purpose. His language and attitude show he defends MI6. MI6 are known, in addition to their paranoia favourite, to attack people (i.e. me) by accusing them of the same crimes they intend employing against them because it becomes more difficult for the victim to question MI6's purpose. MI6 say, "He would say that wouldn't he" (remember Diana); what do you think? If so, this would be MI6 at their most inventive yet; I must congratulate them. But, with your support, they will still fail.

He claims I didn't do the research I stated but hopefully I have shown otherwise and am

able to offer much more substantial documentary evidence if needed that I can post e.g. my first letter to Harrods dated 3rd April 2006, that included my then manuscript and letters from publishers, agents etc (This was six months before Morgan claims he began his work).

My writing is deceptive and I manipulate witness evidence, all lies, of course but please consider this in conjunction with his attitude towards pre inquest evidence; his “Power Constructs”. Morgan prefers to think my evidence is deceptive because the alternative is that he doesn’t know anything about it; this means he cannot be objective and would need to start again. My evidence does sometimes vary because where I find fault, I challenge and put it right.

I doubt I could affect the so called worldwide Diana conspiracy movement even if I were the monster described but, since I have hopefully shown I am not, then Diana is safe; from me anyway.

His book has integrity and is watertight; what a joke. What do you think?

He was going to show that I manufacture and alter evidence but fails to do so because he again only refers to “Power Constructs” where the evidence (i.e. the truth) may, of course, differ.

My book has sold very well and is widely read. Yes; jealousy.

I planned Scotland Yard’s timing of publication regarding SAS soldier N that the police kept hidden for two years; rubbish. Does this fool believe I asked police to release information to me so I could include it in my book? The police whitewashed the “investigation” when forced to reveal it, as I predicted they would in the British National newspaper, the Sunday Express, a few days before the police walked away from it. If I had known about Soldier N two years earlier, the press would have had the details two years earlier.

My book is detrimental to the search for truth of what happened to Diana, what nonsense; Morgan’s ego tells him he is an expert. The reverse is true and Morgan is the biggest threat to justice.

Please consider whether you believe I am what this nasty man describes or whether writing his book had another purpose and since Morgan supports inquest evidence without question, how does he think he can assist justice. What is he able to achieve by espousing corrupt inquest evidence? What do you think?

Hundreds of errors will follow. Well no, they don’t; not one of the examples shown here is an error as are very few in his entire nasty, book; your views please.

Please consider whether I have done sufficient to satisfy you Morgan is a pathological liar and that all his purported reasons are rubbish. If you need any clarification at all please drop me a line and I will answer your concerns as quickly as I am able. Don’t be shy about this if

you have issues. It is important Morgan's lies are dealt with.

Another matter that I haven't mentioned before because it could lead people into thinking inappropriate thoughts was something that happened to me one night in November 2003 when I was intending to begin writing my book the following morning. I have never mentioned this before but feel it is appropriate to mention it now to show I began writing in 2003 and that strange events aren't uncommon to me. I have retained the disc and package in which the BBC posted it to me.

On Thursday 20th November 2003 my wife Sally (who died at home after eight months on permanent oxygen; April 19 2013) was at my mother's home. I skipped through the TV channels still wondering whether to begin my book the next morning; it was a huge task. I came across a program called the Bible Code on the BBC 2 Horizon program and watched as the screen showed lots of indecipherable stuff. It passed parts on JFK and came to a bit on Diana Spencer. It scrolled down to show my name and the camera stopped, on my name; the screen then went back to more indecipherable stuff. It spelt Power which is the name I was known by at school because there were two guys by the name of Power, David and me. I was shell-shocked and was even questioning what I had just seen but then the camera went down to exactly the same place and stopped against my name, again.

I asked the BBC for a copy but they couldn't let me have one because of a dispute with the books author, Michael Drosnin. About a year later the BBC posted me a program disc and I obtained a photograph from the TV screen; here it is. The significance of this to me was that this should happen at that particular moment. Plus being shown the same information twice when I first doubted what I had seen. Needless to say I took it that the Boss was saying don't be a wimp Power and get on with it. I began writing on 21st November 2003. Anyone may check that the program was screened and when. I include the photograph for you all. Look two lines above my pointing finger.

I started writing my book in 2003! Not two years ago in conjunction with MI6 or false flags and nobody else was involved in the writing. I do know some SAS/SBS soldiers and MI6 officers but I do not know SAS soldier N and would never harm Diana's memory as this nasty, corrupt little man suggests, in trying to justify his disgusting commercial attack. I accept the timing of SAS soldier N's revelation at the end of my writing was an incredible coincidence, as I stated on US TV, but you may also think so was the experience I have just recounted to you from the beginning. Other strange things have happened but at this juncture, I show you what I can prove; perhaps another day.

