

When did Brenda know?

Act I

[Speaker casually dressed with no designer accessories visible, in some sense smart but not overdone. I would prefer a slight scruff. No suit. Perhaps if it is still available in fashion an elegant and interesting shirt, but not so loud it would interfere with the words.]

Beyond reason, which is an accomplishment of our civilisation, there exists another thing. Sometimes it is called insight. Sometimes it is called delusion. They are an expression of the same thing. Insight gets it right. Delusion gets it wrong. If this thing beyond reason is something we can grasp and know, what is it?

Perhaps insight is simple idea which explains all our experience in a flash. We do not know where it comes from. It is inherent in ourselves and at the same time connects this little self with everything it knows. It goes beyond the self and expresses all we know. It may go beyond that, we cannot tell, as an expression of the universe within ourselves. If we are deluded enough, it is a communication between God and us.

For what follows, many in authority have told us it is a delusion. This may be the case, we do not know. Our belief is that it is an insight, but we cannot tell. There are some who might be able to tell us the truth of the matter, but we suspect they would not wish you to know.

In some respects what we are to present to you is wrong. It is neither insight nor delusion. Some claim it is inherent in all art. It is a lie.

Nevertheless, lies in an abstract sense may convey some truth. They may not represent the exact sequence of events in detail, but overall describe figuratively what happened with aspects missing.

Another is the idea that we are about to represent a vast calumny with no location in any recognised event. It is a total misrepresentation of the truth, or rather no representation of the truth at all, but its reverse.

We think, even if that is the case, it contains a truth nonetheless. It is not located in the present monarchy, but it is an encapsulation of a simple idea. It is the way power behaves when it is subject to no just restraint. It is when power absolves us of our responsibility to be just, and allows us the freedom of our own will to deny the will of others, in assertion of our domination and control. In this respect, it is no specific event at all, but a condemnation of our civilisation and what these civilisations have always stood for. It is no specific retribution against any particular person. It is a condemnation of ourselves.

It might be thought that this was all we had to say and that was the end of it. But this is not so. The account we give differs from other constructions in a substantial way. Conventional accounts say Diana was murdered because of her relationship with Dodi Fayed. Investigations reveal the incoherence of this idea. It is background to what follows. We have rejected this idea and substituted something else. It is substantially coherent and has great association with well-known facts. We might say in outline but without other confirmation it must be correct. We reject in any way the assassination of Diana was due to her association with Dodi Fayed. If that is not our standpoint, what are we saying?

We note, the audience may be well aware, that Diana was involved in a campaign against the use of land-mines. He or she may regard this as an issue of no relevance. We rather would say it was part of a revelation of something of much wider extent. Just like the wealth of the UK monarchy which under investigation becomes stupendous to mind-boggling extent, we feel there is another accommodated item here.

In fact, we believe the revelation of the UK monarchy in systems used in the application of murder exceed to considerable degree its monetary wealth arising from ownership of one sixth of the land assets of the Earth, amounting to £17,600 trillion sterling, where a trillion is a million million, and other instances of wealth like the half ownership with the Dutch monarchy of Royal Dutch Shell. We think this is a substantial reason why Diana would be assassinated.

There would be no other option, since she was totally estranged from Charles who is thought by many who know him to be a lunatic. She was about to broadcast to the media in interviews that were to be successive and were being arranged of the extensive involvement of the UK monarchy in systems of murder. It was impossible that Diana should be allowed to live. In asserting ethics as the foundation on which she built her life she was decisively rejecting the idea that the UK and its central component, the monarchy, should have a right either financial or as we think distinctly ethical to be involved in systems of murder.