



B27 Who Shot Muhamed Jamal Al-Dura? Is the Boy Still Alive?

Maurice Rogev, MB ChB, 11 Zamenhof Street, Tel-Aviv, 64373, Israel; and Nahum Shahaf, Msc, Natop, Habiluim st 3, Ramat-Gan, 52297, Israel*

After attending this presentation, attendees will understand the need to be cautious with media reports unless it's based on accepted forensic science criteria.

This presentation will impact the forensic community and/or humanity by demonstrating the inaccurate impression created by the media in their description of the A-Dura episode on the second day of the Palestinian Intifada, emphasises the need for caution in interpreting critical Death news reports published by the media unless its based on accepted forensic science criteria.

Details of the Incident: On September 30, 2000, the second day of the Intifada a crowd of Palestinian policemen and civilians, some armed, attacked repeatedly an isolated Israel Defence Force (IDF) outpost situated at a road junction near Netzarim, an Israeli village in Gaza.

French and other television groups televised the incident. The event developed initially as a demonstration and turned violent when Palestinian policemen began to shoot at IDF soldiers in the outpost. French television showed a father and his son Muhammed al-Dura hiding behind a concrete barrel. The 12-year-old boy seemed to be killed and his father seemed to be wounded. The French television alleged that A-Dura was killed by IDF fire. The IDF soldiers claimed that they did not see the pair crouched behind the barrel and they didn't shoot at them.

The pictures of the event were shown all over the world and Muhammad a-Dura became the symbol of the Palestinian intifada.

Methodology: No autopsy examination of the body was made by the Palestinians, there are no accurate details of any wounds that may have been caused by the gunfire. The body was not identified according to accepted standards and recognized practices. The identity of the body cannot therefore be accepted as that of Mohammed a-Dura the boy A-Dura was clearly not killed by IDF fire.

Aerial photographs were taken of the scene that showed the crossroad and the position of the Israeli Defence Force (IDF) outpost. Television footage of scenes of the riot, the boy cowering with his father and of the funeral procession were examined as well as medical notes and still photographs of the boy lying on a mortuary slab.

The aerial photographs showed the crossroad, the wall and concrete barrel behind which the boy and his father had hidden, the IDF outpost and the Palestinian outpost called the "Pita" across the road opposite the wall.

As the original wall had been destroyed for security reasons, a reconstruction of the immediate area of the wall and the barrel of concrete was made. The barrel had the same diameter of the barrel involved in the incident. Geometric and ballistic criteria were used in the reconstruction

The same type of rifles used by the IDF soldiers and the Palestinians were fired directed towards the barrel and the wall at an angle of the alleged fire from the IDF outpost, the "Pita" and from other angles. The television footage and still photographs of the incident and the still photographs of the body were also studied. Medical reports by a Palestinian doctor describing the injuries found on the body were studied in the absence of a complete autopsy protocol. No spent bullets or cartridge cases were available for Ballistic examination.

Results and Conclusions:

1. The geometrical and ballistic findings show that the boy was protected from the direction of the Israeli outpost.
2. The spread of the particles of stone caused by the impact of the two bullets next to the boy's head proves that the fire came from a less oblique direction, consistent with the Palestinian position (named "Pita").
3. The position of the Palestinians relative to the Israeli outpost raises the possibility that the shooting was deliberate.
4. Part of the bullet holes in the wall were made later artificially.
5. Long cut on the body of the boy described by one of the doctors fit a knife rather than a bullet.
6. The evidence of the doctors shown in the television and in telephone conversations is not consistent with the signs of injury in the photographs of the boy alleged to be that of Mohammed A-Dura in the hospital. This raises the suspicion that this is not the boy A-Dura.
7. According to the evidence of the doctors at the hospital the body of the boy a-Dura reached the hospital some hours before the time of the incident started. Therefore the dead boy presented in the hospital as Muhammad a-Dura cannot be the boy from the Netzarim junction.
8. The signs of injury on the boy's body at Netzarim were not consistent with fresh blood.
9. Many manufactured incidents were revealed in the television pictures. These included gunfights in front of the cameras in areas that were hidden from the IDF outpost.

The all event around Mohammed al-Dura including many other events seems to be created, including the death of the boy named Muhammad al-Dura.

Media Reports, Al-Dura, Forensic Criteria