

---

Two years after, the CHUV (Swiss scientists) admits no proof of Arafat's poisoning.  
Dr. Rudi Roth

A French court of appeal has refused last week to reopen an investigation into the death of former Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat amid suspicions that he was poisoned, saying there is no legal ground for an eventual murder trial.

(<http://www.bigstory.ap.org/article/afa1ecf0d894440389483e3e9685507d/french-court-no-murder-trial-arafats-death> and <http://joodsactueel.be/2016/06/27/parijse-rechtbank-herhaalt-yassar-arafat-niet-vermoord-met-polonium/>)

It is interesting to read this text written 6 months ago:

*Frequently asked questions regarding the expertise conducted on President Yasser Arafat's personal belongings and remains*

<http://www.chuv.ch/ira/ira-arafat-faq.pdf>

"Lausanne, 15 December 2015 (corrected version of 15 February 2016)" published by the CHUV (Vaudois University Hospital Centre), the Swiss scientists who were in charge to investigate the death cause of Yasser Arafat.

There is also the article written by the CHUV (Received 28 May 2015, Revised 25 September 2015, Accepted 30 September 2015, Available online 30 November 2015)

*<sup>210</sup>Po poisoning as possible cause of death: forensic investigations and toxicological analysis of the remains of Yasser Arafat*

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0379073815004119>

with these highlights

- *Yasser Arafat died of an unknown illness.*
- *We found unexpected high levels of <sup>210</sup>Po in some of Yasser Arafat belongings.*
- *We found higher than expected level of <sup>210</sup>Pb and <sup>210</sup>Po in Yasser Arafat bone remains.*
- *Bayesian analysis moderately supports the proposition that Mr. Arafat has been poisoned by <sup>210</sup>Po.*

*and "In conclusion, statistical Bayesian analysis combining all the evidence gathered in our forensic expert report moderately supports the proposition that Mr Arafat was poisoned by <sup>210</sup>Po."*

#### ***A. <sup>210</sup>Po poisoning as possible cause of death: forensic investigations and toxicological analysis of the remains of Yasser Arafat***

In 4.4. *Bayesian analysis* besides admitting from the start there is no proof of poisoning: *The evidences gathered during this expert report are not clear-cut: we cannot exclude <sup>210</sup>Po as a cause of death, but we cannot be sure that <sup>210</sup>Po was the cause of death.*

I observed a complete lack of any precise numbers, which is for me another confirmation that there is no scientific ground for their conclusion based on Bayesian analysis.

In 5. *Conclusions* one can read it clearly:

...

*In conclusion, even if our findings reasonably support the hypothesis of  $^{210}\text{Po}$  poisoning, Yasser Arafat's cause of death will probably remain a cold-case.*

and here the writer(s) changed from "moderately support" used in the abstract to "reasonably support" or the inverse. Some disagreements between the writers on the result of the Bayesian analysis or just by accident?

### ***B. Frequently asked questions regarding the expertise conducted on President Yasser Arafat's personal belongings and remains***

For those not interested in the scientific details that are used to justify their study, please go straight to the conclusions (on page 6 of "*Frequently asked questions...*")

*Why can't our conclusions be more affirmative?*

*•Because of the uncommon nature of the samples analyzed (personal effects, decomposed biological samples, etc.) and the 8 years between the death and the analysis, in consideration of the short decay period of polonium-210.*

*•Because of not identifying unsupported polonium in the samples coming from the exhumation, which meant we were unable to conclude with certainty that the death was the result of poisoning with this radioelement*

(Everyone can observe that these statements are not exactly in line with the above highlights of the CHUV article *210Po poisoning as possible cause of death...* and express rather the contrary of what these highlights may suggest)

### *7. Conclusions (page 7)*

*Why did we use a Bayesian analysis and why doesn't the conclusion estimate the probability that Mr. Arafat was poisoned by polonium?*

(Though one could assume that it was Bayesian analysis, the expression was avoided in the original report and not even used in the response of prof. Bochud of CHUV)

...

*This allowed us to conclude that, within the hypothesis of polonium poisoning, all our observations were more coherent than within the alternative hypothesis, according to which the involved party would not have been poisoned by polonium.*

*•This brought us then to formulate our conclusion in this way: "our results moderately support the proposition according to which the death was the result of a polonium-210 poisoning".*

*•In this sense, these results do not then define the probability to which Yasser Arafat would have been poisoned by polonium, but must be integrated into the larger context of the police and legal investigations in connection to this case, and which are beyond our field of expertise*

Neither here, nor in the scientific article mentioned above, there is any justifications of their estimates and **their now "scientific" naming had been treated** already in my text of November 2013 (link below) under:

### **Hypotheses used to conclude poisoning “moderately supported”**

and by the response of Bochud on error margins:

And Professor Bochud commented to Joods Actueel “*Notre conclusion ne se fonde pas sur une évidence en particulier, mais sur la cohérence de l'ensemble de nos observations. C'est pourquoi nous disons que nos résultats supportent raisonnablement la proposition d'un empoisonnement au polonium.*” or “*Our conclusion is not based on any particular evidence but on the coherence of the totality of our observations. This is why we declare that our results moderately support the proposition of poisoning by polonium.*”

Professor Bochud should know better concerning Bayes analysis used in justice. The case of Sally Clark, innocent but condemned by using Bayes analysis is well known by specialists. In stead of calling it "Bayes" ... I would call it in this case "biais" as an anecdotal note to my text.

### **C. Conclusion.**

It is remarkable that the CHUV needed 18 months (article received 28 May 2015) after their report of November 2013 to explain they did not use error margins and give a pseudo-scientific explanation to their method of reaching a conclusion.

And that they also explicitly state:

*The evidences gathered during this expert report are not clear-cut: we cannot exclude  $^{210}\text{Po}$  as a cause of death, but we cannot be sure that  $^{210}\text{Po}$  was the cause of death.*

*In conclusion, even if our findings reasonably support the hypothesis of  $^{210}\text{Po}$  poisoning, Yasser Arafat's cause of death will probably remain a cold-case.*

Probably the report in Joods Actueel was of some influence for the CHUV article, but it might need Bayesian analysis to conclude that.

Anyhow, it looks there is no other article anywhere on the Internet, such as the one Joods Actueel was able to write and distribute thanks to many scientists.

Is the hypothesis “Arafat poisoned” moderately supported by the Swiss report, “strongly wrong”?

November 18, 2013

<http://joodsactueel.be/wp-content/uploads-pjact001/2013/12/Arafat-poisoned-strongly-wrong.pdf>