

De X-Dossiers, Wat België niet mocht weten over de zaak-Dutroux,

translated into the English

The X-Files, What Belgium was not allowed to know about the case-Dutroux

With focus on the exact translation where possible, and fitting translation in case of proverbs and other use of Dutch language that does not carry on in English without confusion. In such cases, the fitting English counterpart has been put to use to translate without any loss of information.

In this document, there have been no parts left out, and footnotes and such are translated where possible. Names that hold part of an explanation (such as a publisher at the bottom of this edited translation) are followed by the translation behind them – or placed in the notes I put at the end of this file. This to share all information equally between people who understand Dutch and those who are unskilled in this language.

Yours sincerely,

Socks

### **Personal notes from page 33**

Copyright @Annemie Bulté, Douglas De Coninck, Marie-Jeanne Van Heeswyck/

Publisher Houtekiet 1999

Publisher Houtekiet, Vrijheidstraat 33, B-2000

Antwerpen E-mail [info@houtekiet.com](mailto:info@houtekiet.com)

**Uitgeverij Fontein**, Prinses Marielaan 8, NL-3743 JA \*

Baarn E-mail [info@fonteinbaarn.nl](mailto:info@fonteinbaarn.nl)

Design

(Zizó!) ISBN 90

5240 536 0 D 1999

4765 29 NUGI

661/654

\*(Uitgeverij is Dutch for Publisher)

Annemie Bulté Douglas  
De Coninck Marie-Jeanne  
Van Heeswyck

# THE X-FILES

*What Belgium was not allowed to know  
about the case-Dutroux*

## Houtekiet / Fontein

We lost track of the amount of people who helped us one way or another. Some of them we would like to thank specifically, of others we know they would prefer to not see their names here. As of such: thanks to André, Anne, Anne-Marie, Ayfer, Bruno, Carine, Caspar, Christian, Christine, Claude, Daniel, Danny, Donatienne, married couple from Zellik, Eddy, Elio, Els, Erwin, Filip, Flurk, Frans, Frans, Gaby, Guendalina, Hadewych, Hans, Hilde, Jan, Jan, Jean-Luc, Jean-Philippe, José, Laurent, Lieve, Loretta, Luc, Marc, Marc, Marcel, Marco, Marie-Noëlle, Michel, Michel, Mike, Monique, Paëlla, Patricia, Patrick, Paul, Pina, Pol, Raf, Regina, Rita, Ruf, Saskia, Serge, Tania, Theo, Tintin, Tiny, Veerle, Vero, Véronique, Walter, Werner, Willy, Yola, Zoë... To the rest we will just say it.

Special thanks to Olivier Taymans, who had been much more than translator before this book, and who should deserve much more than this short sentence. Thanks as well, mostly actually, to the people who were willing to spend time to talk with us. To Tracy, Max, and Juliette.

## Content

### 1. Winter 1995

1. The assize process of Jean-Paul Raemakers 8
2. Fight for the testimony of a madman 21
3. The bizarre official report of commissioner Marnette 30

### 2. Summer 1996

1. Testimonies of Michel Lelièvre 42
2. Life and Work of Bernard Weinstein 54
3. The hearings of Michèle Martin 65
4. Life and work of Marc Dutroux 78
5. A Flemish family in Bertrix 93
6. Life and Work of Michel Nihoul 116

### 3. Autumn 1996

1. First contact with witness X1 132
2. First hearing of witness X1 138
3. The research of the murder of Carine Dellaert 154
4. First hearing of X1 about 'Kristien 175
5. Second hearing of X1 about 'Kristien 192
6. The research of the murder of Christine Van Hees 213
7. The forgotten report of the Belgium State Security 243
8. The murder on a camping in Oud-Heverlee 258

### 4. Winter 1996-97

1. The False accusations against Elio Di Rupo 270
2. The house search at the vzw Abrasax 276
3. Grand useless digging processes in Jumet 280

### 5. Spring 1997

1. The troubles surrounding witness Nathalie W. 308
2. The testimonies of X2, X3, X4, X69 and VM1 319
3. Childhood friends and experts on X1 340
4. Marc Dutroux and serial rapist L.V. 358
5. Hanim Ayse Mazibas and Naatje van Zwaren de Zwarenstein 368
6. The murder of Katrien De Cuyper 379

### 6. 1997-1999

1. The first report of rereading concerning X1 398
2. The second and the third report of rereading concerning X1 422
3. The impressive relations network of Michel Nihoul 453
4. The fourth report of rereading concerning X1 471
5. The falsified files of the Ghent Public Prosecution Service (*from NL parket*) 491
6. Investigating judge Jacques Pignolet on fire 521

### 7. Final consideration

533

### 8. Index

540

Perhaps it is better to be irresponsible and right than to be responsible and wrong.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

# 1 Winter 1995

*Jean-Paul Raemaekers*

***1*** *I will put the machines to work'*  
Jean-Paul Raemaekers, 27 januari 1995

According to the norms of the assize audience, which desires passion and manslaughter, it dreadfully seems to turn into an unpleasant show. Nobody has been murdered, kidnapped, or taken hostage. Nobody has heard of the man who stands trial. The facts he has been accused of he has admitted. Where there to be anything sensational to be expected, it surely would play behind closed doors. The habitués of the Brussels assize court prepare themselves for a technical-procedural debate of several days about the psyche of the defendant, in the morning of Monday 23 January 1995. The defence asks for the internment. Just as expected is the plea of public prosecutor Raymond Loop for a punishment that can serve as an example, at the end of the week.

The defendant is 45 year old Brusselaar Jean-Paul Raemaekers. He has to account for the rape and torture of three children: eight, nine and ten years old. The burden of proof is convincing. It consists of nine movie recordings he himself created that show the facts. Since Raemaekers had been convicted for similar facts in 1989, the end of the process leaves no surprises. The predictions are even less pleasant for him when it seems his lawyer, the successful assize pleader Jean-Paul Dumont, did not show up on his first process day. He has himself be replaced by his confraters Marc Depaus and Patrick Gueuning. The defence seems to be resting in the hopelessness of the situation by default.

The only person who sees matters differently, is Jean-Paul Raemaekers himself. He plays goodwill incarnate who just so happened to destroy his up-to-then perfect rolemodel life due to one faulty happening. He is freshly shaven and has a recent haircut. At starters only speaks when asked to. When he is speaking, he does so with pathos, losing himself in lyrical comparisons that go past the reason of his presence here. Raemaekers speaks in incredibly high speed and manages to take an apologetic, almost submissive tone.

‘I do not want to hide anything and I intend to lay my cards opened up on the table’, he answers to the first question of chairman Karin Gerard. He describes his sexuality as ‘an especially big problem’. Yes, he has viewed the small pieces of film, but at first he could not believe it was him, who was laughing as he made a girl scream in pain as he penetrated her. When something happened, he said, he would lose all control of himself. ‘To compensate for my disease I have always tried to do what is right’, he wraps himself up in the role of patient. ‘Often times I have anonymously donated to funds and orphanages.’

On the first day, some members of the jury are already getting bored when Karin Gerard starts with the obligational topic: his childhood. It was tragic, as with basically every assize defendant. Raemaekers is not the name with which he was born. He was born on 25 June 1949 as the only child of a Rose Wattiez from Etterbeek. The single woman leaves him at the services of the *Openbare Onderstand (Public Support)* in Brussel, after a year and a half. He learns his first words in an orphanage, and is adopted by the family Raemaekers-Doumont in 1954. The head of the family, Armand Raemaekers, is a colonial who is staying in Belgium for a short while. The family takes little Jean-Paul with them to Belgian Congo, from where they return after the independency. It is not clear what got into the busy family to get a five year old child from Brussel. Back in Belgium, the family places their 11 year old adoptive son in a boarding school. Jean-Paul Raemaekers stays there until he gets sent away at 17 for unwanted sexual behaviour\* with younger co-students. ‘She sold me for fourtythousand franks’, fulminates the defendant, when judge Gerard mentions the name Rose Wattiez. He dislikes his biological father just the same. According to the act of accusation, it is about François Deliens, bisschop at the dissident Gallic-catholic Church in Liège. The man is wed and has five children. According to Raemaekers there have to be nine more children added on top of that, of which one himself. During the pre-investigation Rose Wattiez confirmed: Deliens is the father. When the bishop is brought forth as a witness several days later, he will deny with a lot of passion.

Bigger still than Raemaeker’s bitterness against the bishop, is the one against his adoptive parents. ‘There is the cause’, he shouts. ‘At that family I got more beatings than I got food. I am still suffering that I never have gotten a family’s warm nest. Through what happened, I have developed feelings of hate towards women. I am violent towards them.’ The chairman does not want to talk about ‘women, but about children. I do not want to pretend my problems do not exist’, pledges Raemaekers in return. ‘Above all, I am desiring the truth.’

During the pre-investigation that did not show though, the chairman replies. The movie recordings that shaped the proof for the prosecution, date from August 1992 to March 1993. For two months Raemaekers had remained stubborn not having had to do anything with the production of them. At first he claims he had bought the films and that the perpetrator is somebody who looks like him. He has his own little girls – at that time only eleven en nine years of age – that bring him down. They recognize their classmates Nancy P and Nelly D.V. on pictures from the recordings. Nancy of ten, and Nelly of eight, are half sisters from a socially underdeveloped family. Their mother had met the friendly sir Raemaekers at the gates of the shared school, who then gets helped by him in finding a rental house for her and her life companion. They become good friends. While they don’t ask for it, Nelly and Nancy are allowed at times to stay the night at house Raemaekers. And that is when it would happen. ‘I would have never even dared to think such things from Jean-Paul’, Nancy’s father says during the hearing. Nelly delivers the detectives a material item of proof: the night gown she had to wear on Raemaeker’s demand during the recording sessions. According to Nancy they spent the night a total of twenty times, according to Nelly it was a bit more than ten times. Nelly is dissociating, the detectives find. She has repressed a part of the awful memories and responds furiously when somebody tries to make her remember. At one point the version of the children is similar: Raemaekers always acted alone. From the



moment his wife left the house, he would get his camera out and ready. Would they fight him, then they were beaten mercilessly and Raemaekers threatened to take them to a place where things would be way worse. One time Nancy P got home with a black eye. She told her mother she walked into a door. Mother did not look any further.

On one of the pictures Angélique D.G. is recognized. She is nine years old when she spends the night twice at Raemaekers, at the end of 1992. Her picture comes from a recording that lasted fourteen minutes and five seconds. In the run of the week the members of the jury will see the tape. Contrary to Nancy and Nelly, Angélique has no idea of what is going to happen at the beginning of the recording. The child who started out cheerful and smiling is mad with fear and screams with all she can for her mother a few minutes in. Raemaekers penetrates her several times and obligates her to blow him. At the end of the torture he says, laughing loudly: 'Good, then tomorrow we do the second half.' The place where it happens, is easily recognized on the tape. It is Raemaeker's apartment at the Louisalaan in Brussel.

- Why did you record those scenes?
- There was a lot of money to be gotten from it. You could even trade those cassettes.
- With whom?
- It happened within a huge pedofile network that is active in Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany. I was just a small link.
- Who were the others?
- I do not wish to give out a testimony about that.

In the afternoon the first witness is the Brussel investigational judge Damien Vandermeersch. He informs the court about how he got on the trail of the video tapes almost per accident, in May 1993. Vandermeersch' colleague Jean-Claude Van Espen had issued an international detention mandate against Raemaekers because he left with the millions that got trusted to his fake firm PEFI by gullible investors. Together with his wife Régine Depeint he fled to the Netherlands. The Dutch Central Criminal Investigation (Nederlandse Centrale Recherche) manages to track him down in Rotterdam on Friday 21 May. Raemaekers is arrested in a hotel, when he is about to take over a local sexshop, as the content of his briefcase shows. The briefcase also holds 2 million frank in cash. That same day there is a home search in his apartment, at the Dorpsweg 198 A in Rotterdam. Blanco ID's that had gone missing from Belgian and Dutch city halls are confiscated. The detectives find administrative pieces that show Raemaekers had gotten to be owner of a prostitution bar in the Rotterdam red light district. A Dutch detective becomes intrigued with the immense amount of pornographic magazines and video tapes in the apartment. They have been arranged and divided with the mania of a stamp collector. The detective watches a video and has to sit down after it. The tapes show scenes in which mostly Asian, but sometimes European children are being raped by a sadist. The voice of the sadist sounds familiar to the Belgian detectives.

On 24 May 1993 Raemaekers is handed out to Belgium. Next to the PEFI investigation, the Brussel Public Prosecution Service opens a second file-Raemaekers, over which Vandermeersch is put in charge. Immediately he orders accompanying search warrants. The most relevant catch for the process happens on 10 June at a second address of Raemaekers in Rotterdam, where another 125 video tapes and four outdated rolls of film are found.

About the total amount of video tapes found at Raemaekers Vandermeersch does not say a word in his testimony. According to the by advocate general Loop put together deed of accusation only nine can be used as convincing material. It is about the limited amount of tapes on which both the victim as well as the perpetrator could be identified. 'This was a case of we were entirely conscious about only seeing the tip of the iceberg', reminds a Brussel

Guard and Detection Brigade at the Belgian gendarmerie (English translated is GDB, NL is BOB) later on. 'But even that tiny tip was of such a heavy nature it could be brought up in court. And yes, Belgium is like that. Pragmatic. Rather than have the investigation take colossal proportions, people only dig for enough proof to get a life sentence. In Rotterdam a total of four thousand tapes had been found. I remember it well, for it was one of the reasons we had to rent two trucks.

The deed of accusations describes the content of nine tapes as follows: 'The scenario was often times the same. He filmed a girl in night gown that started to undress. The man asked her to lay on a bed or on a table. She had to spread her legs and open her mouth. Following that the man would use his manhood to penetrate vaginally and orally until he ejaculated. The horror and aversion of the victims was manifest. The perpetrator did not hesitate to threaten them. He filmed the spectacle of which he was similarly director and actor. Also he would frequently pause his actions to adjust the lens of the camera, or to change the area of view.

There is something bizarre about the relationship between Jean-Paul Raemaekers and his wife, Régine Depeint. Being the delegated director of PEFI the international detention mandate was for her as well as it was for him. And though during the process it turned out fast enough that she – like Raemaekers' two previous spouses – had plenty of suffering under his bursts of anger, she did not know a thing about the paedophilic shadow side, according to Vandermeersch. 'The defendant was furious when he found out we had her watch the tapes. However, it was needed to get the investigation to move forward.' The hearings of Raemaekers went quite sturdy at first, he continues. 'He refused to confess anything. He was behaving aggressive and rebellious.'

It lasts until 16 September 1993 before Raemaekers wants to tell his interrogators something about the cassettes. What they have confiscated, he then says, is but a small part of his collection. Together with his confessions there are hints at paedophile networks, highly placed customers, and a far-reaching relativizing of his own role in that enigmatic whole.

- But did you find no traces of accomplices?
- On the tapes we could watch only he is visible. The images only show him handling the camera.
- There were no other adults involved?
- No. The defendant claimed during hearings that they were present during other events. He explained he was in a difficult situation because he had to name a politician and a higher army officer (*this part is interesting, because Dutch has two words that both say because, however the word that is out of place in this context has been used for the book*). He told us that he joined these gentlemen at sex parties at an address on the Franklin Rooseveltlaan in Brussel. According to him there were a magister, a lawyer, and several members of the diplomatic corp present as well.

On his bench Jean-Paul Raemaekers is shuffling to and fro uneasily. By the looks of it, he is terribly affected by what is being said about him, but his grimacing makes unclear whether or not he is pulling faces in reaction to the accusations, or not quite. From what they have gathered about the defendant up until now, the jury members can only keep in mind that they will have to judge a hideous being by the end of the week. His chatting about highly placed people seems perfectly fit in the image of the failure that tries crampedly to find accountability.

'For the detectives this has been a terrible experience', Vandermeersch continues. 'So to speak, we had become eyewitness to a gruesome, sickening crime. Now again the camera

was aimed at the position of the child compared to her rapist, and then again there was a close-up on the face of the tiny victim. Regularly we could hear that the children were beaten to force them into the act of sex. On one of the tapes we heard him say that she had to stop crying. He was threatening to restart the entire scene all over, were it appear the quality of screenplay was not good enough.'

The scene in question, Vandermeersch explains, lasts an exact twenty minutes and seven seconds. Nancy P has to suck off Raemaekers and swallow his sperm. Before it comes to this, he is lashing out to her again. 'It is her fault, he says, that the camera had not been positioned properly and that everything had to be redone the next day. On the tape we can hear the girl say "merci" when she is being told it has been good enough for today. The children have been marked for life. During the pre-investigation I met the mother of one of the three girls. She said that she had lost her child forever. I tried to speak to one of the girls, but to no avail. It is by the way quite remarkable that these children have never spoken about the nightmare they have experienced.'

On the second day of the process the experts take their places on the witness benches. In a report of 6 March 1994 Brussels psychiatrists Crochelet and Delattre had shown their pessimism regarding the chances for 'healing' of Jean-Paul Raemaekers. 'The only thing that can move him to be treated, is the fear for penal sanctioning', Delattre mentions. Both psychiatrists regard Raemaekers responsible for his deeds. Raemaekers himself brought them to this conclusion with his broad pleas for detention. He knows the only way out is to resume his previous life within a term of several years – which seems to be his intention. 'Still he is no ordinary paedophile', Delattre presses on. 'With him the sexual perversion is just one facet of a psychopathic behaviour that can take on different forms. His behaviour is defined by an at times hysterical urge to get into the role of somebody else, preferably an important person. He does this with such a conviction that he will believe his own lies. His whole life has been centered around an internal desire of that different me, of respect.' In their report the psychiatrists assign him some other interesting characteristics: theatricality, mythomania, megalomania, paranoia, hysteria, narcissism, extreme impulsivity, void of all forms of fear. In the report of Crochelet/Delattre there is *one* sentence that, were it noticed, could have saved the Belgian state tens of millions in Jumelet. The sentence comes from a passage in which the doctors make a prediction on how Jean-Paul Raemaekers will evolve during a longterm imprisonment. There are two possibilities, they put it. Either he will be entirely devastated mentally, or he will 'create a role for himself that will make him seem better fitted to the actual circumstances of that moment.'

The third psy that is speaking up, is the Brussel doctor Berger. He is the man who was supposed to guide Raemaekers after his earlier conditional release in 1991. 'But at the time nobody had shared with me I was dealing with a paedophile', Berger is witnessing. 'And now we know that during therapy he had already started the events which cause him to be put to trial now.' Contrary to his two colleagues Berger does believe in the healing strength of detention. According to him the process on itself is an important part of the therapy Raemaekers will have to follow. 'For a mythomaniac like himself there is no heavier punishment thinkable than the ultimate confrontation with himself. That is what is happening here.'

On the third day of the process the three ex-wives are testifying. One after another they deliver the image of a True Love who starts out undeniably charming, but who changes after several months into an obsessive indoors tyrant. 'He has beaten his own children often and hard, but he has never raped them', is almost the only positive thing Régine Depeint can add to the image. For a short while the process is becoming amusing, when it turns out that

Raemaekers introduced himself to one person as Alexandre de Saligny, and to another as Alexandre Hartway La Tour. With a third marriage he added his wife's name to his. It became Alexandre Jean-Paul Raemaekers de Peint. There is one constant: Jean-Paul Raemaekers prefers to be called Alexandre.

The moral consultants are being brought forth to speak. They visited Raemaekers in prison. 'He told me he is but a small cog in a much bigger network', one of them declares. 'He says he has delivered little girls to sex parties that were attended by mighty and important people. No, he has never mentioned names. What I do remember clearly, is that he said one day: if I talk, this land will explode.'

Miss Françoise de Saligny follows the run of the assize processes in *Le Soir* on a daily basis. She is a cultural attaché at the Finnish embassy in Brussel and enjoys a certain fame with her essays about the arts in Paris. Françoise de Saligny is not a bit proud of her heritage. Her father had once mapped out the entire family tree of the Saligny's and came to the tragic conclusion that she, Françoise, is the last heir of the family. In the summer of 1987 Françoise de Saligny got a print of a French paper shoved in her face. A colleague asked her if perhaps this was family of hers. She read with surprise: 'Alexandre de Saligny is a writer. He mentions he enjoys a lot of fame in France. But fate made it so that he was born in Brussel and still has a lot of love for Belgium. After having conquered Paris, he wants to break through in his own land. In occasion of his twentysecond book he wants to announce himself to the Belgian public. Due to this he gave a press conference in the Pershuis at Namen (*House of Press at Namen*)'.<sup>5</sup>

Miss de Saligny manages to get a copy of the book mentioned, *Les anges se parlent*. She runs into an amount of silly rhymes about 'the things of life'. There is a loose note with the book. There is written: 'Woul' you like to publish a book?' I help you. Woul' you like to write a book? I write it for you.' Signed: Alexandre de Saligny. Miss de Saligny starts to read. After two pages her finger rests on the first error in writing and she calls her lawyer Alain Berenboom. A few days later he calls her: 'It is worse than you could have imagined.'

The accompanying Alexandre de Saligny had run into justice several times.' He starts stealing money since his first job at an insurance company. On 8 May 1979 he is sentenced to four years in prison. In 1980 he is sentenced three times. The correctional court of Bruges gives him a lifelong sentence of no driving due to a deadly traffic accident. In Brussel there are sentences due to an effort of extortion (four months of jailtime) and swindling (two months of jailtime). During his first penitentiary leave, in 1981, Raemaekers leaves for France. Five years later he has to flee from whence he came.'

At the end of the talk with his client, lawyer Berenboom has to mention just one more sentence: on 5 June 1987, again due to swindling, by the correctional court of Namen. It is unclear how Raemaekers manages it, but he is walking around freely, even giving press conferences. It turns out his false name does not serve to hide himself for justice. At the back of the booklets he publishes, is his own picture, and a biography –with fictional literary awards- his own birth date and the name of his mother.

Jean-Paul Raemaekers moves into a mansion on the Paul Dejaerlaan in Sint-Gillis in 1987. It is a neighbourhood of fancy, nineteen-century houses with quite the amount of recently divorced fourty-somethings with the intention to make something good out of life after all. Raemaekers introduces himself into this environment as a writer, impresario, philosopher, and master chess player. At times he hints about his noble heritage towards friends, but the thing that most will remember is his passionate conviction that he is the son of the bishop of Liège. Alexandre, as he lets others call him, can certainly play chess like no

other, his friends remember. 'He was the kind of player who enjoyed immensely to play against five to ten opponents at the same time on evening markets.'

His publishers house is at the Lombardijestraat 4, Sint-Gillis. The small company, Editions Impériales d'Occident, is started on 1 march 1987. Most of the booklets that are laying in the window, mention Alexandre de Saligny as the writer. There are no 401, as the writer-publisher mentions on the back, but still more than ten. One of them contains the libretto of a never played opera, *La Belle de Budapest*, another is the biography of the Italian-Belgian charmesinger Rocco Di Quinto, who at the beginning of the eighties enjoyed being a star for a brief period in the Walloon area. Rocco Di Quinto, the reader can discover, sleeps with the underaged girl singers of his small choir. One of them he impregnates. 'The new law on child labor threatens to screw up the quite promising career of Rocco Di Quinto et les Rockets', Alexandre de Saligny writes.'

As Françoise de Saligny keeps on digging, the case is becoming only more mysterious. The man who stole her name, owns three brandnew cars: one Jaguar and two Porsches. In the cafés of Sint-Gillis he waves around with big piles of banknotes. He travels without end 'for business'. In his but rarely opened small store there is not ever a customer to be seen.

On 13 October 1988 the Paul Dejaerlaan is hit by a raid by the moral brigade of the Brussel court police (GPP). One door is mashed in. A megaphone is used to take hold of the suspect, who has hidden himself inside a clothes drawer on the top floor. The action has had an observation round a week in advance. Raemaekers, who got a tip about the event, has fled to the Netherlands and thinks wrongly all dangers are gone a week after. Miss Françoise de Saligny reads about it in the papers. Raemaekers is being accused of having raped Isabelle L., an eleven year old girl, multiple times. On August 1988 he has ensured her parents that she is blessed with 'a golden voice' and should make a recording urgently. This would certainly be best to happen in Manilla, where recording studios are 'cheap'. He manages to get the parents crazy enough to invest 205.000 frank into the project. From Manilla he lets the father pay another 250.000 frank per postal exchange. Because small Isabelle leaves such an impression on the local recording chiefs that there is already talk of vinyl recordings. For forty-one days Isabelle is on the Philippines in the company of her 'impresario'. Who does certainly bring her to a studio, but not the recording studio she expects. In the hotelroom a video camera has been made ready.

During the investigation it turns out that prior to his arrest, the suspect had been busy with administrative formalities for a fund called SOS Enfants en Détresse (SOS Children in Need). He was planning to close his bookstore and open up a house to take in problem children in place. In 1986, as proves later, he has been the official caretaker of a thirteen year old girl for a whole year. She was no longer welcomed by her mother, who was a marginal woman from Charleroi. Sylviane B., who lived in with Raemaekers, speaks up about having been raped and abused multiple times. Nobody wants to believe Sylviane B., not even her mother – not even when the name of the of paedophilia accused Raemaekers is being mentioned all over the press. Because of the mother, who gave one declaration – 'she makes it up' – the testimony of Sylviane B. is without any conclusion. This is up until today so.

On 7 June 1989 Raemaekers is sentenced due to carrying a false name. Because of a complaint from Françoise de Saligny he is not ever again allowed his beloved pseudonym. Not even three weeks after he gets another sentence. For what he did to Isabelle L, he gets a prison sentence of five years, from the court in Brussel. Two of this with suspension. During this process Raemaekers is denying the light of the sun. In contrast to what the child is claiming, he has never penetrated her and he has never forced her to suck him off, he makes it to be. Four years later, during the searching in Rotterdam, the detectives find a recording on

which can be seen Isabelle L. spoke the truth. It also turns out there has been another child abused in front of the camera. It is a Philippine girl nobody could be bothered to identify.

Just as disgusting as Jean-Paul Raemaekers leaves the Brussel stage in 1989, as glorious he returns two years later. After having sat out a third of his punishment, he is released 14 October 1991 and rents an office building on the Louisalaan in Brussel. On number 163, close to the head office of the Commission for Bank- and Financials (*Commissie voor het Bank- en Financiewezen*), he posters with short term interests until 22 percent and more. Raemaekers is an investor, this time. 'Number one in international investments', it is voiced in an advert in the Golden Pages (*Gouden Gids – phone book*). On 3 March 1992, only a year and a half after the true start of his investors office, he establishes his partnership Placements Experts Finance Internationale (PEFI), at the court of Trade in Brussel. Raemaekers makes his wife a delegated manager and names himself 'PDG' (President Director General)<sup>13</sup>. Nobody knows how it happened, but Raemaekers is richer than ever. In the summer of 1992 he makes short trips to Paraguay and Nigeria. 'In Paraguay I established a bank, it goes quite easy there', he will exclaim later on.'

A few weeks before Raemaekers' leave for Paraguay, reporter Guy Legrand enters the building of PEFI. Legrand works for the weekly paper *Trends*, handles the investors department, is bored with the upcoming gooseberry season, and feels like having a laugh. The reality overwhelms his craziest fantasies. 'It is peculiar how a house of such weight has remained unknown for such a long time', he notes a week later in *Trends*.<sup>\*15</sup> For an hour Raemaekers kept bringing up Luxembourg interest rates that were 10 percent at first, and fifteen minutes later already 13,5 percent. What Guy Legrand remembers mostly, is the conversation that started when he noticed a world map with small paper flags pricked all over.

- And what is that?
- That is to give you an impression of the countries where we are active.
- That is quite impressive for such a young partnership.
- Oh, but we are expanding. Do you see the office building next door?
- That beautiful new building?
- Yes, well, we are renting 250 square meter there from September.

At the end of the meeting, Legrand remembers still, Raemaekers was already speaking about 'ten floors', pretending to trade stock packages of many hundreds of millions on a daily basis, and was mentioning 65 banks from just as many countries with which he negotiated on a daily basis.... 'I was checking some of the banks he mentioned. As I could have expected, they turned out not to exist.'<sup>16</sup>

One thing did make Legrand look twice, however. Jean-Paul Raemaekers proves, as he claims, to be indeed part of Mensa, the association of self-proclaimed super intellectuals. To prove such he placed a huge advert in the stock magazine *Echo de la Bourse*, on 11 June 1992. In this paper he brings report of a lecture he gave a few days prior at a meeting of Mensa in the area of Charleroi.

It is not allowed to use membership for commercial purposes, but Mensa did not get the time to reprimand Raemaekers. On 2 June 1992 the investigational judge Van Espen accuses him due to 'the not allowed using of the communal savings, faulty in writing, and use thereof'. It is the Commission for Bank- and Financials (*Commissie voor het Bank- en Financiewezen*), that had contacted the Brussel Public Prosecution Service in February 1992, well before PEFI was established. PEFI has no permit for international investor. What Raemaekers should offer, is a mandate of an acknowledged foreign bank. 'Oh, I will get that in a bit',

Raemaekers answers the people of the commission, when they have him answer to them. A bit later he is present, with the requested attest – it is from the international Swan Bank from Paraguay. Before the Commission for Bank- and Financials finds out that this bank is non-existent, somebody noted that the attest was forged at the copycenter around the corner.

On 22 January 1993 the Brussel court of trade gives the firm a restriction of trade. The procedure does not matter at all, because PEFI has dissolved on 30 August 1992. After that Raemaekers is trading money for a while longer with firmnames like International Swan Bank, or Universal Brokers Company Exco. One of his latest clients is the French singer Chantal Goya. Raemaekers ‘lends’ her 200 million frank and sharp lawyers can only just intervent to stop Raemaekers putting down a false autograph and stealing part of the security deposit. 200 million frank is about the size of the well PEFI created.

*It has about gone like this, even though nobody ever had been able to explain how Raemaekers, barely escaped from prison, could rent a building on the Louisalaan. ‘I was trading paedophilic cassettes,’ Raemaekers shares open heartedly during one of many phone calls we had with him in the spring of 1997, when he was in the prison of Namen. ‘Such a network, there is a lot of money involved. And what money, would you think, was invested through PEFI? Those were the rewards of a trade in childporn.’*

On 30 June 1994 the Brussel correctional court sentences Raemaekers to six years of an effective prison sentence due to swindling, treacherous bankruptcy, and abuse of trust. He goes *higher up*, but ends up with a *heavier* sentence.

The court gives him seven years effective on 5 January 1995. During those days Raemaekers is in a prison cell in fearful wait of a different process, the one of the Brussel assize court.

Just before the jury leaves for the discussion on Friday 27 January 1995, the defendant gets the last word. He has understood that things are not looking too good, and falls into a very long monologue. He is talking extremely fast again, leaving his words hang a bit at times. Jean-Paul Raemaekers is asking for forgiveness. Of the children, of their family, of all the people I have gotten into a bad place... I will not be mournful about the punishment I deserve. My apology is meant. I only hope that people will treat me during my punishment. When I see children, the arousal is stronger than I myself am. I, the harasser, the swindler, I want to repent. But more than that. I will put the machine to work. I am the black sheep that is going to prison now, while the big shots are staying out of your crosshairs.’ There is a confusion rising in the courtroom. The defendant takes a sheet of paper, starts waving with it, and is about to read up a whole list of names. Chairman Karin Gerard is reaching for the hammer.

- Mister Raemaekers, what you are doing cannot be allowed!
- But I can proof it, miss chairman.
- I want to take note of your sudden request to mention the names of accomplices, but I can not allow this to happen during a public hearing.
- Very well, I will share the names later with qualified enterprises. And then I would like to end with the confession that I have an amount of video tapes to prove my right. On top of that I left a hundred and fifty pages counting confession with a notary. That one will be handed over to the court were anything to happen to me.’

The paper is handed over to the Brussel Public Prosecution Service, and will serve later on as a base for some informative investigations that will be opened in 1995 by the Brussel Public Prosecution Service. With shaking hands Raemaekers wrote down 5 names. The first is of a Belgian magister, the four others are creditors from the file-PEFI.<sup>19</sup>

Three hours after this incident the jury returns. On all questions asked the answer is yes. Guilty all over. Judge Karin Gerard sentences Jean-Paul Raemaekers to a life of forced work.

## NOTES

1. *Telex press agency Belga, 23 January 1995*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
2. *Reconstruction on basis of newspaper articles and conversations with people present*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
3. *File 5192 of investigational judge Van Espen.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
4. *Act of accusal for the Public Prosecution Service general (parket-generaal in NL) of Brussel, Raymond Loop, 2 December 1994*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
5. *Vers l'Avenir, 25 July 1987*
  - Page 12 in translation, 14 in Dutch pdf
6. *The first contact with justice is experienced by a nineteen year old Raemaekers in the beginning of the seventies when he steals bikes and harasses minor-aged girls.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
7. *Due to fraudulent bankruptcy, abuse of trust and handing out false cheques.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
8. *The correctional court of Paris sentences him to 3 years imprisonment due to swindling, on 20 March 1991.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
9. *Le Rêve de Di Quinto Rocco, Alexandre de Saligny, Editions Impériales d'Occident, page 90-93*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
10. *La Dernière Heure, 15 October 1988.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
11. *On penalty of 50.000 frank.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
12. *During the correctional process of 29 June 1989, Raemaekers is convicted in one effort due to striking and wounding a secretary who worked for him.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
13. *His prior convictions do not allow Raemaekers to be take on a managing role.*
  - Page 14 in translation, 17 in Dutch pdf
14. *Contact by telephone with Jean-Paul Raemaekers, 28 June 1997*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
15. *'Trends', 2 July 1992*
  - Page 14 in translation, 17 in Dutch pdf
16. *Conversation with Guy Legrand, January 1997*
  - Page 14 in translation, 18 in Dutch pdf
17. *Contact by phone with Jean-Paul Raemaekers, 23 June 1997*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
18. *Reconstruction based on newspaper articles and conversations with people present.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
19. *The document is delivered for further investigation to the Brussel Public Prosecution Service. BOB Brussel, 27 Maart 1995, pv 104.017.*
  - Page 15 in translation, 19 in Dutch pdf



## 2 *'I came to realize he had contact with non-identified people who left no trace of their visits.'*

Previous lawyer Jean-Paul Raemaekers, 28 October 1996

As always they are present. The hagglers, the greedy, the antique traders, the gossipers from around the corner, and the customers of the flea market. It is Thursday 7 December 1995, late in the afternoon. In the hanger in the Onafhankelijkheidsstraat at the Brussel Molenbeek the auction master goes very steadily through the tickets 182 to 308. He wants to go home. Bailiff Michel Leroy and his assistant François Daniël want the same. The public bids in waves. Ticket 203, entailing two tv's is being sold for no more than a thousand frank. A Durst-enlarger, normally worth a lot of money, is sold for only 300 frank. Ticket 232, the Corona-sewing machine, hit but not sold. For ticket 216, a box with twenty cd's in, people bid back and forth with passion. Amount: 6.000 frank. For ticket 243, composed of 27 video tapes, bidding goes up to 1.600 frank. Ticket 255, good for 322 original video tapes, swaps owner for the exceptional high amount of 20.000 frank. And 430 home made recorded tapes, made by the previous owner (and 60 empty VHS-boxes), reaches the pleasant amount of 8.000 frank just the same. 'You cannot say what will happen', a connoisseur claims. 'The presence of two obsessed collectors can be enough to make several worthless pieces suddenly highly expensive.'

Maybe that is the simple explanation to why the video recordings of Jean-Paul Raemaekers get such high prizes during the public auction of the remaining wares of partnership PEFI on that day. Not small the surprise of the Public Prosecution Service of Neufchâteau when the press reports this public sale at the end of 1997. Up until then nobody had noticed that this was the improbable fate of the property of one of the few wholesalers of childporn ever trapped by Belgian law enforcement.

For a while now the detectives know part of Raemaekers video collection had gotten lost during the court investigation, but they have no idea as to how. On 17 February 1997 the curator of PEFI, Brussel lawyer Tom Gutt, sends a letter to the Brussel Public Prosecution Service. He had gained from messages in the press about digging operations in an old stonecoal mine in Jumet, directed by Jean-Paul Raemaekers, that Neufchâteau is interested in his past. In his letter, Gutt expresses surprise about the fact nobody has reached out to him yet. He explains how shortly after Raemaekers arrestation a load of video tapes was delivered in front of his door. 'A total of twothousand cassettes', Gutt writes. 'These tapes have never been viewed by the court. They have been selected at the time, based on the labels Jean-Paul Raemaekers had stuck on them.'<sup>3</sup>

The reasoning is solid. In Rotterdam a small fourthousand tapes had been retrieved. In the investigation which led the owner to the assize court, only a two-thousand had been viewed by the BOB (Guard and detection brigade). The two-thousand remaining tapes, of which cannot be excluded that between the many kilometres of regular tv-recordings and innocent movies is childporn as well, are laying stacked in a hangar of court expert André Fourneau in Anderlecht. He wants to get rid of them soon as possible, due to lack of space, and he pressed Gutt to get the entire mess burned.

When detectives of the Brussel Guard and detection brigade come to retrieve the tapes in Anderlecht on 12 March 1997, they do not find twothousand, but 797 video tapes.' For a long time they are happy with the assumption that the curator has probably made a mistake and that his report on 'twothousand cassettes' was simply too rough an estimation. Now it appears that in Molenbeek, on 7 December 1995, a total of 779 cassettes have been auctioned off. Who counts this amount to 797, gets close of the two-thousand mentioned in Gutts letter. This concludes: the Brussel Public Prosecution Service has let at least half of the loot go to waste in a stupid fashion. Investigative judge Van Espen, who led the investigation of PEFI, keeps holding on to having shared the total amount of the collection to all those who had to know it. His colleague Damien Vandermeersch claims that he has never known of twothousand uninvestigated video tapes.

There is no suspicious scene found on the 797 remaining tapes. But there is no reason to believe that the 779 auctioned specimen were any more suspicious. During the official report of the auction there were 322 'original video cassettes'. Those have been bought movies. It is known the paedophiles have the habit to disguise their beloved scenes by putting them in the middle of innocent movies by montage – preferably a Walt Disney. The most disgusting scenes are usually exactly on the tapes of which the wrapping would have one expect it the least.

It is clear that Jean-Paul Raemaekers is worrying immensely about his video collection. A month after having been arrested in Rotterdam, he aims a handwritten plea to curator Tom Gutt:

'I afford to request you the returning of certain wares before they are being sold and have been kept by your care with mister Fourneau. To know: the clothes of my three children (11 year, 9 year and 10 months), the clothes of my wife, my own clothes, personal items of our three children, the video cassettes which we recorded from the television, everything that cannot be sold.'

Raemaekers is clearly convinced in that period that blunt denial and bluffing is the best strategy. He lives in the hope, it turns out later, that dark forces within the Belgian court system will come to his aid. Contrary to clothes, school notebooks and teddybears, he does not get his cassettes returned. Which does not mean either that the Brussel court will exploit this material fully. 'They knew perfectly well who I was and who I, were I to want it, could discredit', Raemaekers tells later. 'After my arrest they sent me signals. They would have me put in detention. That way I would be a free man after a year or so. I cannot explain why it

went wrong and they gave me life after all. All evidence towards the people for whom I worked, found in 1993, have been pushed away during the investigation already.'

How credible is Raemaekers? A Brussel Guard and Detection brigadier (GDB) who interrogated him multiple times, still does not know after all those times. 'Sometimes I am thinking: this is no use, he is a madman, we are losing our time. Otherwise you cannot deny that he had been in the middle of a criminal environment of which we knew little to nothing for years. It was him who explained to us that paedophiles mostly trade by exchange of their wares. That is, in denial to all wild stories, the thesis we keep until proven otherwise: he started raping children in front of a camera because he had no material to exchange. Now, no matter how you turn or twist it, Raemaekers certainly must be a source of useful information.'

Already in the first days of the assize process, Raemaekers manages to wake interest of the Brussel Guard and Detection Brigade. And not just because of the threat that he will 'put the machies to use'. After his process Raemaekers tries to get cynical detectives on those grounds convinced that Nancy P and Nelly D.V, like most other little victims, were 'rented out' by their mother for scraps. According to Raemaekers their mother knew perfectly well of what happened. That he kept her out of reach during the investigation, Raemaekers claims, 'was part of the deal.'

On 1 February 1995, not even a week after the process, GDB Boon makes a flabbergasting discovery. Raemaekers account in the prison of Vorst got several anonymous deposits. Were there to be a name mentioned, it is 'Madrid' or 'Leclercq'. At first Boon can only retrace the post office from which the money, mostly amounts of thousand or twothousand frank, has been deposited from the counter. The post office is located in the Dokter dejaselaan 22 in Schaarbeek. Neither in that street, nor in the surrounding area, is a resident by the name Madrid or Leclercq. In the Dokter Dejaselaan, however, lives the mother of Nancy and Nelly. After searching for a long time to identify the anonymous gifter, Boon can identify the writing based on two post mandates. It is the mother.'

People can assume that professional intriguer Raemaekers loaned her money at the time, and that she is repaying in small amounts. It is a possibility, but for everybody who got even a few seconds view of the torture Nancy and Nelly had to go through, it is entirely impossible that any mother would hand the perpetrator even half a frank – and even less so if that person is in jail. The two little girls are no longer living with their mother anymore in 1995.

When Raemaekers is interrogated by the GDB on 20 February 1995, he explains to that that he took in a total of about 400.000 frank as hush money, coming from anonymous paedophiles or from parents who would rent him their children. Concerning the mother of Nancy and Nelly, he declares without further ado that she would 'lend out' her daughters on set times to grown men for a rate of 10.000 frank for an hour or two. He also called names of these 'customers.' During the same interrogation, the first since his sentence, Raemaekers talks about sex parties with minors at various locations in Brussel, gives first names of what seem to be other small cogs of an immense, well-oiled machine. He mentions amongst others the address of a recording studio on the Molièrelaan in Ukkel, where paedophiles could order video tapes to be recorded. He also claims he had visited there with Isabelle L.' Only a bit short of two years, it proves Raemaekers was hinting here at a recording studio of which the business men in the mid eighties had ties with a different firm that had during these times, immediately after his coming to Belgium, nobody less but Bernard Weinstein.

In the beginning of 1995 the people of GDB do not know yet who Bernard Weinstein is. And even would the Frenchman have been able to draw their attention, coincidence would have been a well-fitting explanation. The post-Raemaekers investigations are shrouded by a

cloud of uncertainty. The detectives can not pin this moron down. Now he is combative and speaks from regret, with revenge his only motive to speak. And then he looks down on his interrogators, plays with shining eyes at aid of important people who can end this investigation in the blink of an eye.

When two Brussel GDB aim to have a second interrogation in the prison of Vorst, on 15 March 1995, Raemaekers refuses to leave his cell. The only thing they hear of him is that he is 'under heavy pressure.' He is even more nervous than usual and says his lawyers have forbidden him from answering the gendarmerie any more.

The total amount of people who came looking for Raemaekers in prison since 1 February 1995, is without question impressive. He had gotten visitors twentysix times. Not bad for a recently convicted to lifelong forced labour paedophile. Outstanding is the high number lawyers from direct entourage of his previous advisor Jean-Paul Dumont, that visits him in the prison of Vorst: Marc Depaus, Patrick Gueuning and Sylvie Théron. Even Dumont himself and lawyer Jean-Marie Flagothier come to visit Raemaekers in that period.' He is also visited by the Brussel judge of trade, Raymond De Smedt. He is a volunteer at SAJ Autrement, an organisation that reaches out to convicts. To him Raemaekers hands over a long and emotional letter in which he mentions no longer wanting to be interrogated by GDB, but only by judicial police. In that letter, which ends up at Brussel procurer Benoit Dejemeppe on 22 March 1995, he promises to deliver hard proof about a paedophilic judge, an important laundering action, a murder, a secret terrorist group, and some loose information about the Agusta-affaire, a paedophile network and the pink ballets. Whether or not Dejemeppe was impressed by this, is unclear. What is certain is that he does not agree to Raemaekers request. The investigation remains in hands of GDB, which will now mostly be interested as to why Raemaekers suddenly has preference for Brussel JP.

According to registers of prison Vorst no Judicial Police came looking for Raemaekers between 20 February and 15 March. 'Still there have been two decectives of the judicial police', Raemaekers shares a year and a half later, when contact with the GDB are optimal again. 'They had been sent by the Brussel commissioner Georges Marnette. He is a good friend of Jean-Paul Dumont. It was Dumont who forbade every and all contact with the gendarmerie. I was supposed to only share my information with the JP, but only after it had been filtered and checked by Dumont.'<sup>12</sup>

If everything had gone according to plan, Jean-Paul Dumont might have been minister today, chairman of the PSC or certainly something of that type. In the seventies he was one of the most well-known *golden boys* of the PSC. For years he was chairman of the PSC-youth department. He became part of Cepic, the ultra right studygroup of PSC, established and led by ex-prime minister Paul Vanden Boeynants. Several prominent Cepic members – led by former prime minister Paul Vanden Boeynants and baron Benoit de Bonvoisin – as well as Cepic itself would become involved with an amount of dubious affairs, up until the financing of the extreme-right Front de la Jeunesse. Being a lawyer full of promises Dumont would later on defend members of this terrorgroup, of who an amount got sentenced because of setting fire to the left weekly printed paper Pour, in 1981.<sup>13</sup> They were the first names in a folder of names that, looking back, could easily serve as a register of keywords for twenty years of organized crime in Belgium. Supposed members of the Bende van Nijvel (*the Gang of Nijvel*) (Adriano Vittorio), exgendarme Madani Bouhouche, Eric Lammers (of the neonazi Westland New Post), members of the gang around Patrick Haemers (Axel Zeyen), Michel Nihoul, assigned Brussel JP- commissioner Frans Reyniers, subcontractors-godfather Carmelo Bongiorno... Is is probably an incomplete list, but at the same time it offers an insight of the spheres of influence in which Jean-Paul Dumont resides. At the end of the eighties Dumont becomes the informal head of a small circle of lawyers that manifests

around the same clients and files for years. For example, baron de Bonvoisin, who is wrapped in uncountable affairs. During that time, Dumont shares his office with lawyer Didier De Quévy, Marc Dutroux' lawyer in 1989. He works together closely with Martial Lancaster, Philippe Deleuze who has disappeared off stage by now already, is close friends with Michel Nihoul, and Julien Pierre, the current lawyer of Dutroux.

Jean-Paul Dumont's fall is just as spectacular as his rise to the top. In Juli '95 he is suspended at the counter for nine months for sexual harassment and because he called in sick at a big assize process in Liège but took part in a tv-debate the same afternoon. In that same period Brussel substitute Jean-François Godbille receives a bill for visitation cards he never ordered. Investigation proves Dumont had these cards printed. Rumor has it he wanted to spread them in Brussel brothels. Substitute Godbille is during that time in charge of investigations against Carmelo Bongiorno and Benoit de Bonvoisin. The Brussel PSC, for which Dumont is currently only city counsellor in Ukkel, prefers him gone rather than to stay. *(during time of translation to English, the guy has been dead for a while now – he died in 2009, at the age of 57).*

That commissioner Georges Marnette and lawyer Jean-Paul Dumont are close friends, is no secret. How close, is less clear. In the beginning of 1997 a member of the cabinet of minister of Homeland Affairs Johan Vande Lanotte signals the Public Prosecution Service in Neufchâteau that the lawyer and the commissioner have established a company in Montréal, Canada, and that they have been seen in each other's presence several times. Brussel magistrates declare in the same period in the weekly paper *H u m o* that Dumont is a regular tipper of Marnette. The two would meet each other regularly in the restaurant Mok ma Zwet, an establishment that owes its fame in particular to the fact a member of the gang around Patrick Haemers was able to go into hiding there for a while in the eighties. A different frequently visited place of meeting is the restaurant Le Vieuw Bruxelles in the Brussel Ilot Sacré. This place is being run by a certain Michel Laval, about whom Achille Haemers, father of, says he gave him money to start a business. When asked about this by *H u m o*, Marnette says members of the Brussel JP frequently organise lunches in one of the establishments of Laval. The previous Brussel commissioner in charge Frans Reyniers and big boss Christian De Vroom came there often as well. Concerning Dumont, Marnette says they got to know each other in 1984 and 'softly on' have gotten to be friends. 'Every now and then we went out together for food. Not often, everytime together ten times at the most. We had a clear agreement: during the meal we never spoke of judicial affairs in which one of us had gotten involved.'<sup>14</sup>

It is not so exceptional that the gendarmerie and the JP try to steal cases from each other through sneaky ways. The unbelievable about the interest of Dumont and Marnette for Raemaekers, is that everything revolves around the word of a madman. Only a year and a half after the facts do the Brussel GDB get to hear what truly happened in the weeks and months after the assize process, from a very privileged witness, when they have been called to work in the investigation of Neufchâteau. On 28 October 1996 they interrogate Marc Depaus, who got word a week before the process of Jean-Paul Dumont that he, together with his co-worker Patrick Gueuning, had to take over 'this little business' or a little bit. Dumont told them he was depressed, which had also obligated him to hand out the defense of Madani Bouhouche for the Brabant assize court a few weeks earlier on. 'He thought we had more chance with two young lawyers than with one established lawyer, because amalgamates and ambiguity between client and lawyer could be avoided that way', Depaus says.

For Depaus, thirtyfive years of age then, the process of Raemaekers turned into a debacle. At the end of 1996 he no longer is a lawyer, which gives detectives the advantage

they can interrogate him without an interfering chairman. Depaus explains to them Raemaekers had already explained him during the first conversations about his intention to, were things to get sour, announce in court that he will sue ‘highly placed.’ It is unclear to him whether or not there is a connection between that plan and the dropping out of Dumont. The main pleader followed the process intensively but behind the stage, Depaus recalls still. He was constantly in reach and would work on his next strategy from his office. ‘It seemed to us that Dumont was the only person in whom Raemaekers had full trust.’

Surrounding Raemaekers’ dislike to talk for longer with GDB, the ex-lawyer can still remember approaching investigative judge Vandermeersch after the process, with the proposal: lessening of punishment in exchange for information. Vandermeersch declined the offer. According to Depaus Dumont would only then walk the JP-lines. ‘After having consulted master Dumont – of whom I asked advice – did I meet two inspectors of the JP. Afterwards I saw I had stuck my hands inside a waspnest. That is when I retreated from that demarche.’

- You used the word ‘waspnest’. Could you explain more precise what you mean?
- I used the word ‘waspnest’ because the case seemed simple at first. Raemaekers possessed a certain amount informations and wanted to negotiate about these. The first demarche was about possibility and modalities of this negotiation. After my visit to investigative judge Vandermeersch I started asking myself the question which was the support the detectives enjoyed due to their hierarchy. On the other hand it proved there was a rivalry within this police service and at the end I came to the conclusion Raemaekers had contact with non-identified people who left no single trace after their visits. All these elements had me realize I was playing a game of which I did not even know half the rules. It is in that context I decided to leave.
- Raemaekers declares the judicial police was chosen by Dumont in function of his good contact with commissioner Marnette. Can you confirm this and could you tell us something about those contacts?
- I do not know if the JP has been chosen by master Dumont due to his contacts with commissioner Marnette, but it is true that master Dumont and commissioner Marnette have known each other for a long time (...).
- During his interrogations Raemaekers told us he possessed documents, even video cassettes to support his information. Did you know about these documents?
- Yes, I know these documents exist. In case the negotiations were successful, it was supposed I were to stand in for receiving these, but at this moment I am unaware of where they are.
- You say these documents exist. Have you ever seen them yourself?
- I have never seen them.
- Has Raemaekers told you at the time where they were and where you would have to go to retrieve them?
- No.’

The few friends Raemaekers has left still today, are about the condemning documents and video tapes just as affirmative as Marc Depaus, that morning in the offices of the Brussel GDB. ‘The safe is located in a banking building in Zürich’, one of them ensures us at the beginning of 1997. A different confident is of the opinion Raemaekers has hidden his trade in Peru or in Paraguay. In a conspiring tone of voice it is called he is not as crazy as he seems and he has ensured himself of ‘a life insurance’.

Of any and all improvement of fate Raemaekers will not notice anything in 1995 and 1996. He moves to the most despised place of the land amongst convicts: the prison of

Bergen. In the filthy and overpopulated institution he catches stories about paedophiles who got bullied to death, and he is convinced he is witness of a food poisoning that heads into the annals as 'suicide'. Raemaekers swallows numbing pills as if they are candy. In Bergen he lets the events pass by them in a haze. Occasionally he calls his bosom friend, John M. Verswyver, to notify him that 'they' have 'betrayed' him, and that his revenge will be sweet – if that day is to ever come. He manages to get a replacement to the prison of Namen, falls ill, and sinks deeper and deeper into inertia.

And then the case-Dutroux starts.

## NOTES

1. *De Morgen*, 12 November 1997  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
2. *Tom Gutt shows up briefly in the affair-Dutroux. He is councillor of the Nigerian family West. The family is living in Elsene at the cult Celestian Church of Christ, the assumed center in a circuit of human traffic set up by Annie Bouty.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
3. Letter of Tom Gutt, 17 February 1997. BOB Brussel, 6 March 1997, pv's 150.635 and 150.636  
○ Page 18 in translation, 22 in Dutch pdf
4. *BOB Brussel*, 12 March 1997, pv 150.693  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
5. *The official report of the auction teaches more even about Jean-Paul Raemaekers. Between the items to be auctioned off, there was a noticeable large amount of internal documents of freemasonry. It is likely Raemaekers was not only member of Mensa, but also of a lodge.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
6. *Letter of Jean-Paul Raemaekers to master Tom Gutt, 7 July 1993.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
7. *Phone contact with Jean-Paul Raemaekers, June 1997*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
8. *Findings BOB Brussel, 1 and 2 February 1995, pv's 101.299 and 101.923*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
9. *When she is interrogated on 1 March 1995, Nancy P denies this. Both the interrogators as well as the female psychologist who is standing by her, cannot shake the impression this little girl is hiding a whole lot.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
10. *Hearing Jean-Paul Raemaekers, BOB Brussel, 20 February 1995, pv 101.925*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
11. *Findings BOB Brussel, 15 March 1995, pv 103.625.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
12. *Interrogations Jean-Paul Raemaekers, BOB Brussel, 19 October 1996, pv 115.417 and 29 October 1996, pv 116.351.*  
○ Page 20 in translation, 25 in Dutch pdf
13. 'Pour' was about to open up with revelations about the investigation in the case-Pinon, better known as the file of the Pink Ballets (Roze Balletten), in which top politicians and magistrates were suspect of partaking in sex parties with minors.  
○ Page 20 in translation, 25 in Dutch pdf  
! No mentioning of any sources at all
14. *Hilde Greens and Raf Sauviller, Humo*, 18 February 1997  
○ Page 21 in translation, 26 in Dutch pdf
15. *Interrogation Marc Depaus, BOB Brussel, 28 October 1996, pv 116.342*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf

### 3 *'On these tapes, he said, are highly ranked people to be seen'* Cellmate of Jean-Paul Raemaekers, 21 September 1996

- What do you think of this?
- Pfft.
  
- It does not affect you?
  
- What the people are getting worked up over... To me this is the most normal case in the world.
- Alexandre, the land is in turmoil.
  
- They're all hypocrites. You know, in Belgium there are families willing to sell their children for twohundred- or threehundredthousand frank. And you can do with it as you please. They've been offered to me more than once.

It is this conversation, Serge Loriaux tells a month later, which brought him to the realization that he had shared a small space with this creature that is perhaps not even the lesser of Marc Dutroux himself. At the beginning of August Loriaux got word from the prison management in Namen that he would be replaced to a different cell. The man he met was ecstatic due to the fact he was here, and not in Bergen. The man introduced himself as Alexandre de Saligny, bank manager.

From the way he had said it, Loriaux found they did have something in common after all. He is a nihilistic forty-something who answers 'painter of the arts' when people ask him how he stayed afloat before he came here. In the sentence of the court of Namen he is described differently, however: 'an irreparable swindler'. Serge Loriaux handled multiple golden cases after having made the discovery there is a goody two shoes with the same name as he, who on top of it, was born on that exact same day.

Loriaux and Raemaekers seem to get along very well, at first.



One of them is to be released in a year or so, but up to his ears in debt. The other will not be leaving the gates of prison before the changing of the century, but does not find money amongst his worries. In three years, so Loriaux has been told, Raemaekers has spent 600.000 frank in prison, on luxurious wares, loans to fellow prisoners, and unpleasant businesses other inmates talk a lot about, but of which nobody knows the exact details. Intriguing, the Brussel GDB discovers later, that Raemaekers did not have to spend one frank to costs for lawyers. His current lawyer is Jean-Marie Flagothier, a gentleman who had been busy in the eighties with the poujadistic middle class party RAD/UDRT. According to private detective André Rogge he was a member of the organization of Brabant Reserve Officers, also known as BROL. This organization had been caught in a scandal due to the Gladio-affair. One of the prominent members of this militaristic club is the son of old-prime minister Paun Vanden Boeynants.

About Flagothier one can say without exaggeration that he belongs to the last of the militant Belgians. The suave intellectual has his business in the shade of the Atomium and is specialized in militair law. It is unclear what brings him to be a volunteer for the quite hopeless case Raemaekers from 1995 on. During discrete conversations with journalists Flagothier mentions multiple times that it is because of him Raemaekers could be pried from the sphere of Jean-Paul Dumont. Other times gossipers will claim Dumont and Flagothier scheme together and want to play the convicted paedophile in a bizarre play of smokescreens and false accusations, that will hold the country in its grip from August 1996.

Master Jean-Marie Flagothier visits Raemaekers at least once a week in prison. His generous way of life and the multiple visitations enlarge the street credibility he enjoys with the convicts. Raemaekers is permanently on the hunt for somebody to do business with, Serge Loriaux tells the detectives. As such he appears to be looking for a murderer for hire, without specifying who might be the target. Loriaux as well, had been approached. Raemaekers asked him to make a trip outside of Europe after his realease, to retrieve an amount of documents and video tapes. The conversation was about Peru, where Raemaekers claims to own a villa, and where Loriaux – were he interested – could get to work as a house painter. Loriaux clarifies to his cellmate that there is quite the difference between a canvas and the front of a house, but that does not change anything to Raemaekers' solid decision to give his new friend one mission or another. At first, Loriaux is interested. He knows bailiffs and incasso companies will be chasing him, soon as he gets out on February 1998.<sup>2</sup>

Serge Loriaux has rented a tv and does not miss a second of the news from 16 August. Sabine and Laetitia that are escorted to a policecar while shaking. Procurer Michel Bourlet, under flashing cameras, announcing to have the immense pleasure to share the freeing of not one, but two girls. Bonfires in Kain and Bertrix. The cuffed Marc Dutroux on the stairs of the court palice in Neufchâteau. Michel Nihoul. The digging machines in Sars-la- Buisnière. The posthumous prints of Julie and Melissa. Raemaekers is watching too and cannot resist to commentate on the images. From what Raemaekers is saying, Loriaux gathers this whole affair is supposedly nothing more than a fait divers of which the scale does not even come close to what he knows and owns. 'He kept saying without end the tapes the police had shown his wife, were nothing compared to the tapes he says to possess', Loriaux declares to the GDB. 'He kept saying there were paedophilic scenes on these cassettes with important Belgian personalities. He also said that were these tapes to fall in hands of the justice, this would cause an enormous shock. Judging by his words there were even ministers involved? Continuously going by the words of his cellmate, Loriaux sees a trivial reason why Raemaekers does not want to give away the place of his treasure without conditions, and prefers to keep the event of handing it over in his own hands: ' There is also material in there of such nature it could give him a second sentence to forced labour for life.'

Quite soon, the case-Dutroux leads to a small scale internal migration within Belgian prisons. Without giving much explanation managements separate sexual harassers and the like from other convicts. As such Loriaux is being replaced to a different cell mid September. He offers the detectives to rejoin Raemaekers voluntarily, so that he, after having won his trust anyway, can interrogate him gently. The GDB is excited about this proposal, but prison management of Namen does not want to give in.

When on Sunday 18 August 1996 a silent march of mourners puts flowers at the temporary grave of Julie and Melissa in Sars-la-Buissière, passers-by are looking at a small pamphlet in front of the window of café l'Embuscade. On the pamphlet, a photo copy of bad quality, is the face of a girl. Sylvie Carlin is her name. Nineteen years old. Disappeared in Rocourt on 15 December 1994. Sylvie Carlin? Nobody had heard of her yet. In the following days, names of children who have disappeared or found murdered in unsolved circumstances appear in newspapers in lists that grow daily. In Neufchâteau detectives are buried beneath tips. It becomes clear to investigational judge Jean-Marc Connerotte and procurer Michel Bourlet that there is a form of criminality of which the existence had barely been expected. Marc Dutroux changes the borders of the ratio. Besides the appearing of the amount of traces, magistrates in Neufchâteau are caught by a purely human, almost intuitive feeling that the derailed psyche of just one man cannot be enough to clarify this. Although (still) not proven yet, the existence of a criminal network behind Marc Dutroux and Michel Nihoul is being viewed as a certainty in those first days. Even more so when the first threats are given out. Michel Bourlet and Jean-Marc Connerotte start to live like hostages. They are permanently guarded by crews of the Special Intervention Squadron (*'Speciaal Interventie Eskadron'* or *'SIE' in Dutch*) of the gendarme. The apartment of Connerotte is a fortified fort. In the middle of this madhouse Bourlet keeps contact with the parents of murdered and missing children. Connerotte hands out search warrants daily. Half Henegouwen is being turned upside-down.

There is need for reinforcements. On Tuesday 20 August minister of justice Stefaan De Clerck promises during a work meeting in Neufchâteau a grand expanse of resources. That day, while leaving the small palace of justice, De Clerck is swarmed by press agents from Belgium and foreign countries. Quickly he visits the hit families Russo and Lejeune in Grâce-Hollogne and is oh-so happy to being able to promise something at least: never before have so many detectives worked together on one file at the same time, as they are in the case Dutroux. During the work meeting there have been made decisions about it.

Jacques Langlois, a magistrate from PSC from Aarlen, is temporarily named second investigational judge in Neufchâteau. He has to take over all files that are not tied to the case-Dutroux, so Connerotte can fully focus on the investigation of the paedophile networks. Tenfolds of policeagents have reacted on a call from Neufchâteau on Monday 19 August to join in the investigation. In several hours time an army of policemen has formed, and the spreading of tasks is a matter of improvisation. Those at the right place at the right time, get the lion share. The investigations around Marc Dutroux, Michèle Martin en Michel Lelièvre remain mostly in hands of the gendarme brigades of Neufchâteau, Marche-en-Famenne, Bastenaken and surrounding area. To get an image of the streams of money coming from Dutroux' activities, the detectives of the financial section (3KOS) of the Brussel GDB. Figuring out the exact role of Michel Nihoul becomes a mission for the national brigade of the JP, accompanied by the Brussel JP.

One of the most remarkable figures spontaneous coming to the aid of Neufchâteau, is Georges Marnette, the Brussel JP-commissioner who showed a lot of interest in Jean-Paul Raemaekers at the beginning of 1995. Around 1996 Marnette has still a mostly unspoken reputation as 'supercop'. He has a quarter of a century experience, took care of countless

small and large gangs, specialized in sexual crime cases amongst others, and leads the anti-banditcrew in 1996. In 1984 This same Marnette is present as one of the first with one of the biggest criminal mysteries of the land: the 'suicide' of WNP-leader Paul Latinus. Before this, Marnette interrogated Latinus multiple times. Halfway the nineties he takes on the role the other 'supercop' had taken on before him and of whom he had been the right hand for years: Frans Reyniers, dethroned because of too close ties with the criminal environment. Just like Reyniers in his glory years, Marnette is immensely popular with the Brussel press for the Guard and detection brigade. Always in reach, always up for a chat. For years he keeps an informal press briefing on a daily basis.

Georges Marnette is through-and-through familiar with the criminal world in the capital city. In the days after the arrest of Michel Nihoul he prides himself on having closed one of the regular addresses of Nihoul, sexclub Les Atrébates. The newspapers report no different, and for who listens to Marnette, will decide no different than that this man is the right man in the right place. However, what only a few know, is that Les Atrébates did not get closed by Marnette at all, but by the Brussel GDB. On top of that, the previous manager, Michel Forgeot, will later declare in court Marnette used to be a loyal customer of his club. Marnette's opposition in Neufchâteau is coming from the GDB from the start. They say he knows the environment of the criminal world too well. His ties with Jean-Paul Dumont could become unpleasant in this file, is mentioned. The investigation towards the extreme right Brussel PSC-environment is evolving with Michel Nihoul.

There is no week passing without Marnette leaving both friend and foe speechless in Neufchâteau. He has something very, very interesting, he tells to all willing to hear. He, first present commissioner Georges Marnette, managed to get his hands on the irrevocable evidence of material ties between Marc Dutroux and the file of Jean-Paul Raemaekers. 'This find is of the utmost importance', Marnette will clarify in an interview later on. 'This proves Dutroux is not just the chef of a small criminal gang in Charleroi, but that he clearly had ties with a different group.' The 'evidence' is composed of an enlarged image from one of the video tapes that had gotten confiscated from Raemaekers. In an official-report at attention of Connerotte, Marnette notifies on 31 August 1996: 'Our attention was drawn in particular by the picture, labeled with 'P37 letter I', on which a scene is depicted of a girl (unfamiliar to us) is vaginally penetrated by a man. (...) To get the best scientific indications, we asked operator Nowak Michel of the laboratorium of the scientific police, to compare this with a picture of Marc Dutroux, taken on 04.02.1986 by the GDB of Charleroi (picture copy in add-on) and the picture from the file referenced (...). Based on this research it seems reasonable to us, from the scientific point of view, to claim the person on this pornographic picture is surely the previously mentioned Marc Dutroux.'<sup>6</sup>

At the end of his official-report Marnette lashes out harshly to the Brussel GDB. As another add-on he adds a recent newspaper cut-out in which is described, related to the case-Dutroux, how Raemaekers claimed during his trial that he would call 'names of highly placed'. In his message Marnette notes he has no idea as to why Raemaekers did not come through.

Amongst the policemen from the financial section of the GDB from Neufchâteau, there are also troop sergeant Eric Eloir and his colleagues Luc Delmartino and Dany Lesciauskas. A year ago they had been chasing Raemaekers, until they had to discover Jean-Paul Dumont had forbidden his client to speak longer with them. It is not hard to understand that the GDB turned purple when they found out about Marnette's act. They know the file quite well and look at his official report as pure demagoguery. They find a new move of Dumont and find Bourlet and Connerotte to listen to them. Not the Brussel JP, but the GDB will have to untangle this trace further. It should be mentioned the informative files Raemaekers-bis

have never been closed.<sup>8</sup> Therefore there is no objective reason to suddenly hand Raemaekers over to Marnette.

Saturday 7 September 1996 is a day of happy rejoining of Raemaekers and the GDB. It has been already a year and a half ago that they were seated opposite each other. Raemaekers has not changed a bit, they notice. Still his flow of words makes it nearly impossible to ask him a question in a serious way, or to jot an answer down if one is even given. The GDB have already given up writing down the chaotic speech of Raemaekers literally. They are already happy if they manage to catch the essence of his workflow in a somewhat discernable fashion. Something they find harder to get used to, are Raemaekers' fluctuating moods. 'In 1994 there had been this scene during a hearing', one of the GDB mentions. 'From one moment to another his face changed color. He started hammering aggressively on the table and was screeching like a Spanish fury. Nobody understood what happened. 'Get that traitor away!', he screamed. The so-called traitor turned out to be a gendarme who was sitting in the back of the room the entire time, listening to what was going on. Raemaekers saw an unbelieving grin appear around his mouth at a certain point. On other days Raemaekers was angry because he had slept bad, or because he was of opinion the GDB had to go and arrest everybody whom he had named. The worst you could do to him, was ignore him. He could start crying like a small child. But the worst was his mania for conspiracies, his permanent state of paranoia. One morning we picked him up from prison and he refused to get out of his cell. 'They' had tried 'it', he said. He was bathing in sweat. What did they try? There was a panicked story about men who had snuck into his cell that night, and had tried to murder him. He had dreamt, that much was clear. But you were not allowed to say that out loud. He had been awake a whole week after that, because 'they' would certainly try 'it' again later on. At the end of the week he was a wreck. That is the entire problem with Raemaekers. He knows much, very much. But part of the things he talks about, is probably only real in his fantasy, or had gotten different shape due to his boundless paranoia.

It is, Raemaekers understands immediately that Saturday-morning, case-Dutroux that brought him back to the center of attention again. Against his interrogators he takes the form of good-hearted civilian, and claims to be deeply shocked because of the happenings of the past weeks. No, he is not looking to excuse his own misdeeds, but this... This is certainly something entirely different. He may have destroyed lives, but murder children? Not that. In a swearing tone Raemaekers exclaims to be working without condition with justice, this time.

Though Raemaekers is officially interrogated within the bounds of the base-case-Dutroux, the GDB learn nothing about Dutroux and his consorts that day. The GDB has the largest of doubts with the 'evidence' of Marnette. The blurry image fragment with number P37I is not unknown to them. On that a man is visible with Dutroux-hairstyle, Dutroux-mustache, and Dutroux-glasses who is raping a child, according to Marnette. However, the fragment has been analyzed years ago. Based by furniture, wallpaper, and pieces of clothing there was concluded it dates from the beginning or the middle of the seventies. Raemaekers talks with certain disdain about 'oldies'. Those are mostly 8 millimeter-movies of sex parties with children who have only after that filming been put to VHS. This material is still, mostly due to lack of better, exchanged intensively amongst less wealthy paedophiles, but has travelled an endless long road throughout the years. At the time of which the P37I was made, Marc Dutroux was a fresh twenty-something who must have looked entirely different from the man on the picture.

Raemaekers gives notion he had never met Dutroux. The P37I image rings a bell though. 'It is an old familiar from the environment', he explains. And if the GDB would take

the effort to see if there is sound on the old tape, they would notice the would be-Dutroux speaks Dutch – a language unfamiliar to Dutroux.<sup>9</sup>

On the interrogation of 7 September is Raemaekers himself who picks up the topic where he left a year and a half ago: the circuit of the partouzes (French for group sex parties or orgies) of Brussel in the eighties. He talks for hours about a sexparty with minors that supposedly took place in a white villa at Meise in 1992. He gives a description of the villa, with abundance of details about the colors of the ceiling, the carpets, the color of the canapés, etc. The white villa will later on appear many times in different testimonies. Raemaekers describes how five children, of which he estimates the age being nine up until thirteen, are being raped by ten or so men. It is about people he does not or barely know, but of who he can remember the cars – Jaguars, BMW's and Mercedeses – very well. One of those present was a famous Brussel lawyer, he says. This type of parties got organised many more times, according to Raemaekers, but what shocked him that one time 'was the fact there were no women present.' On Sunday 15 September he gives more details and draws a schematic of the villa.<sup>10</sup>

It is mostly because of this confession that investigational judge Connerotte opens file 111/96 at the end of September.<sup>11</sup> Within the gendarmerie this part of the investigation is baptized Opération Dauphin. Despite the fact people know by now that official report of Marnette is unreliable, it is taken as initial pv of file 111/96 which connects Raemaekers with Dutroux. Independent of it there are hints that connect the facts of which Raemaekers speaks, with the relational network around Michel Nihoul.

In his official report, Marnette has labeled the fragment in question with the code P37I. It suggests the JP went to registry in Brussel for further explanation. Nothing is less true, it turns out. It takes a month for the GDB to get view all available tapes. In the beginning of October they report to Connerotte: 'Due to his claims, we have received the confiscated tapes from the services of commissioner Marnette at the registry of the correctional court. We have viewed these cassettes and have not found the scene in question. Following that we have requested all files concerning the confiscated wares of Jean-Paul Raemaekers. We have clarified all cassettes in question have been destroyed (...). Allow us to point out we do not understand the goal of the claims by Marnette. It seems desirable to us to ask mister Marnette for clarification about what elements have served as base for his file of 31/08/96.'

It seems in all regards Marnette has pulled Raemaekers into the case-Dutroux with the use of a false file. 'The hidden intention was evident', a member of GDB reviews. 'Like a fat year before, in March 1995, he wanted to gain control over Raemaekers, preferably by hearing him out himself. Why we do not know. But when you see what Marnette did shortly after to Elio Di Rupo, we have a strong feeling at the very least.'

All together is is not exceptional that confiscated wares are destroyed. Even more so when they are part of a judicial investigation with all reason to a conviction and with every chance to passing it on has long since gone. In 1996, with the case of Raemaekers, there are still several judicial investigations of which the confiscated tapes can form useful evidence, theoretically. And still it happens. With just as much ease as landing on a public auction, the Raemaekers-tapes disappear into the oven.

The cellars of the Belgian palace of justice is subject to the wildest of stories. There are gigantic mountains of evidence from old judicial files stacked upon one another, of which is said only rats know their way within. For a stack of video tapes there is no more place left on 27 January 1995. That day the Brussel court decides to have them destroyed. The decision is taken with a previously unseen efficiency: the first day after the passage of Raemaekers term to appeal against the conviction of forced labor for life. The hasty decision to this action,

GDB member Eloir discovers later, is taken by lawyer-general Marchal. On 16 June 1996 the tapes have been destroyed, save three. Two tapes were not allowed to disappear on Marchal's orders, and one was forgotten about during the destruction.<sup>13</sup>

Looking back, it seems Marnette has reached the exact opposite of what he intended to do with his file of 31 August 1996. Instead of getting Raemaekers in as 'informant', he has to see powerless how the rivals of the GDB get to do this.

On 12, 13 and 15 September 1996 the papers *Le Soir* and *La Libre Belgique* make mention of Jean-Paul Raemaekers and the Public Prosecution Service of Neufchâteau holding interest in his past, without clear cause. 'It is clear the goal of these articles is not to share new information about the investigation with the public, but solely to focus the attention of 'some' on the claims of Raemaekers', it sounds later in an official report of Eric Eloir and Luc Delmartino of the GDB. Especially the articles of Gilbert Dupont of *La Dernière Heure*, in whom they expect the bossom friend of Marnette, gain their special attention. Dupont cannot hide his deep sadness and outrage when he has to report the fact Marnette left the investigational team in Neufchâteau with slamming doors, in a scoop, on 31 October 1996. In an article titled 'The investigation is no longer going smoothly' the reporter mentions 'disguised pressure' and 'sabotage' of the investigation-Nihoul.' On the same page as the praise is another peculiar article, signed by Gilbert Dupont as well. In which is made mention of a burglary, by strangers, at lawyer Jean-Paul Dumont. The world is small, it appears: 'There was fiftythousand frank taken, and a certain audio tape, seemingly chosen, since other tapes had not been taken. It was solely about a cassette on which the lawyer had recorded a conversation with a previous client, currently locked up in the prison of Namen. There is notice of a refusal of the lawyer to mediate between both at the cost of his grace. Who is this client? Nobody less but the Brussel JeanPaul Raemaekers...'

The article has not stayed out of sight of Eloir and Delmartino, members of GDB. Two manifest insincerities catch their eyes. One: it is anything but true that Dumont supposedly refused to stand by Raemaekers, the opposite is true. Two, and more intriguing: there has been no tape stolen from Dumont at all. When they got word there was a supposed break-in in the office of the lawyer, they themselves immediately contacted the police of Vorst. The officer on duty faxes them the official-report that had been put together on 29 October 1996, after the submission of the complaint, and adds to that a computer print of the service 101, which had received the complaint.' The burglary, the GDB find, took place in the night of 28 to 29 October and was confirmed in the morning. The police of Vorst, so it turns out, only got word of this happening at 16:45 in the afternoon by service 101, and was present to the scene at 17.19. One would expect lawyers to know how to react to a burglary, but the associates of Dumont strangely let a full working day pass before calling the police. Before the police arrived, the Brussel JP had been discretely at the site already.<sup>18</sup>

'In all likelihood, this was one of the latest interventions of commissioner Marnette, before his leave for vacation', the two members of the GDB put in an official report.' In that same document they say it too: 'All these elements confirm our previous statements: Raemaekers is a hindrance, and it is possible they try to intimidate him.'<sup>20</sup>

They fear Raemaekers is supposed to see the article. That no tape had ever been stolen, seems to be certain when lawyer Dumont 'formally denies' in a press meeting in the evening of 31 October the loss of anything else but the amount of 50.000 frank.

Tension is present. Without proof of the existence of a Brussel paedophile network, the incidents and the games of the police in October of 1996, strengthen the suspicion the restlessness in certain circles is great.

## NOTES

1. *In the beginning of 1997 private detective André Rogge researches the data that lead to the digging works in Jumet. It is his conviction the entire operation is set up with the help of Flagothier. Rogge says he found the name of the lawyer in the statutes of the BROOC.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
2. Raemaekers, by the way, will help Loriaux get a lawyer. It is the previously already mentioned Jean-Marie Flagothier, his own advisor. In the following months Raemaekers will add more cellmates to the clients of Flagothier.
  - Page 25 in translation, 31 in Dutch pdf! No mentioning of any sources at all
3. *Hearing of Serge Loriaux, GDB Brussel, 21 September 1996, pv 116.342*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
4. *The judicial police of Aarlen is involved in this central part of the investigation as well.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
5. *Interview with Georges Marnette in the weekly magazine Ciné Revue, January 1997.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
6. GP Brusel, 31 August 1996, pv 38.649
  - Page 27 in translation, 34 in Dutch pdf
7. *It is about an article from 'Het Nieuwsblad' (The News Papers), titled: If I speak, this land bursts.'*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
8. It is about the files with these note numbers: BR 73.66.104743/95, BR 37.66.104744/95 and BR 37.66.104748/95.
  - Page 28 in translation, 35 in Dutch pdf
9. Interrogation Jean-Paul Raemaekers, GDB Brussel, 7 September 1996, pv 113.243
  - Page 29 in translation, 36 in Dutch pdf
10. Interrogation Jean-Paul Raemaekers, GDB Brussel, 15 September 1996, pv 113.454
  - Page 29 in translation, 36 in Dutch pdf
11. Connerotte has at that moment, besides the 'base file' concerning the abduction and murder on children by Marc Dutroux and consorts (86/96), already four side-files opened: car swindlery (87/96), disappearance Loubna Benaïssa (108/96), testimonies X1, X2, X3 and X4 (96/109) and testimonies Nathalie W (110/96). Later on added to it are: protection X1 (136/96) and the network surrounding businessman L.V. from Walcourt (139/96).
  - Page 29 in translation, 36 in Dutch pdf
12. *Determinations GDB Brussel, 11 October 1996, pv 115.411*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
13. *Determinations GDB Brussel, 11 October 1996, pv 115.411*
  - Page 30 in translation, 37 in Dutch pdf
14. *GDB Brussel, 28 October 1996, pv 116.342*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
15. *A year later Gilbert Dupont will mention with similar grand certainty the fact that due to the hard work of Marnette and his colleagues, Michel Nihoul is innocent like a lamb.*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf ! No mentioning of any sources at all
16. *'La Dernière Heure', 31 October 1996*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf
17. *Police Vorst, 29 October 1996, pv 4185 and telex service 101, nr B961024882*  
× Not found in Dutch pdf

18. In telex 619 of the police of Vorst is written: ‘Somebody of the lab of the JP was already present and had done the necessary.’
  - Page 30 in translation, 38 in Dutch pdf ! Telex 619 cannot be retrieved
19. *GDB Brussel, 28 October 1996 pv 116.342*
  - *Not found in Dutch pdf*
20. GDB Brussel, 31 October 1996, pv 116.351
  - Page 30 in translation, 39 in Dutch pdf



## Socks' notes:

(maybe some pagenumbers are messed up – can happen. My apologies. Anyway, here's what stood out for me, and things that I thought didn't make much sense. Hope you enjoy)

So perhaps I am looking past some facts in trying to translate it proper, perhaps I got drowned in long sentences and words used in the court system that I am not aware of. Maybe it is because I am too picky and need to complain. Who knows. Anyway, here is a list of things that stand out when reading the X-Files on Marc Dutroux.

The pagenumbers correspond to the Dutch pdf I had received that starts counting from page 2 (I take it the front was missing).

Things that stood out, and the pagenumbers in the Dutch pdf	
Page 1 and 2	Comparing the names of the 3 people who set up this book, it strikes me as odd that the names are so strangely listed on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> page. The names are broken up and it just reads weird all-together. Why would they not list from longest name to smallest name if they went for the overall graphical look?
Page 3	The mentioning of several names, of which some seem quite strange (I take it they are screen names and aliases), and of which some are double (even if you have 2 people with the same name, they know you thank them without you pointing out who is first and who is second in the list of the same names)
Page 4	Naatje van Zwaren de Zwarensstein seems really bizarre for a name. Translated it would be something like 'Naatje of Heavies the Heaviesstein'. Naatje is an old Dutch name, and was derived from Anna.
Page 4	Wow so many people with M in their name. Marnette, Marc, Michel (2x), and Michèle
Page 4	The women have a first name that phonetically starts with a K. Carine, Kristien, Christine, Katrien
Page 4	Elio Di Rupo, Hanim Ayse Mazibas and Jacques Pignolet all offer great opportunity for slurring and butchering the names. You could end up with Ellie Jo Dir Upo, Hanimay Sema zibas and Jacque Spignolet and still understand who is mentioned. Sounds kind of odd to me there are

	so many people involved in a list of names that do not fit in in the other blocks, except for the fact they allow to be butchered. Perhaps it is a coincidence their parents all thought it good to give slurrable names.
Page 4	The names for the headers! There is the fault with 4 and 6. In 4 the year of 1997 is not written fully, but in 6 it is. There is no consistency in noting 2 years and then cutting off the second year only once.
Page 4	vzw Abrasax - I take it the vzw is an abbreviation or initials, but it does not make sense this is not written in capitals, as opposed to the first letters of the first or last names of the people mentioned in the content list when their full name is not mentioned. It is another bit of inconsistency which comes off as strange, and even more so seeing that the content list would have been looked at quite often.
Page 8	The Dutch version only mentions 'zedenfeiten', making it unclear if the sexual behaviour J-P involved others in was unwanted by the other students or unwanted by the boarding school administration. And it also leaves out what kind of behaviour it was, as a 'zedendelict' (a crime involving sexual harassment) is a very broad group of different types of sexual harassment, of which all involve physical contact.
Page 9, 15, 23, 24	An unneeded enter which causes a strange separation in the sentences and creates a weird paragraph.
Page 10, 17, 28	The conversation is a bit strange.. Instead of being in a bullet list, one of the sentences is in the 'wrong row' and comes right behind instead of below the last item.
Page 14	<p>When there is the first mentioning of Berger, at the beginning of the new paragraph, he is not brought up as psychiatrist, psychic, psyllium, or psychologist. He is simply brought up as "psy", or more precise, "the third psy".</p> <p>This is an interesting part, seeing the descriptions of the other people involved, as well as the situations, have been quite broad. The writer had no problem expanding the total word count with at least a tenth more words than needed to get the information across.</p> <p>So then why write down Berger as simply "psy"? Are there two psychics missing? Do we have a</p>

	<p>psychedelic administrating team of which we have two members that have not been mentioned and Berger can pass for a therapist too? The context suggests he is the third of a kind, and with the previous mentioned duo that wrote the report, it would be logical to assume Berger too, is a psychiatrist. Then why is he the only one that is not mentioned being a psychiatrist from the start? It comes off as just a bit more odd than just lazy writing. It's interesting to note nowhere in the whole paragraph is Berger mentioned as being anything to do with psychiatry, aside from the lazy mentioning.</p>
Page 22	<p>People don't think twice about finding that there are only 797 video tapes instead of previously mentioned 2000. In such a big case, involving so many people, it is more than a bit strange that nobody bothered to count the exact amount, let alone have just the one curator come up with the estimated amount.</p>
Footnotes of chapter 1,2,3	<p>Not all footnotes added with a number appear in the text – most do not</p>
Footnotes of chapter 1,2,3	<p>The lack of researchable source when claiming a fact. If some event that is taken as evidence to state things in this book is taken as valuable, then there needs to be researchable proof, rather than having to go out and request the files at the investigators/court.</p> <p>When a footnote lacks any concrete sources that have me investigate whether or not a claim is based on truth or a half-truth, if it is truthfull at all, it is quite hard to find what is true and to be believed about the story written.</p>
Footnote 15, chapter 1	<p>The number seems to be the issue number of the previous mentioned magazine. It is not, however. In the translated file this is fixed.</p>
Footnote 13, chapter 2	<p>The number is easy to read over as it is in a line with other numbers, and only the second half of the number has been put in superscript, making it very easy to overlook.</p>
Page 31	<p>In the file which is written in Dutch, there is suddenly the words '<i>streed credibility</i>', which seems quite out of place in this Dutch book.</p> <p>This is for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language is different from the main language, and if a different language is used, it only really concerns words <i>previously unknown</i>, like names of</li> </ol>

	<p>produce, plants, and cultural things such as opera. There are two translations, of which one 'reputatie', 'geloofwaardigheid', and even the more literal 'straatwaarde.' Using the English word instead of translating it significantly lowers perceived seriousness of the book.</p> <p>2. The words are not written in italics. When different languages are implemented, even more so in official or semi-official texts, they are written in italics to let the reader know there is something up with these words.</p>
Page 32	<p>Location Sars-laBuisserie is written in several forms, starting with Sars-la-Buisserie (page 32), then going to Sars-laBuisserie (page 32) and later on being changed to simply 'Sars' (later pages, after checking if there had been more stripes left out).</p> <p>From something as trivial as a location (even though one can find the proper name with ease anyway) it is a disgrace to find it written in several different ways. Not to mention, there is also a Sars-la-Bruyère, which is my first result when I look for Sars. The two places are 31 km apart.</p> <p>The proper name is Sars-la-Buisserie</p>
Page 34	<p>When there is mentioning of the opinion of the GDB towards Marnette, captured in two sentences following each other:</p> <p>'Marnette's opposition in Neufchâteau is coming from the GDB from the start. They say he knows the environment of the criminal world too well. His ties with Jean-Paul Dumont could become unpleasant in this file, is mentioned.', translation page 27.</p> <p><i>('In Neufchâteau komt de oppositie tegen Marnette dan ook van meet af aan van de BOB. Hij kent het milieu té goed, zegt men daar. Zijn banden met Jean-Paul Dumont zouden in dit dossier vervelend kunnen worden, oppert men.')</i></p> <p>There are absolutely no notes on this.</p> <p>No superscripts at all.</p> <p>Who said this exactly? Where did the writer for</p>

	<p>this paragraph get his/her source?</p> <p>It is hinted that the commissioner has criminal ties, but there is no proof delivered and it feels that these sentences are only in place here to steer the reader in a certain direction.</p> <p>Without people to quote, or the GDB itself after having handed out an official statement, it is highly unprofessional and reeks of manipulation to put this paragraph with this phrasing into the book.</p>
Page 34	<p>At first I thought it was perhaps part of a quote from the findings of Marnette, but then I noticed there is no endquote, so it appears to be a paraphrasing by the author.</p> <p>The noting of the date is out of order compared to the way other dates have been noted. Instead of writing the month full out, here numerals have been used, separated by dots. There is a note at the end of the paragraph (note 6), but there is no final comma to mark end of quotation. It could be laziness of the author as seems to have happened previously, but the odd date, note that is not in superscript again, and lack of commas, makes the final two sentences come off as strange.</p>
Page 35	<p>More emotions that are now taken as facts..</p> <p>'It is not hard to understand that the GDB turned purple when they found out about Marnette's act.'</p> <p>translation page 27</p> <p><i>('Het is niet onbegrijpelijk dat de BOB'ers paars uitslaan wanneer ze lucht krijgen van de stunt van Marnette.' In the Dutch pdf)</i></p> <p>I get it that people can get annoyed, but at the end of the day, it is your job, you get paid to do whatever and if you get invested emotionally, you got a problem if you're not your own boss.</p> <p>There is no way to find if the GDB truly was so upset at the whole thing, or if they just shrugged and were happy to have Marnette be busy with something so they can do something else. (seems to me other side of the coin)</p> <p>No sources, no people quoted, again this</p>

	<p>generalizing comment about how ‘suddenly the entire organization!!!1!’ is purple with anger.</p> <p>Again, it seems like the author wants to steer the reader by throwing some strong emotions in the mix.</p>
Page 34	<p>P37 letter I</p> <p>T piece of so called evidence is mentioned several times after the first mention on page 34. However, later on, most notably on page 36, it is written as P371. The font of the pdf does not allow for the same looking icon – both appear clearly to be different.</p> <p>The description of the piece is the same, and so I decided to go by the name it was mentioned under at first. However, the sudden name change is a total of 25%, which is unacceptable.</p> <p>Note: on page 37 the evidence is labeled P371 again. Still better, but the occurrence of name change is still quite strange.</p>
Page 36	<p>The use of the words ‘<i>would be</i>’</p> <p><i>‘En als de BOB'ers de moeite zouden nemen om na te gaan of er op de originele beeldband ook klank te horen is, dan zouden ze merken dat de would be-Dutroux Nederlands spreekt - een taal die Dutroux vreemd is. *9’</i></p> <p>‘And if the GDB would take the effort to see if there is sound on the old tape, they would notice the would be-Dutroux speaks Dutch – a language unfamiliar to Dutroux.<sup>9</sup></p> <p>Page 29 on the translated file.</p> <p>As stated before about foreign words in Dutch textfiles, these words are out of place.</p> <p>Let’s see how many Dutch words could have been used in its place:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. vermoedelijk</li> <li>2. denkelijk</li> <li>3. presumtief</li> <li>4. waarschijnlijk</li> <li>5. ogenschijnlijk</li> <li>6. gelijkend</li> <li>7. misschien</li> <li>8. mogelijk</li> <li>9. vermoedelijk</li> </ol>

	<p>10. wellicht 11. aannemelijk 12. toevallig</p> <p>And I'm certain there are more, seeing I only took to use some closely related variations. There are many ways to convey one message through the use of different words while still using one sentence.</p> <p>My point here is, if there are so many well-known Dutch words available, then why would the writer use an English word in a supposedly official book? Typos and laziness aside, this is just strange. Not to mention, it breaks up the entire feel of the paragraph.</p>
Page 36	<p>The writer suddenly gets into detail on a word he prefers to use over other words.</p> <p>'On the interrogation of 7 September is is Raemaekers himself who picks up the topic where he left a year and a half ago: the circuit of the partouzes (French for group sex parties or orgies) of Brussel in the eighties.'</p> <p>Page 29 of the translated file</p> <p><i>('Raemaekers zelf neemt tijdens zijn verhoor van 7 september de draad weer op waar hij hem anderhalf jaar eerder heeft laten liggen: het circuit van de partouzes (Frans voor groepsseksfeiven of orgieën) uit het Brussel van de jaren tachtig.')</i></p> <p>What is interesting is that this introduction of a word foreign to Dutch is actually explained in this sentence as if it were to matter to a Dutch speaking reader what an orgy is called in French.</p> <p>The English words get no translation, and from the 3 passing cases has only 1 been treated properly. There is no consistency at all.</p> <p>And then there is this French word, which is about a sexual act that gets written out fully. I get it that there is no avoiding sexual acts in the book, but to actually make the reader stick to sexual acts longer than absolutely needed for the total run of things, comes off as quite strange.</p>
Page 37	<p>This is without a doubt one of the most interesting pages so far. The main subject of the</p>

	<p>final paragraph is the destruction of Raemaekers' tapes.</p> <p>The destruction is to be done by oven.</p> <p>The date for the destruction is 16 June 1996. There was a rush in the destruction, meaning they could have been destroyed at a later date as well.</p> <p>The numeric writing of the date is 16-06-96. It's quite interesting to find the ending numbers in this date to compile 666.</p>
Page 39	<p>Uncertainty about who or what is being spoken just before the 20 superscript.</p> <p>'Al deze elementen bevestigen onze eerdere conclusies: Raemaekers hindert, en het is mogelijk dat men hem tracht te intimideren.'</p> <p><i>'All these elements confirm our previous statements: Raemaekers is a hindrance, and it is possible they try to intimidate him.'</i></p> <p>Page 30 in translation.</p> <p>This leaves open who is trying to intimidate Raemaekers, and to what purpose. So far the convict has not opened up on anything, and most of the evidence that connected to him, had just been burned in an oven. And the things he does say, are mostly just ignored because he comes off as a madman. Not to mention, there is no word of the political figures he mentioned that were involved, and whether or not they are even investigated. So even if he would mention something, the chance of it having any effect at all or changing anything about his life-sentence, is very small, from what I gather.</p>
Page 39	<p>The hiding of the source of note 2.</p> <p>Instead of mentioning the source of the claim, there is the next note in its place, which becomes hidden from the list of notes by being placed in the list number of note 2.</p>
Page 26 on translation	<p>The mentioning of Café l'Embuscade – instead of the letter L, the number 1 is used. A quite strange occurrence, seeing it makes no sense at all. Also, there is no such café, however the name l'Embuscade gives several results.</p>



Words and abbreviations which I may not have translated too well, due to having absolutely no former knowledge about the correct (both English as well as Dutch) words used in court and official instances. Were there a mistake to be made, it may very well be one of the left words wrongly translated to the (grouping of) words I have written on the right. Is one of the words on the right out of place in the file, than you can easily find out where I messed up by translating it yourself – a lawyer or somebody aware of the correct terms can easily retrieve the correct translation. Were this to happen, my apologies in advance.

BOB – Bewakings- en opsporingsbrigade	GDB - Guard and detection brigade
Parket	Public Prosecution Service
GP – Gerechtelijke Politie	JP – Judicial Police
PSC	Since changed of name, ‘Parti Social Chrétien’, or ‘Social Christian Party’ Currently ‘Centre démocrate humaniste’, in English ‘Humanist Democratic Centre’ A christian democratic French speaking Belgian political party.
SIE - Speciaal Interventie Eskadron	SIS - Special Intervention Squadron

I am not translating anymore of this mess; it feels the writer tries to push the reader into a direction, and loses objective storytelling. Furthermore, most notes have no connection to what happens in the text, or are impossible to retrace: cases of ‘we had a phonecall’ and ‘they said’. Without any solid source that can be retraced without having to dig for whatever clues, there is no way to say which source is valid and which is not. It feels like a case of blind men touching the elephant and all giving a different story on what the animal supposedly looks like – only now the elephant is what happened and the description is influenced by the way the story is told, and what sources are left out. It feels too much like the story is purposefully hard to follow, as to discourage people to look into the case.