

Date: 18 March 2024

To: AIVD: General Intelligence and Security Service
Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations
P. O. Box 20010
2500 EA The Hague
NETHERLANDS

From: John Christmas, exiled whistleblower against Parex Bank of Latvia, identified by Spanish prosecutors as money launderer for Vladimir Putin's Tambovskaya Mafia

RE: Disinformation promoting Karins over Rutte for NATO position

Dear Sir/Madam,

In July 2024, NATO will select a new General Secretary. One candidate is Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte and another candidate is former Latvian Prime Minister Krisjanis Karins. I know Karins personally and I can detail his corrupt connections to the Kremlin. And, I noticed two Western organizations are spreading disinformation to promote Karins.

When I blew the whistle on the embezzlement of the assets of Parex, Karins was one of the first to receive the information and I had email correspondence with him. Instead of using the information to stop the embezzlement, he started a cover-up conspiracy against me and all Latvians which included having the Latvian government secretly pay the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD, in London, funded by the Netherlands) to pretend to invest in Parex to give the impression Parex had not been looted.

This fraud racket with the EBRD started in 2009 and still continues now in 2024 with the EBRD acting as 'straw owner' of Parex successor Citadele Bank which was closely connected with the massive money laundering discovered at the Danske Bank branch in Estonia. The same circle of banks protected by Karins has also included ABLV Bank of Latvia and Ukio Bank of Lithuania which were also top Kremlin money launderers. The evidence of the EBRD fraud has never been disputed, only kept hush and downplayed.

I also know Karins' wife Dr Anda Karina. In 2019, opposition politicians in Latvia circulated documents showing that she received nine million euros sent to her in confusing ways, from a Cyprus company connected to Putin and transferred through ABLV and Danske Estonia. The evidence appeared in Latvian media in 2019 however amazingly was not noticed by Brussels, London, or Washington. This evidence also has never been disputed, only kept hush and downplayed after it was originally released.

On 13 March 2024, the Atlantic Council 'think tank' in Washington, D.C. hosted an event featuring Latvia's new prime minister Evika Silina with a theme about Latvia

John Christmas

being a strong 'bulwark' for NATO. Silina is from the same party with Karins. Many people at the Atlantic Council have been aware for years that the Latvian government is secretly paying the EBRD to protect Putin's money-laundering network because I've sent the evidence to them repeatedly. However, they publish opposite pieces about Latvia fighting hard against Putin's money laundering.

The Guardian newspaper in London published an article on 14 March 2024 arguing that NATO should consider Karins instead of Rutte. This article must have been sponsored by the Kremlin, most likely indirectly through Latvia or the EBRD. The Guardian, like the Atlantic Council, has also been fighting me for years. This started in 2013 when I first gave the Latvia-EBRD fraud evidence to the Guardian. They reacted by sending a journalist to Latvia to conduct interviews. Then they published a promotional article about Latvia with a top leader of the Kremlin's banking network in Latvia talking about how he and Latvia were fighting hard against money laundering. The article omitted the evidence showing Latvia was secretly paying the EBRD to protect the money launderers, even though that was originally going to be the subject of the article.

I attached a 2014 letter from Eurostat to Dutch Parliamentarian Pieter Omtzigt where Eurostat admits it allows Latvia to keep its national debt 'confidential' to protect Parex. The letter does not mention that Parex was Putin's top money launderer. I worked together with Omtzigt to expose the EBRD-Latvia fraud in 2014, however he stopped replying to messages after he received this letter. He must know of some reason why Eurostat is protecting the EBRD-Latvia fraud. This letter appeared in the Dutch media in 2014 and the Dutch government should have reacted by forcing the EBRD and Latvia to correct their financial statements. However nothing was done and therefore the fraud still continues today, with European taxpayers the big losers and Putin the big winner, and apparently NATO candidate Karins also a big winner since his wife got nine million euros.

I will post this article on social media and forward it to journalists and others. My goal is improving the economy and security of Latvia, the European Union, and NATO.

Thank you for your service

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Gidon Omtzigt', is written below the text.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EUROSTAT

The Director-General

Luxembourg,
ESTAT/DG/WR/D3/JV/PL/eb/D(2014)3304947

Mr Pieter Omtzigt
Member of Parliament for the Dutch
Christian Democratic Party CDA
Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal
Plein 2 – PO Box 20018
NL - 2500 EA The Hague
THE NETHERLANDS

Subject: Parex Bank and the EBRD

Dear Mr Omtzigt,

Thank you for your letter of 26.08.2014.

Eurostat is aware of the put option provisions included in the shareholders agreements concerning Parex Bank, and its successor companies, between the government of Latvia and the EBRD. It has the relevant documents and has been informed by the Latvian authorities that these are to be considered confidential.

The put option provisions allow the EBRD to sell its relevant shareholdings back to the Privatisation Agency (which is classified within the general government sector of Latvia) under certain conditions, which include sale of Citadele Bank by the Privatisation Agency.

The mentioned provisions do not meet the definition of financial derivatives in the European System of Accounts (ESA 95; paragraphs 5.65 to 5.68) and are considered as guarantees. Guarantees are treated as contingent liabilities under ESA95 (paragraphs 5.05, 7.12 (c) and 7.22) and therefore no government liability is to be recorded in the Latvian statistical data.

It may be worth noting that any future call on this guarantee would be recorded as a government expenditure, thereby increasing the Latvian government deficit at that time.

The statistical treatment of this issue under the newly introduced European System of Accounts (ESA 2010) remains the same.

Yours sincerely,

Walter Radermacher