

Date: 3 April 2024

To: Secret Intelligence Service MI6
85 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7TP
UNITED KINGDOM

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

RE: RUSSIAN MONEY LAUNDERING, EBRD, AND NATO

Dear Sir/Madam,

In July 2024, NATO will select a new General Secretary. One candidate is former Latvian Prime Minister Krisjanis Karins. I know Karins personally and I can detail his corrupt connections to the Kremlin. I noticed several Western organizations, including in the UK, 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 which included having the Latvian government secretly pay the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD, in London) to pretend to invest in Parex to dupe the public that Parex had not been looted.

This fraud racket with the EBRD started in 2009 and still continues now in 2024 with the EBRD currently acting as 'straw owner' of Parex successor Citadele Bank which was closely connected with the money laundering discovered at the Danske Bank branch in Estonia. The same circle of banks protected by Karins has 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 the Latvian media in 2019 however amazingly was not noticed by Brussels, London, or Washington. This evidence also has never been disputed, only hushed up and downplayed after it was originally released.

The Guardian newspaper in London published an article on 14 March 2024 arguing that NATO should consider Karins. This article must have been sponsored by the Kremlin, most likely indirectly through Latvia or the EBRD. The Guardian has 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 Kremlin money launderer in Latvia portrayed as a hero, 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 the original idea for article.

The EBRD pays out many donations and consulting fees which could be the explanation for the Guardian's actions, and the refusal of most other media and NGO groups to publicise the evidence against the EBRD. I hear indirectly about this all the time and occasionally I hear directly. For example some years ago I explained the EBRD fraud to a senior person at the Institute of Directors, wondering if they might be interested to expose the problem. He told me he could not get involved because he was receiving EBRD consulting fees.

Another problem is with a circle of London writers who are funded (I think) by Bill Browder and who portray themselves as anti-Putin. Foremost among them is Edward Lucas, formerly of the Economist and now a candidate for the House of Commons. Lucas writes general articles about the evil of Putin while sprinkling in praise of the Latvian government or specific people in the Latvian government. I have met Lucas several times and personally explained the looting of Parex and later the EBRD cover-up. He seemed to agree with me and didn't dispute the evidence. However he refuses to put the evidence in articles. Instead, he labels people from the Latvian government who are directly involved in the EBRD cover-up as anti-Putin even though the beneficiary of the cover-up is Putin. I have also caught Lucas several times lying to other influential people in London that my whistleblowing is fake.

Evidence that I am correct and the 2009-2024 Karins-Latvia-EBRD-Parex-Citadele deal was and still is a fraud can be found in official documents from the Dutch Parliament, Latvian Parliament, and the European Commission's Eurostat. People at the UK FCA, UK SFO, and London Stock Exchange have known about this for years however they refuse to stop the fraud. I attached one example of evidence which is enough to prove my central allegation is correct. It is a 2014 letter to Dutch Parliamentarian Pieter Omtzigt in which 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. This letter was in the media in the Netherlands, along with quotes from me since Omtzigt and I cooperated to get the fraud investigated and exposed. However the British media blocked out the information and the EBRD is still now in 2024 pretending to be unaware of the revelation even while running a roll-over of the original fraud to protect Parex successor Citadele.

This brings me to my final point which is that right now in 2024, the EBRD claims to be investor in four banks connected with the Putin Regime: Citadele of Latvia, Siauliu of Lithuania, Ameriabank of Armenia, and Bank of Cyprus. I believe the purpose is to give false credibility to Putin's money launderers so that they can transact in (directly or through correspondent accounts) euros, pounds, and dollars.

I hope MI6 can put an end to this. All that is required is confronting the EBRD and Latvia with evidence that their accounting is fraudulent which means the EBRD and Latvia must restate their financial statements back to 2009. Of course this means tens of billions of euros of bonds issued by the EBRD and Latvia are in default, and much of that is listed on the LSE. Alternatively, if the fraud is allowed to continue, Putin will be able to continue laundering one or two hundred billion through this network each year and the EBRD and Latvia will continue selling more fraudulent bonds to the public. Plus there is a danger that the new NATO General Secretary will be a controlled-person for Putin.

I will post this letter on social media and forward it to select people, as I already did last month with a similar letter I wrote to AIVD Dutch Intelligence. My goal is improving the security and economies of the NATO countries.

Thank you,
John Christmas





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