

RS

FRONTLINE



murder money & mexico



email this page

search outline

schedule

bulletin

search

frontline

family tree
interviews

readings
maps

mexican news

links
discussion

mexican news reports on the scandals

Transcript of Raul Salina's answers to questions submitted by
Swiss Prosecution Team
Almoloya Prison, December 6, 1995

**This government document leaked out. It covers the Swiss investigators' fr
Raul in the presence of Salinas's lawyers and two witnesses. (Note: Some o
not included in the transcription.)**

statement by raul salinas de gortari

With reference to the list of questions duly appended to the casefile, [Salinas] r

TO QUESTION 1: Yes, and I wish to give a brief explanation, unless a more
will be permitted upon conclusion of the questioning, but first -- since the list c
with the Swiss authorities -- I want to express the following to the Swiss gover
institutions and the Swiss people: Switzerland is a country that my family and
and I -- have known, loved and respected for many years.

My wife went to school in Switzerland when she was a girl, I have taken part in
competitions in Lucerne, my nephews -- my brother's sons -- studied in Switze
are currently in school there. All of this explains the great confidence with whi
accounts in Switzerland, being cognizant of its standards and rules, and the tru
country's institutional banking system. Secondly, I want to express my apologi
government and to the country's financial institutions, especially Banque Pictet
house which opened its doors to me in good faith, and I'm going to explain wh
myself under a different identity.

To begin with, I beg the Swiss authorities to understand that we are not before
furthermore, I am subject to a trial in which I have been falsely accused of hon
statements are limited by the imperatives of the fact that I am defending myself.
Furthermore, I am unaware that the Mexican authorities have charged me with
drug trafficking. This is why I ask the Swiss authorities to understand that I am
absolutely truthful, but that [illegible] to know the action of the Mexican autho
myself. Fourth, in regard to the first and subsequent questions asked me, I wish
solely responsible for these accounts and I absolve my brother-in-law Antonio
Zertuche and my wife Paulina Castanon de Salinas of any responsibility. Next,
apologies for my mistakes, but I have never taken part in any criminal activity
drug trafficking.

TO QUESTION 2: In Banque Pictet, Geneva, and in Julius Baer Bank and Ci
was also an account in another Geneva bank which was closed last year. Please
to my present situation, there are facts that I can't remember precisely, but to th

the part of the casefile to which I have had access, I can frankly confirm every responsible for. I think those are the banks that I can recall at the moment. Let there is a long-time account in another Swiss bank, also located in Geneva, but remember the name of the bank, which I think I visited only once, and the acc submitted from the US.

TO QUESTION 3: At Banque Pictet, in the name of Juan Guillermo Gutierrez Geneva bank whose name I can't remember precisely at the moment, there was name of Juan Jose Gonzalez Cadena. In another Geneva bank whose name I believe the account is under the name Dozart. There is an account in the name Gortari and another in the name of a company, Noborona (I can't state it's correct have the documents available, but the account paperwork was submitted from Baer Bank in Zurich. I'm not familiar with Julius Baer Bank; and I can't tell you there are or under whose names in Zurich, because the accounts were opened in New York and through a Swiss company called Confidas. Now I want to explain the strategy. To begin with, I categorically deny the slightest connection with drug trafficking. I categorically deny that these funds could have the slightest connection with the the illegal dealing in drugs. Any statement by any authority in any country purporting a relationship between these funds and drug trafficking [illegible] because it is a presumption. I never had the slightest connection with drug trafficking or any other activity, also an absurd presumption. My brother, former President Salinas, fought organized crime with total firmness. This prison is one sign of that fight and -- in contradiction with the Constitution, which they are violating by holding me here on trial together with the heads of the major drug trafficking rings that were fought by President Salinas here: Miguel Angel Felix Gallardo, Rafael Caro Quintero, Ernesto Fonseca; Jo Guzman was here; Humberto Garcia Abrego was or is here, along with dozens of others. President Salinas fought doggedly, all of which -- I repeat -- makes the idea that I might be connected with drug trafficking an absurdity. Let me add that two years ago I was arrested in the US, a country that I have visited dozens of times during my life and I was never detained or questioned by US authorities when I entered the country. On the contrary, I was always warmly received, because I don't have any [2+ lines missing] from any activity related to my work as a government official, it's not dirty money I gained. I worked in the government in 1989 in a government corporation called SEMAR, and from 1990-91 in the Secretariat for Planning and Budget, under the secretaryship of Miguel Angel de la Madrid. My direct superior was Carlos Rojas, the current Secretary. There was never any corruption or abuse of power in the institutions where I worked as a government official. I can give an explanation for this money: after deciding to organize an association of investors to construct various mechanisms for putting together a fund that could be repaid at the end of my brother's administration -- for various investment projects and to obtain a greater volume of credits, because I was and am convinced that the economic growth of Mexico will require extensive foreign financing. The mechanisms [in different identities] is explained precisely because I was trying to protect my family. Only later, when I -- together with an investor friend -- obtained access to the system of Citibank, through Confidas, that I could use my real name. The goal was to bring together business friends to put together an offshore fund for reasons of safety and to avoid entanglement with the political vicissitudes of President Salinas' term. As I don't have the knowledge of the steps the Mexican authorities are planning to take, I'm not going to give names of the businessmen who invested in one form or another, since some investments were in the form of loans and others in the form of advances on individual projects. If I were in Switzerland I'd happily furnish full details, but I can't provide information when I find myself in Mexico. I don't have my files [illegible] other people, but I declare to the Swiss authorities [illegible] and we are going to present this explanation clearly. I certainly erred in not having her sign, but she holds no responsibility for, and has no exact knowledge of the participants and projects. In reality, my wife, Paulina Castanon, [illegible] was my wife and faithful spouse. She can probably think of some names of friends who part

Juan
Guillermo
Gutierrez
Somez

and logical, since we got together socially with these businessmen friends. I do brother-in-law, Antonio Castanon, has the vaguest idea about this strategy, since with me and I simply feel affection and gratitude toward him for having stuck to brotherly loyalty during these terrible ten months, dropping his work and his attention to himself to Paulina's support.

TO QUESTION 4: In my previous answer, I tried to explain the origin and purpose and pointed out that some of the account applications were submitted after 1989 and I submit them directly myself and that there are even some banks whose names I don't remember. Obviously, all of this information is in my files, but right now I can remember only the first. I'll deal with them now. In the case of Banque Pictet in Geneva, I can speak of the first from 1989 to June 1993, and the second from June 1993 to present. In the first I was introduced to Banque Pictet by Ms Margarita Nava Sanchez, and one or two accounts I can remember -- were opened with her, but it was precisely within the strategy that I was involved. After June 1993, Ms Nava's name was removed from these accounts, and a new account was opened under the name of Juan Guillermo Gomez, together with my wife Paulina. Another account, Jose Gonzalez Cadena was opened at the Suizo [Schweizer?] bank, Geneva, and I can remember that. The accounts at Citibank Zurich were opened by Confidas, and right now I can't remember which there were. At Julius Baer Bank, I [illegible] the account numbers or other references for the present accounts, or the other Dozart account. I seem to remember that another account was opened when Ms Margarita Nava ceased to participate and the funds were transferred to

TO QUESTION 4B: I think there's an account at Julius Baer in my name; in the case of other persons at Pictet: under the name of Juan Guillermo Gomez Gutierrez; and then there are accounts under the name of Juan Jose Gonzalez Cadena, another pseudonym. Under contract with an account at Julius Baer under the name Novarone, I think, and there should be an account under the name of Juan Manuel Gutierrez Gomez, a real person. Citibank New York was called Trocca through Confidas; I don't remember how many accounts there are. The Dozart is also a trust, originally set up by my present wife's former husband as an inheritance from the deceased first husband, whose name was Alfredo Diaz Ordoñez. I can remember at the moment.

TO QUESTION 4C: At Pictet, under the name of Juan Guillermo Gomez Gutierrez; at Schweizer [?] Bank in Geneva, under the name of Juan Jose Gonzalez Cadena; at Citibank Geneva, and at the bank (whose name I can't recall) which has the Dozart account under the name of Raul Salinas.

TO QUESTION 5: Right now, I'm not sure if it was in July 1989, at Pictet, the first account was opened in the name of Juan Jose Gonzalez Cadena was opened probably around the same time; the Citibank accounts were later, and the Julius Baer accounts were from the previous year.

TO QUESTIONS 6 AND 7: [Answer identical to that to Question 5]

TO QUESTION 8: The first Pictet account was opened by Ms Margarita Nava. She opened it under the name of Juan Guillermo Gomez Gutierrez. At Citibank -- it was specifically -- the entire strategy was devised by Ms Amy Eliot, who was acquired by the bank as an investor to make transfers. Ms Eliot's correspondent in Zurich was a woman who no longer works for the bank; subsequently it was a woman of Spanish origin with no antecedents, because she spoke Spanish very well. I opened the account under contract with Julius Baer in Mexico, with some Swiss representatives of the bank; I believe that all of the Julius Baer accounts were opened with Mr Curtis. The Dozart account was opened in Angeles through a bank employee, but I don't recall the names of either the person

Curtis Lowell

TO QUESTION 9: I am the person empowered.

TO QUESTION 10: The total amount is on the order of \$100 million, without [illegible] and, in accordance with the strategy that I outlined previously, I am the owner or beneficiary of this total, but I repeat that, at the appropriate time, I will go to the Swiss authorities. I am asking the Swiss Prosecuting Attorney [Carla del Real] and members of my family and my defense team so that they can speak with you please; I want you to understand that, since I don't know what indictment they might level at me or other people, since in reality I'm the manager of a strategy and not the owner of

TO QUESTION 11: The reason is that on the one hand, in exchange for my promotion I could obtain resources that could cause me tax problems; in fact, a large amount of resources is for me, for my consulting and promotional work, but basically... because the accounts were opened under different names I wasn't familiar with the system proposed to me, so fictitious names were used in order not to create a political scandal. I was previously known about Citibank's Confidas system I wouldn't have resorted to if I had kept the account at Pictet simply because of that bank's efficiency. But I can add that "Dozart" was inherited, that account already existed, and I opened the account in my own name, so that actually I kept only one fictitious name, at Pictet. I've already said that Pictet is an excellent institution, very efficient, so I decided not to close that account. On the other hand, I closed the Juan Jose Gonzalez Cadena account and transferred the money to my own name.

TO QUESTION 12: As I recall, only the Juan Jose Gonzalez Cadena account was used for depositing travelers' checks, all the rest were interbank transfers.

TO QUESTION 13: [See previous answer].

TO QUESTION 14: I think that I've answered in my previous replies, but I want to repeat that I've never had the slightest connection with the crime of financing the drug traffic; the money comes from lawful sources and it's not possible to believe that the money goes back to over six years ago, no one would have believed back then that they were connected [sic]. The money is lawful in that it is used to do with drug trafficking.

TO QUESTION 15: It's a trust, and I'd have to see the documents in order to know its purpose [illegible] I don't recall.

TO QUESTION 16: The transfer orders might have been issued by myself, by Sanchez, Mrs Paulina Castanon de Salinas, Ms Amy Eliot or in the fictitious name of Guillermo Gomez Gutierrez and Juan Jose Gonzalez Cadena; in any case, who was acting in accordance with my instructions, as I'm the person responsible for the

TO QUESTION 17: I don't recall the number of the account, but remembering that the accounts belong to accounts managed through officers of Citibank and Confidas (and so these are accounts that were opened by bank officers, I didn't open them directly; since I don't have all the files I couldn't even tell you today what names the officers had for the accounts.

TO QUESTION 17A: It is [was?] in Citibank, and my wife, Paulina Castanon, and the bank officers who opened and managed it should have [had?] access.

TO QUESTION 17B: I replied to that in previous answers.

TO QUESTION 17C: I don't remember.

TO QUESTION 17D: That has already been answered.

TO QUESTION 17E: I don't recall at the moment, I neither confirm nor deny

TO QUESTION 18: I don't recall the number, but in fact it's the name that was Citibank Zurich.

TO QUESTION 18A: I can't specify the amount, but it should be around \$45

TO QUESTION 18B: That has been answered previously, it's completely verified, it took place through Citibank New York.

TO QUESTION 19A: I believe I've already answered that question.

TO QUESTION 19B: Let me point out that, as I said before, Ms Margarita Nava participated in June 1993, and if she has some other, later accounts not signed by Gomez Gutierrez, they could be accounts independent of the ones that I was aware of.

TO QUESTION 20A: Because there was no reason to have two accounts, and she stayed with Banque Pictet.

TO QUESTION 20B: It's my impression that I didn't make the transfer directly, that Ms Margarita Nava Sanchez is the one who communicated with the Pictet. No specific reason that I can recall, I simply seem to remember that having two accounts was useless work for the bank and for my supervision, so it was decided to keep just one. I remember the arguments pro and con. I suppose they were opened under the same funds that were in the other two accounts. It seems to me that it was a prudent decision, since it involved the same people and the same money. I don't recall if it was in February 1993, or if it was Ms Margarita Nava. I don't even remember if it was when I took steps to exclude Ms Margarita Nava from the accounts, because it removed Ms Nava's name from the accounts, so maybe the reason for changing order was to leave Ms Nava out.

TO QUESTION 21: Although I can't confirm it, I believe that I don't have two accounts. It's my impression that Ms Margarita Nava opened an independent account, but I think I'm telling the truth.

TO QUESTION 22A: There are only two possibilities, I would have to look at both. An alternative would be that it was a transfer by the investors: that seems the most likely alternative is that the New York office run by Ms Amy Eliot was managing so in accordance with her optimization strategy, but it was the same money from the [illegible] a transfer in addition to what existed as of that date, that could be the [explanation], that it's one of the loans by the investors, but on the basis of the information allowed to see at present, it's very [illegible] that it was an internal movement of funds, since \$25 million left Zurich on 8 June 1993 on an order from the Trocic investment in money market instruments, and twenty days later the same administrators recall the money. Here in the documents is the name of an officer, Plange-Rohr, that movement is quite normal in the money market, there's nothing strange about it, it's resources on various financial markets. That was the duty of the administrators and the facilities for doing so.

TO QUESTION 23A: I recall having ordered this transfer [on June 30 1993].

carry out -- to a friend of mine (I could give you his name at a later time) for a was a lawful business deal. At this moment I don't wish to give the person's name projected deal, I believe that it fell through, but I don't want to give more detail stated at the outset. Seeing this document, I can tell you that the total amount to recipient was actually greater, this was just a portion, and there was nothing un to thank you for making documents that clarify things available to me. My fam can give you the name of the recipient. He is a friend of mine, and the deal was

TO QUESTION 23B: I believe that I have answered that question.

TO QUESTION 23C: I've answered that in previous replies.

TO QUESTION 23D: For the transfer.

TO QUESTION 23E: That's what was decided by the participants.

TO QUESTION 24: Because no transfer could be made until the funds had be they had to arrive, then they could be transferred.

TO QUESTION 25: [A document is presented for examination by Salinas] I s \$15 million was transferred, the total amount was higher, and these \$5 million that was moved. Various channels were used, as agreed upon by the participan agreement because the recipient wanted it this way. I believe that it would be v authorities to find out who the recipients were and learn that they are people w with drug trafficking. I'm sure that you can question them and find out that thei nothing to do with the crime being investigated here.

TO QUESTION 26: [A document is presented for examination by Salinas] A and addressee, it's the continuation of the first \$15 million transfer. If the Swis can verify that the \$15 million and these \$3 million reached the same recipient recipient's business has nothing to do with the crime under investigation here.

TO QUESTION 27: On my instructions. This answer also covers Question 27 that -- since the money had nothing to do with drug trafficking -- the accounts had had any doubt -- because, say, my accounts had actually been linked with would never have gotten my wife involved. We never expected that anyone w the accounts might be frozen for the crime of drug trafficking. What I did know Mexican authorities were aware of the existence of a fake passport in the name Gomez Gutierrez and that the money had to be moved, but someone lied and r baseless drug trafficking accusation. I also don't know what interests acted or h the Swiss government disclose its banking secrets; I know which interests are c me politically, but I can't understand how it was possible for the Swiss governr banking secrets without a shred of evidence, without any real foundation. If I h Swiss government or Swiss banking authorities I never would have sent my wi has been violated on account of a lie.

TO QUESTION 27B: Because we knew that the passport that the Mexican au for was in that safe deposit box, along with documents concerning Citibank, ar Guillermo Gomez Gutierrez was known to the Mexican authorities, they had to safe deposit box.

TO QUESTION 27C: The ultimate purpose of all of this money in the [illegit described was to promote business and employment in Mexico, and Ms Amy F to move those funds. I don't know what words were actually exchanged between

Julio Bar

wife, but I suppose that Ms Eliot wanted to keep Citibank out of this problem of information about the drug trafficking accusation, I don't know, or she helped I trap, since we trusted Swiss banking secrecy and for this reason -- even after my incarceration and investigation -- we weren't worried about moving these funds: events which in large measure led to the decision to move the money: firstly, the Mexican authorities knew about the fake passport and, secondly, Mrs Amy Eliot

TO QUESTION 28: Luis del Valle is a tax expert who I have known for many years. For services I have contracted on various occasions as a tax advisor. Basically, he's a lawyer and an expert in tax matters.

TO QUESTION 28A: To accompany and advise my wife.

TO QUESTION 28B: I don't know what exact instructions Luis del Valle had spoken with him for ten months, but generally speaking he was to assist my wife

TO QUESTION 29: I already explained the reason that Antonio Castanon opened at the beginning of this hearing. I'm enormously grateful to him, since he has put aside his personal responsibilities and, at this critical moment, he had to count on a mechanism that was financially secure to provide continuing support for my wife, Paulina. Both Paulina and Antonio are part of my defense team and they are devoting all of their time and energy to assist me. This has led to my indictment for the crime of homicide. The mechanism for providing security was by depositing a large sum to his account (but very small in relation to the group of investors that I could identify at a later time), I don't know whether or not he transferred, but the intention was to deposit a large sum to his account, about \$1 million for the purposes that I described. I'm sure that Paulina and Antonio have made statements and are doing likewise, because they are people that tell the truth. I don't know why a safe was rented, but I suppose it was for keeping documents. I don't have the foggiest notion whether or not they were made or not, since I've had no contact with my wife.

TO QUESTION 30: I'm surprised that this business should appear in an inquiry by the Swiss authorities, because I don't recall that it ever actually operated: it's sole purpose was to provide a business reference. I think it was more a matter of vanity than of necessity. This business never attempted or accomplished anything. At the beginning, when it was set up, there was an idea that it would engage in some -- lawful -- transactions, but it never carried out any operations, nor do I remember when it was shut down, since it was run by Margarita Nava Sanchez. When it was set up I believe that its registered office was in Explanada -- I can't recall the number -- but I can't say this for sure because this address was given as a reference for Margarita Nava and Juan Guillermo Gomez Gutierrez. I don't know if there is any property with the homicide currently under investigation and have fabricated statements in this regard. I have already stated and denounced this before the judge, but none of this has anything to do with crimes or misdemeanors, so I repeat: the crime under investigation is the foundation.

TO QUESTION 31: It's a brokerage firm. I've had deposits in InverMexico with which I was associated and which were liquidated some time ago, I don't recall when. I believe that the firm is still in operation, but I was simply a customer and I don't see why this should be of the Swiss authorities' investigation.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION 32: Do you hold, represent or manage accounts in the name of fictitious names or corporate names in countries other than Switzerland?

TO QUESTION 32: I have to say that, as I understand the question, I do not have

accounts in other countries, except for Mexico. I don't know whether any of the group of investors might have foreign accounts which have nothing to do with the strategy that I described here, this banking took place in Switzerland and with banking secrecy -- banking secrecy that has been violated due to lies, because I and any of the people mentioned have the slightest connection with the crime of drug trafficking. This is a false accusation, and this lie was the basis for violation of banking secrecy and for the arrest of two innocent people. I implore the Swiss authorities to stop a series of maneuvers carried out to persecute me and my family, to make a fair and absolutely innocent involvement of Paulina Castanon de Salinas and Antonio Castanon. I request that they immediately establish a less severe, more benevolent and fair situation for those involved. There is no crime of drug trafficking; the strategy that I described will be presented to the authorities when they permit me to do so, and before the Mexican authorities a writ of indictment is handed down, since things have proceeded to present without a formal trial has been opened for the crime under investigation here. Once again, I request a fair situation, justice and complete exoneration for Antonio and Paulina Castanon, who are detained in the investigation of a nonexistent crime.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION 33: [Line missing] manage or administer 1

ANSWER: In my answer to your previous question, I thought that you were asking if there were other accounts in addition to those already mentioned in this interrogation. The accounts in the US and London already mentioned are part of the group of accounts that exist here; that is, they are basically part of the group of accounts managed by Citibank. That's the way Citibank New York and Citibank Zurich organized them. They have facilities for opening accounts anywhere and don't require any participation to do so.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION 34: What benefits did you receive for managing these accounts?

ANSWER: The benefits that I received have to be divided into two parts, since the money remains --to generate business with this money, and I was to share in the profit when the deal closed, depending on the structure and financing of each deal. Moreover, taxes on those deals when they went through -- here in Mexico, obviously. On the other hand, I might have a tax problem, but just to show the Swiss authorities my good intentions, significant profits were realized in the course of time, and I was : did -- make use of this money, which I received for the management and consultancy for each of these investors. There actually were significant profits, and I made repeat that I'm informing the Swiss government of this to demonstrate the truth of my statement, even though it could result in a tax problem for me.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION 35: Was the group of investors which you mentioned in this statement legally constituted in any manner?

ANSWER: No. But I want to make the following frank observations. The article, Article 127bis of the Federal Code of Criminal Procedure, states that I have all information concerning this judicial investigation, and I request that a copy be turned over to my lawyers, together with copies of all documents in the possession of the authorities, since these proceedings are being conducted under Mexican law and I have this right. So I'm requesting copies of all information received by the Swiss authorities in this case. Of course, I'm also requesting the information that led to intervention by the authorities. That is, since it is guaranteed to me by law, I wish to know what information was brought before the American authorities tasked with investigating the case. Article 128 says that I have the right to know the identity of the plaintiff, so I have

who falsely accused me or linked me the crime of financing drug trafficking. I the Mexican authorities represented here inform me who was the complainant trafficking and who falsely linked me [to this crime]. According to the rights of the beginning of this hearing, I have the right to communicate with anyone I choose for appropriate defense. In accordance with this right, I request that I be able to communicate immediately with my wife, Paulina Castanon de Salinas. In conclusion, I want to point out -- I made mistakes, but I never engaged in criminal activity. I made mistakes and I accept responsibility for them, but any contact with drug trafficking is abhorrent and that the accounts still exist and that no attempt was made to erase them shows a lack of concealing the movements [of money] from the Swiss authorities, because that is lawful and we always trusted Swiss banking secrecy. I also want to add that I learned that Antonio and my wife Paulina were detained in Switzerland, because of a lack of confidence in Swiss justice. I have only two more observations to make. First, I believe that the Swiss authorities exercise great objectivity and care in examining any evidence that the authorities might submit with regard to drug trafficking, because I have proof that the authorities invent and fabricate evidence. So I request that you, Madam Prosecutor, determine the origin of any such item of evidence. I also want you to understand that President Clinton crossed a number of enormous private interests when he modernized this country, and what is happening today -- the persecution and attack against me and my family-- is part of modernizing and transforming Mexico. I knew that this visit by the Swiss authorities was in the hand of God, I'm truly thankful that these events took place in Switzerland, because of my confidence in Swiss law and Swiss officialdom. Once again, I submit that the evidence is at the disposal of the Swiss authorities, and I request that you allow my family to enter into direct contact and communication with you. Thank you for listening.

[End of text]

[home](#) · [interviews](#) · [family tree](#) · [readings](#) · [maps](#) · [chronology](#) · [mexican news](#) · [live](#)
[tapes & transcripts](#) · [press](#)
[FRONTLINE](#) · [wgbh](#) · [pbs online](#)

web site copyright 1995-2007 WGBH educational foundation