

Pierre Genevier  
423 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street (RM 528)  
Los Angeles, CA 90014  
Ph.: (213) 622-1508  
Email: [pierre.genevier@laposte.net](mailto:pierre.genevier@laposte.net)

Mr. Michael R. Bloomberg  
City Hall  
New York, NY 10007

Los Angeles, March 25 2008

Copy: Mr. President of the United Nations General Assembly  
Mr. President of the United Nations Security Council  
Mrs./Mr. Permanent Representatives of Members States of the United Nations  
Mr. Secretary-General of the United Nations  
International Organizations Presidents, Directors,, ICANN CEO

Object: Preparation of a detailed platform of reforms for the United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG) selection process in 2011 [this letter with its Internet links can be accessed at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/letblo3-25-08.htm>]

Dear Mr. Bloomberg,

I take the liberty of writing you to present you a special work that I made during the past 15 years and that lead me to express my interest for the posts of UNSG in 2006 [see letter to the UN General Assembly <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/let6-14-06.htm> (1)] and of World Bank President in 2007 [<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/letwb6-2-07.htm> (2)], and to ask you if you would like to participate in some way in the preparation of a detailed platform of reforms to resolve our global problems that would be presented in the 2011 UNSG selection process.

*A) The UNSG selection process, how I came up with this platform of reforms to resolve our global problems and why I am contacting you.*

As you most probably know, the selection process of the UNSG is not a transparent and efficient selection process, and attempts have been made to reform it. In 2006 the UNA-USA prepared with the help of some UN country member representatives and experts a paper proposing some changes, and the UN Canadian Mission also presented some views on the subject. Even though these 'efforts' did not lead to any changes in 2006, it appeared more and more clearly that the process should be reformed to, among others, give the UN General Assembly a more important role in the process. An important suggestion of the UNA-USA report was, I believe, that the candidates should present **a platform of reforms** to resolve our global problems that could be evaluated by member countries. Such a requirement would help us tremendously because, at this day, the UNSG selection process does not give a chance to the UNGA to agree on a strategy to resolve our global problems and to select the best UNSG and some other IO Chiefs to implement this strategy [it also raises certain questions and has implications that I will mention at the end of my letter].

Another necessary reform should be that every country – even the countries with a permanent seat in the Security Council - be able to present a candidate. This is important because the most advanced countries (P-5 or G-8...) are not 'allowed' to present candidates according to unwritten rules although they are or would be **the ones who could make the greatest efforts in looking for solutions to our global problems**. In

2006, none of the candidates had prepared a real platform of reforms (or they had very weak ones); in fact most of them announced their candidacy at the last moment, and the one who announced it early, the candidate from Thailand, focused his two or more years run on trying to get the support of Thailand's neighboring countries, instead of discussing the global issues and preparing solutions to address them [his run 'practically' 'ended up' by a 'coup d'etat' in Thailand supported by the King!]. I expressed my interest for the UNSG job because I had come up with a platform of reforms in 2005 [<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/let11-29-05.htm> (3)] which address the important global issues of the moment like environment, the Internet, poverty, the international financial system, etc., and because my profile 'fitted' in 'some' ways the 'profile' the UNA-USA had come up with [see my explanation on this subject in (1)].

In 1993 [after I was very unfairly fired by a local administration near Paris and threatened to have problems for the rest of my life, see explanation in [recent letter to 8 University Presidents and Civil Servants \(9\)](#) and at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indlwfr.htm> (4)], I started working on a computer project proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the World Wide level, and I (together with 5 partners) eventually presented a practical computer project proposal in a European Research and Cooperation program in 1997 [<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/COPPRO5.htm> (5)] **that was supported by many national and international experts around the world.** When I designed my 'unemployed' computer project proposal, I tried to make sure it was good for every one on the planet – the experts' letters of support I received confirm it is, I believe [see proposal and letters at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indprop.htm> (6)], but instead of receiving any form of help (financial help or a job,), I was victim of all sorts of obvious persecutions from administrations in France and here [see (9), (4) and <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indlwus.htm> (7)], and International Organizations did not help me either. Between 1999 and now, I wrote several letters to Country Leaders and IO Chiefs to inform them on the progresses on the computer project proposal, and to address more general problems that affected either my situation or the realization of the project I was defending [meaning all the problems that were preventing its realization whether they were political, management, legal, the range of issues I had to address was quite wide, so my letters talked about development issues, management issues at the UN, environment problems, the war in Iraq, poverty, religion, human rights, etc... It was my responsibility as the coordinator of the project and as an unemployed to do so, I believe].

This is this 'analysis work' (and my related research work) that lead me to present a comprehensive set of proposals that would help us to resolve our global problems in 11-2005 (3). The platform was therefore the result of a fairly rigorous intellectual work that started in 1993 and is based on scientific, good (common) sense or logical arguments, but it should be more precise to win a large consensus among the UN members, so I must now go one step further in its elaboration and need the help of an international team of experts in several areas to develop more detailed proposals and to quantify their costs and revenues or benefits - after reading the draft work-plan I present below, **you will easily understand why you are the first person I thought about to work on this project and why your contribution could be significant.** Of course, at the same time, the UN General Assembly and Security Council must approve and even encourage the proposed work-plan or this project [that would also help them in responding to the questions related to the possibility to present a platform] and must continue their effort to reform the UNSG selection process. This leads me now to talk about the 'first' proposal of the platform – the creation of a new Internet International Organization.

B) The creation of a new Internet International Organization.

In 2005, the WGIG presented '*the report of the working group on Internet governance*', and the US discarded its conclusions by saying that it will never give up the control of the Internet (now administered by ICANN), but I believe we can still convince the US and other countries like China that one new Internet International Organization would be beneficial for everyone; I phrased my proposal as follow (3):' **8) The Internet should be at the center of our strategy to defeat poverty (and to resolve other global problems) because it will allow us to develop 'global' computer applications that can be used by every country administration, and therefore to bring progress to many countries at the same time. To develop this new Internet strategy and to resolve the actual Internet problems, we must create 'one' Internet organization that will have the responsibility to administer and maintain the Internet (ICANN + registries + registrar + root name server operators responsibilities), and that will be funded by the fees to register domain names (\$800 millions). This new Internet organization will also 'fund' the improvement of the Internet access in poor countries (jointly with ITU).**'

One important task of this new organization **would be (a)** to establish a fair registration fee system for all domain name holders taking into consideration (1) the use of Internet resources, (2) the revenues generated by this use, and (3) the type of sites (perhaps we may find other criteria as we work on the analysis), and of course **(b)** to develop and run a computer system that would administer this new fee system **which is a serious technical challenge as you probably understand**. The new organization would also be responsible **(c)** for developing and maintaining global computer applications that could be used by every country in the world [like the one I proposed to develop in [the INCO-Copernicus proposal \(5\)](#)], and **(d)** for financing the development of the Internet in poor countries.

So to convince the UN member countries that this proposal is well founded, we must describe precisely how this new fee system would work and how it would be administered, which means that we must specify, analyze and design the computer system that would administer the domain name registration fee system. These are typical computer system development project tasks that would require the work of a group [1] of computer, organization, information systems... experts during **about 2 years (2009-2010)**. We must also plan fairly precisely the migration from the actual 'organization' to the new one, this includes analyzing the technical aspects of the migration (transfer of existing data, format of the data, ), proposing locations for the various servers (root name server,) and making an estimation of the cost of this migration and of the regular budget and revenues of the new organization, work which could be handled by another group [2].

Our proposal must also explain **(1)** how the new organization would address the 'contents restriction issue' that is important for some countries like China that have strict freedom of information standards, **(2)** how it would resolve the existing Internet problems described in the WGIG report [Internet stability, security, cybercrime, spam, problems], and **(3)** how it would address the other issues like IPR, consumer rights, multilingualism, data protection and privacy rights – problems and issues that cannot be addressed efficiently with the actual organization of the Internet for obvious reasons. This work could be handled by a third group [3]. A fourth group [4] should work on the specification, analysis and design of one other global computer application to give UN member countries another example of global Internet applications this new organization would have the responsibility to develop, maintain and administer.

Finally, we should have a group [5] **(1)** that studies the IT costs of some rich countries' administrations and the type of computer applications administrations use, and tries to evaluate the IT cost saving we could achieve in poor countries if we developed

applications that can be used by every country in the world, (2) that studies the possibility to finance the development of the Internet in poor countries the new domain names fee system (and more generally this new IO) would give us, and (3) that studies the impact this new organization would have on our poverty reduction goals ('MDG' or 'new MDG') - this last work is more an 'economics' work, but it is also critical. Overall, this particular proposal would require at least 5 teams of International experts [6 to 12 people in each team working about half-time during about 2 years; groups composed of scientist, engineers, economists, IO experts and/or managers, national administrations experts and/or managers, industry experts, NGO experts...]. I also plan to have some human resources experts work on 'organizational' issues in part E.

**Why we can convince the UN member countries that this is a good proposal.**

The Internet stability is critical for every one, and the more Internet users we have the better it is for the big US Internet firms (Yahoo, Google, Microsoft, AOL, Ebay, ), so I am fairly sure we can convince the US of the pertinence of this proposal. A new Internet IO would help us resolve the actual problems of the Internet and increase the number of Internet users as I explained (3): 'Giving the domain name registration responsibility and revenues to only one organization (1) would help to solve the Internet stability, security, cybercrime, spam, problems because it would simplify the development of a coordinated approach to these problems, (2) would make it easier to address other issues like IPR, consumer rights, multilingualism, data protection and privacy rights by allocating resources (set up professional teams) to analyze and propose solutions on these issues, ... The Internet stability, security, cybercrime, spam, problems are technical, policy and resources problems that registrars, registries, and ICANN cannot resolve with the actual structure.

ICANN has now 'many 100s of agreements with registries and registrars around the world' (see ICANN comment on WGIG report pages 12) and a \$23 million budget about, while a unique administration would have only few different 'general' agreements with the different types of domain name holders (this would simplify the policies development); and it would have a significant budget to have teams of engineers developing tools to monitor (and monitoring) the 'network activity' and the sites activities ... Moreover, it is obvious that it is not in the best interest of registries and registrars to be picky on the type of information and 'commitment' they require from the domain name holders, and to verify the content of sites and the accuracy of the information provided.

On the other hand an International Internet administration -that is not limited by the profit objectives and that can coordinate its effort with other administrations- can require more precise information from the domain name holders, set up procedures to verify this information and the content of sites (based on complaint or in a random manner), and eventually take steps to immediately disconnect the sites that violate the contract agreements (for example sites that display child pornography should be immediately disconnected from the network and the evidences should be transferred to the local prosecution authorities. Finally, the development and maintenance of Internet based global applications that could be used by every administration is a complex and costly task requiring a dedicated organization.

We can also convince countries like China that the creation of this Organization will not affect their capacity to set their own freedom of information standards by explaining how we will address the Internet contents restrictions for various populations, and we can convince poor countries by explaining how this new organization will finance the development of the Internet in poor country, will develop computer application that can be used by every country in the world, and more generally will help defeating poverty. The WGIG did not have the resources and, perhaps, not the interest either to make detailed technical proposals, it seems, so the work presented here would definitely help UN member countries to find a better Internet governance solution, in addition to giving a new possible direction to resolve our global problems.

C) The environment proposal – adding poverty reduction objective to the Kyoto Protocol.

The second proposal that consists of ‘adding poverty reduction objectives’ to the Kyoto protocol, wants to address the ‘psychological or will cause of poverty’ by pacing the greenhouse gaze reduction in rich countries to the increase in economic activity or CO2 production (or poverty reduction) in poor counties [see 11-2005 letter (3) : ‘We must address the ‘psychological’ or ‘will’ causes of poverty like (1) the fear of defeating poverty because of our environment problems (add poverty reduction objectives -behavioral changes,- to the Kyoto protocol to fight this fear and to associate every country in the world to the protocol)’; see also my letter dated 5-4-05 at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/let5-4-05.htm> (8)].

A lot of research work has already been made on the Kyoto protocol and many proposals of CO2 reduction objectives and of methods to achieve the proposed reductions have been made, and/or are in effect, but **they point out three weaknesses in our effort**: **First**, the speed at which we want to resolve the poverty problem or the speed at which we want poor countries’ economy to grow (and indirectly to increase their CO2 production) was not taken into consideration or at least not discussed publicly or was not made part of the ‘official equation’; **second**, the possibility to ask both rich and poor countries to accept behavioral changes that would serve our environment and poverty objectives was not studied in detail, if at all; **and thirdly**, the possibility to buy or sell pollution ‘credit’ in an ‘organized CO2 market’ given by the Kyoto protocol is not a practical and ethical solution to our ‘environment problem’, I believe, because it gives the possibility to buy or sell ‘rights to kill the poor’ which is wrong and it does not give us the possibility to relate precisely enough the poverty and environment problems. So our proposal should address these three weaknesses.

To do that, we need one group [6] that studies how we could replace the existing CO2 trading system that is used to finance poor countries’ development and to discourage the big polluters in rich countries by a new system of taxation and incentive that would encourage the reduction of CO2 production in polluting (rich,) countries, and help fund technology transfer initiative and special poverty or development efforts in poor (or developing) countries – perhaps with the help of (or through) the World Bank UNEP, UNDP, UNIDO,. This group should also look at the possibilities to ask countries to accept behavioral changes that would affect greenhouse gaze reduction in rich countries and poverty reduction in poor countries **in order to associate every citizen of the world in our common effort to protect the environment and to defeat poverty**. We also need a group [7] that look for the Internet global computer applications we need to resolve our environment problems and to implement our environment reform. As mentioned above, one of our objectives is to put the Internet at the center of our strategy to resolve our global problems, and for this we must think about the kind of global computer applications we need to develop to support our strategy.

We also need another group [8] that looks at the impact a rapid reduction of poverty in poor countries would have on the CO2 reduction objectives in rich countries and that makes economic analysis on our proposed solution – study how the proposal (including behavioral changes,) would affect our poverty reduction goal [‘MDG’ or new DG]. It is important that people in rich countries understand that resolving the poverty problem will **not** destroy the entire planet because we are in control of what it is going on; and that the people in poor countries understand that they must participate in our global effort to protect our environment by coming out of poverty more rapidly, while respecting the environment as much as possible. As I explained in my letter in 2006 (1), our objective to half the number of people living in extreme poverty by 2015 **is an**

**inhuman objective**, and this proposal along with the others of this platform should help us to end extreme poverty rapidly.

**Why we can convince the UN member countries that this is a good proposal.**

We can convince both rich and poor countries to support this proposal **because it is the only honest long term strategy we have** that will benefit both rich and poor countries and because researchers have stressed the importance of linking poverty and environment a long time ago already. If we don't take into consideration the need (**and the speed** at which we want) to defeat poverty when designing greenhouse gaze reduction objectives, we will end up with the same critical environment problems in 10, 20, 50 years from now. 'We' (rich countries) created a form of society that **is not sustainable** and/or that **is dependent of the suffering of billions of people around the world** [see in (2) explanation given on the about 25% US share of the global production of CO2 for only about 300 millions inhabitants or 5% share of total population. If we had applied the supposedly 'very successful US society' to every country in the world, 10 or 15 years ago, we would all be dead by now or at least 'tres bronzes' and soon to be dead.]. The environment problems we have today are due to an obvious **long term strategy failure** in rich countries and International organizations, and we are now making again the same mistake, I believe. Unless we take into consideration the increase in economics activity in poor countries, we will not protect our environment for the more than 6 billions people on earth, we will protect the 'environment' for one billion people only or less (if we don't destroy earth) and this is wrong.

To convince everyone, our proposal must explain this reality as clearly as possible by estimating the impact of rapid poverty reduction effort would have on the CO2 production in poor country and indirectly would have on the needed effort to reduce CO2 production in rich countries. It should present some concrete proposals (behavioral changes for each country, taxation and incentive system to replace the CO2 credit market,), **make sure that everyone –each country- has an equal share of effort to resolve this joint global problem poverty/environment**, and quantify the impact on our 'MDG'. The environment summit last year in Bali did not address the weaknesses mentioned above. Rich countries admit that they pollute too much, but at the same time they refuse to admit that they must take into consideration poor countries growth requirements to defeat poverty to evaluate their CO2 reduction objectives; and poor countries avoid imposing on themselves poverty reduction effort corresponding to rich countries CO2 reduction effort, and this will lead to a new long term strategy failure if we do not change it. [As a parenthesis the speed at which we resolve poverty has an impact on the effort to maintain peace around the world (!)].

*D) The reform of the international financial system – or ' the improvement of our remuneration system' .*

This reform's objective is to improve our very imperfect 'remuneration system' **and to find ways to have 'remunerations' that are more in relation to 'each individual relative contribution to society's progress'**. I phrased it as follow: '*We must tackle the systemic causes of poverty like (4) the unfair remuneration system that is a key issue to build an honest and fair society (reform the international financial system, business laws,) and the society' s organization that creates a ' world of beggars' (re-evaluate the cost of doing business in a modern and complex society,);'*' You may (or may not) agree that the differences between the 'salaries' of rich entrepreneurs [like you (were )] and of civil servants [country or administrations leaders, judges,] are completely unfair and a very serious urgent problem –see explanation in (2)- [if you do not agree, our detailed proposal should convince you, and your point of view and arguments would still be very useful]. I believe that you work as New York Mayor for only one dollar per year, but having former industry leaders who made enormous amount of money take on the highest civil servants position for \$1 a year (or even for 100 times less than what they

make in the private sector) is not a good long term solution to our administration management problems and to resolve our societal efficiency problems.

Finding a new ‘remuneration system’ **that rewards every one fairly and that is conform (or compatible) with our political system - democracy**, is not an easy task, and convincing everyone (including billionaires) that we must change is perhaps even more difficult, but we should not let the difficulties stop us. We need to find a system that allow us to reward the people in proportion with their relative contribution society’s progress and that, at the same time, allows the people to determine what is a fair remuneration given a definite relative contribution to society’s progress – namely a system that ‘respects’ our democracy principles. [To do that, I believe we must **(1)** re-evaluate the cost of doing business in a modern and honest society (that has a universal health care system, a fair legal aid system for every poor, a fair justice system, that protects its environment, that pays its civil servants in relation with their important contribution to society’s progress), **(a)** by estimating or studying the budget needs of this modern and honest society (modern and honest rich country), and **(b)** by looking for and analyzing all the ‘unaccounted for’ (in our existing taxes system,) costs large corporations (and more generally businesses) impose on the community (we could study if a big corporation that pays taxes based, among others, on its profits although it uses the earth resources and interacts with administrations in very much the same manner whether it does or does not make profit, should not compensate the community more for the use of the community’s resources.); **(2)** we must find ways to let ‘the people’ control how people get rich, control executive, stars,, salaries, control gain on the financial market.; and **(3)** we must redefine the words ‘*private property*’ in world with limited resources, limited space, limited capacity to pollute, and an expanding population].

We need a group **[9]** that **works on taxes issues**: looks for and analyzes all the ‘unaccounted for’ (in our existing taxes system) costs large corporations (and more generally businesses) impose on the community and/or evaluate corporations’ use of all the resources, [for example, we could try to estimate what are the community’s justice costs of big corporation, and see if the \$455 9<sup>th</sup> Circ. appeal fee should be the same for a big corporation that ‘imposes’ complex antitrust litigations on the community and for a fired civil servant who is forced into a simple litigation.]; and a group **[10]** that **works on budget issues**: look at the cost of giving justice, healthcare, decent housing, ... to everyone, and/or of running a country that respects human rights and its environment [since it eventually come down to that], estimate the budget of the ‘perfect society’ [justice and health care are very important for rich people, so we can make them understand that they are also important for poor people]. [The ‘*big political question*’ should not be whether to raise or lower taxes, but what is the right salary for the relative contribution of each individual (what is the right salary for a ‘definite relative contribution to society’s progress’)].

We would also need a group **[11]** that **finds ways to give the control of how people get rich to the people**: looks at way to control executives and/or ‘owners’ of corporation ‘salaries and/or compensation’ (we probably must make an analysis for different size of business); and to control individual or corporation’s gain on the financial market (this includes finding a way to dissociate the control of a public company from the amount of share owned); and looks for solutions to the unfair salaries of stars (sport, movie, TV radio stars,) or find ways to control these salaries too; **this group should also redefine the term ‘private property’** [We must reward talent, integrity, courage, ‘hard work’,, and pay attention to ‘the market’, but not humiliate or manipulate a large majority of people. For example, it is not fair and /or even good for society to let companies use star (sports, or other) image to sell products because it is a form of manipulation of the public opinion. Advertising is important of course, but we must make sure that ads put forward the ‘qualities’ and uses of products, and not encourage people to buy a product because such or such well liked star uses it. We should not use either the outrageous salaries of (movies or other) stars to promote the movies or events as it is done today]. [We need to find ways to prevent business owners wealth to grow ‘exponentially’ as the business grow or become public while at the same time rewarding honestly their effort and letting them keep the control of the business they developed and continue to develop (see recent example of Google founders and CEO who became billionaires in few years) because at one point the wealth they accumulate has nothing to do with their **relative** contribution to society’s

progress. **Please understand that I am not trying to minimize your ‘contribution’ to society’s progress, I am amazed at what you have achieved (as business leader and as Mayor)**, but I just believe that an entrepreneur’s work is very similar to an ‘administration’ leader’s work and therefore that their salaries should be comparable,. ‘This’ **may** lead to the community (government) owning a part of large corporation’s capital, and to less speculation - we should keep an open mind on the possible solutions),].

Here again, we need a group [12] that looks for the global Internet based computer applications we need to develop to support or implement the reform of our ‘remuneration system’ and/or of our international financial system. One of the reasons our economical system is imperfect is that the people who developed it **had imperfect (or limited) information systems**. The Internet gives us the possibility not only to develop more precise information systems, but also to develop international or global information systems, so we must take advantages of these new Internet possibilities to design a better economical and international financial system. Finally, we also need to have a group [13] that studies how this reform would affect the transfer of ‘big corporation’s profits’ from one country to the corporation’s headquarter country, and looks at the economic implications of this reform (of this better redistribution of wealth system) would have on our new ‘MDG’ (on the fight against poverty). We must keep in mind the very large number of poor people that are kept in extreme poverty or that do not have basic decent living condition.

**Why we can convince the UN member countries that this is a good proposal.**

We can convince the UN members that this is a critical reform **(1) because** the unfairness of our remuneration system has become more and more obvious these past few years after the press and media started listing the wealthiest people in the world or the wealthiest stars etc. and talking about some ‘exaggerated compensations’ [the wealth of Martha Stewart that increased by \$500 millions during her 5 months stay in jail, a golf player who makes \$90 millions dollars a year, or a radio animator who makes \$300 millions a year to tell shocking jokes on the radio are example of ‘exaggerated incomes’ in comparison to the US President, the Chief Justice,, salaries], **(2) because** it is critical to show the people of the world that we address this obvious problem to help the billions of people who live in poverty or extreme poverty, **(3) because** the World Bank published a report explaining that growth is not enough to defeat poverty, and that we also need to have a better redistribution of the wealth to defeat poverty, **(5) because** there have been recently several obvious problems or scandals [like the sub-prime crisis that has shown how some executives received enormous compensation while at the same time the companies they managed lost billions of dollars(!) (and many people lost their home and work at the same time (!)); the variation of the price of oil that lead to huge corporation profits, while it put a lot of pressure on some poor countries,] that prompted actions from governments or congresses or at least lead them to ask some questions, and **(6) because** as I explained in [\(2\)](#), the unfair remuneration system is a justice issue, a development issue, a political issue (**a flaw of our democracy**), a psychological issue and a global issue [in the US, it is obvious that politicians or civil servants are not paid in relation to their relative contribution to society’s progress, and China, a communist country, has several of its citizens that are billionaires although it has 100s millions people in extreme poverty, so we should be able to get a wide support on this reform].

E) The various other proposals (improvement of the justice system,... resignation of King and Queens, 65 age limit proposal.), other subjects to be addressed, and human resources work (search for potential IO managers to implement the platform., and impact on other International organizations' work and structure - World Bank, IMF.)

In my 11-2005 letter (3), I described several other problems and related proposals: ' (5) the imperfection of the legal system that does not work for the poor (creating a fair legal help system.); (6) the lack of accountability of administration (deny the various immunities, stress responsibility instead of power.)' ... ..(2) the lack of respect for the poor and new generations (set up a 65-age limit for country leaders and IO Chiefs.), and (3) the unethical behavior of ' churches' [ask ' churches' to think about what would be their role in a world free of poverty, and to promote (the people) justice while continuing to encourage charity]... **We must use the advantages of our information society more efficiently;** (7) the various components of society (stars, executives, king and Queens, lawyers,) must speak up publicly and ask politicians to change the laws that give them unfair and undeserved salaries and/or privileges. And the UNA-USA report mentioned other subjects the UNSG should be prepared to address as mentioned in (1): 'The 'UN Agenda and Priorities sections' of UNA-USA report lists several important subjects (MDG, terrorism, weapons proliferation, management reform, peace building commission, refugee, human rights council,) that the next SG should be prepared to 'deal with' '.

First, the improvement of 'our justice systems' **is critical** to resolve our global problems [particularly to fight corruption and to defeat poverty], of course; and we should not limit ourselves to make proposals to improve the legal aid system (s) and the access to justice for the poor (the legal aid system is almost inexistent in the US by the way); we should also look at the accountability of judges and prosecutors [the judicial immunity, the contents of legal decision, the discretionary decision,], and at the organization of the justice systems including the interaction between the national and international justice systems [in the US for example the work of the US Supreme Court is completely 'absurd' – the Supreme Court denies about 90% of the petition for certiorari it receives (!), and since it has the 'discretion' to do so, it is completely immune and unaccountable for this or it is not accountable for about 90% of its work, and for the few other cases it does address, the justices have full immunity, meaning that the justices are not accountable for any of their work, and they are hired for life (!), and they do not insure the coherence between lower courts decisions (!)].

We need of a group [14] that looks for ways to improve our legal aid systems and the access to justice for the poor (in rich countries) - this is a complex issue that requires us to look at the way lawyers are remunerated, the way the legal information is distributed (by libraries, the internet,), the obligations to be represented by a lawyer to file a lawsuit, the possibility to participate in mediation program, the way administration defend themselves in court particularly against the poor,. We need a group [15] that looks for ways to improve the organization of our justice system and to make judges and prosecutors more accountable [judicial immunity, the contents of justice decision, interaction between the international and national justice systems,], and that addresses the refugee and the human right commission issues mentioned in the UNA USA report, and the resignation of Kings and Queens issue.

We need another group [16] that finds ways (1) to make administration more accountable (take away the immunity...) and (2) to promote '**responsibility**' instead of '*power*' (this group should also look for arguments supporting the 65 age limit issue for country leaders and IO Chiefs –even if I already gave many). We can do that because at the same time we address the unfair remuneration system for civil servants. This group would also look at the religion related issues (unethical behavior of religious groups, **think about the role of religions in a modern society,**) and at a possible solution to the homelessness problem in rich countries I would like to present in my book. We need a group [17] that looks at terrorism, weapons proliferation, and peace building commission issues and that looks at the regional conflicts, and proposes possible efforts on these issues. We need a group [18] that looks at the global internet applications we can

develop to help us implement the various changes we propose in these areas (improvement of the justice system,). And a group [19] that looks at the millennium development goals and that proposes new goals that would take into consideration the various efforts we describe here, this group would work together with groups [5],[8],[13].

Finally, I believe we also need a group [20] that **looks at the human resources issues** related to our platform (finding the managers to implement it, studying the impact on the work of other IOs, on UN management reforms,). It would be useful to look for managers that could implement such changes in IOs (at the UN and other IOs also, World Bank, IMF,) and eventually ask them to interact with the various team and to participate in drafting the final proposals [It is possible that one of the reasons Mr. De Rato quitted his IMF Managing Director job **in June 2007** is that he understood that the next UNSG should have his word to say in the selection of the other IOs (IMF, 'World Bank) managing directors or more exactly that his platform of reforms should affect other IOs work -in quitting early after Mr. Wolfowitz was asked to leave, he indirectly made sure that the World Bank and the IMF chiefs would be chosen soon after the next UN SG selection process. An important work of the UNSG is the coordination of the work among IOs (through the CEB committee), and to efficiently coordinates IOs' work we must have a common strategy among IOs and find the right profiles to implement the strategy.]

**Why we can convince the UN member countries that these are good proposals.**

We can convince the UN members that such reforms are important even if we may not necessarily obtain a time table for the implementation of all these changes [like the 65 age limit for country leaders, or the resignation of Kings and Queens in some 'poor countries']. For the justice system reform, rich countries(US, France,) justice systems are not working for the poor, and this affects how people behave toward the poor and indirectly how rich countries behave toward poor countries, which slows down our effort to defeat poverty, so to improve rich countries justice will have a significant impact on our effort to defeat poverty. And, information technology plays a greater role in the improvement of justice [in LA, the District Court recently (in 1-2008) implemented a new electronic filing system (for lawyers), this new system makes it much easier to administer the various cases, to respond to pleadings and to draft decisions simply by giving the possibility to cut and past the parties positions, and soon perhaps to research the cases by clicking on the Internet link referencing a legal authority. It simplifies tremendously the good administration of justice,], so if we can associate poor countries in the justice systems reforms in rich countries, **first** they will learn from it, and may not make the mistakes we made, and **second** they may be able to use the computer systems we develop in rich countries (at little cost) to improve the efficiency of their justice more rapidly.

*F) The timing and the project cost estimation, my personal situation and contribution, and your eventual contribution.*

The preparation of this detailed platform of reforms would take place **in 2009 and 2010 (about)**, so that it can be presented **in the 2011 UNSG selection process**. As seen above, we would need about 20 teams of 6 (to 12) experts working (on the average) half time during the two years – each participant would receive a compensation of about \$50 000 per year for an average of half-time work [the groups would be composed of scientists, engineers, economists, IO experts and/or managers, national administrations experts and/or managers, industry experts, NGO experts ...], and I would work on the project full time. We would also need an estimated \$800 000 in travel expenses, so that the various team members can meet at least 3 times during the project length and so that I can travel to coordinate the efforts. This would make our project cost ranging **from \$17.8 millions dollars to \$35.2 millions** depending of the size of the teams. Of course, this is only a rough estimate of the work that needs to be done – the work-plan should be improved (during the next few months) as hopefully the 'partners' (willing to finance part of the project) join in, as I write my book (see proposal below), and as we start finding the people to work on it. I

would like to start working on the project full time as soon as possible, but I still have great difficulties here in California.

Since I arrived in the US and was given refugee documents (granted asylum), I was sent more than 16 times in the street, became regularly sick, and was eventually put on disability by county doctors [for more than 2 years I don't have \$2 every month to buy toothpaste, warm or supplemental food to improve my health, to wash my clothes or to do anything..., although I have been put on disability by county mandated doctors,], because administrations violated basic regulation articles (or even criminal statutes) and repeatedly lied or simply ignored my refugee documents. Recently I even received a very unfair (and invalid) **deportation order that pretends that I never applied for asylum although I have made many efforts to try to resolve the various problems I had in my immigration case for the past 6 years.** On 2-27-08 I wrote again to the 3 US administrations concerned (9) to ask them to propose a fair settlement of my various lawsuits that includes a financial compensation for the grave prejudice I suffered [several lawsuits are pending, see letter sent to 8 US Universities and to administrations <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/letallcalcsm2-27-08.htm> (9)]. The letter contains also several links to other letters I sent to administrations (FBI, DOJ, politicians,) that will give you more detailed on the proceedings and the legal issues, if necessary. I put again here some of these links: [deportation order](#), [motion to reconsider deportation](#), [verification of status](#), [refugee A03 EA Card](#), [other](#), [recent criminal complaint](#), [last year letter to the Attorney General](#),], but I have no response yet and I am still worried they execute the unfair deportation.

I have now worked on this 'project' in one way or the other **during the past 16 years** [which makes me 'fit' for at least one of the UNSG profile requirements of the UN Canadian mission: '(2) *demonstrated commitment over time to the objectives and purposes of the United Nations*', see also my resume at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indresu.htm>], and I have invested a lot of time and effort, but in return I was victim of all sorts of persecutions although I believe I followed the intellectual (and moral) path **I was honestly supposed (or required to) to follow.** I would like to write a book during the next few months that explains what happened to me, that describes the intellectual process that lead me to makes these proposals and to express my interest for the UNSG post [see [book proposal](#), this is just a draft proposal, I have not had the time to correct or edit it properly yet and my English is not perfect as you noticed] and that presents the proposals and their benefits to the general public. I would also be defending the platform in front of the UNGA in 2011 if the project went through.

Your experience as business leader and civil servant would be very useful to develop further any of the platform's proposals even if it is particularly appropriate to prepare the creation of the new Internet IO proposal, of course. Your experience as mayor shows that you are interested in the problems of the community and has lead you to interact with the UN for the past 8 years which could come in handy, and your foundation has already funded some UN projects, I believe. Moreover, it appears that your term as mayor will end in 2009 and therefore that you may be available to invest more time in the project in 2010 which would be at a critical time. And, of course, since you have worked for \$1 a year for the past 8 years, you won't be picky on the salary issue [if salary were the only remaining issue that prevents your participation, I would be willing to double (or even triple) your actual salary to secure your 'help', of course (!)]. Many people asked (or wanted) you to run for US President, I believe, and some talked about you being able to invest \$1 billion in the presidential campaign, so this 'project' may seem to you 'cheap' and/or not so challenging in comparison to a US Presidential run (requiring you to go everywhere around the country), **but** it would give you a chance to use your experience, intelligence and (some of your) time to improve the lives of a great many (many) people around the world and to encourage an important management reform at the UN.

I copy this letter to the UN General Assembly (and to IO chiefs) because they need to approve **and even encourage the proposed work-plan**, and because as mentioned above, this 'project' could help the UNGA in its effort to reform the UNSG (and some other IO Chiefs) selection process (es), which is a quite complex task as you surely understand [see letter to the UNGA at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/letunga3-25-08.htm>]. Requiring the UNSG candidates to present a platform of reform to resolve our global problem **raises several serious questions**: How precise should the platform be [this project could give precious information on the amount of work that is necessary to prepare a serious platform and on how precise the platform should be]? Should the UN General Assembly approve the platform preparation work? And if so, how long before UNSG Selection process should the work-plan to develop the platform be handed out? Should the candidates present the team that will work on the work-plan at the same time they presents it [finding the financing and the team after the UN General Assembly accepts the work plan would be easier of course]? Should there be a limit on the number of candidates and related work-plan? ... And **it has or may have also some implications** in other IOs leader selection processes, and in the organization and work of the UN missions and other Ios country representation offices... [Finally I believe that your participation in this particular project would be good for everyone on the planet, so if some UN member countries or their representatives or IO Chiefs feel the same way and the work-plan is approved, they should be given a chance to tell you.]

### Conclusion.

This project would help the UN General Assembly in its effort to reform the UNSG selection process in addition to present a possible 'new direction' or new strategy to resolve our global problems and to improve the lives of many people around the world. The platform **(1)** encourages us to pay a little bit more attention to what is going on in rich countries to defeat poverty, to use our information society more efficiently, and to put the Internet at the center of our strategy to resolve our global problems, and it **(2)** addresses important psychological, systemic and information society issues that lead to poverty and to various other problems we are facing now.

Your experience as business leader and then as civil servant in New York would be very useful to develop **a detailed platform that can be accepted by every country in the world**. And this project would give you a chance to use your experience, intelligence and time to improve the lives of many people around the world (after focusing only on the Big Apple's population) and to encourage an important management reform at the UN. If the UNGA approves this project and you decide to participate in some way in this project, I will be happy to work with you, and in the mean time I can bring you any additional information you may need, look forward to hearing from you and remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Genevier

Ps: I will try to send you this letter by email at [webmaster@mikebloomberg.com](mailto:webmaster@mikebloomberg.com) also so that you can access the Internet links more easily, and this letter is also at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/letblo3-25-08.htm> as mentioned above, and the UNGA letter at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/letunga3-25-08.htm>.