

Pierre GENEVIER
423 East 7th Street, RM 528
Los Angeles, CA 90014
Email: pierre.genevier@laposte.net ; site: <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com>
Phone: (213) 622 1508 (message only)

Country Leaders, and Country Economy and Finance Ministers
Members of the World Bank Executive Board
The World Bank Staff

Copy: President of the United Nations General Assembly
Permanent Representatives of Members States of the United Nations
IO. 'Chiefs', US Congress, Politicians

Los Angeles, June 1 2007

Object: Platform of reforms to defeat poverty and to resolve our (related) global problems, search for a World Bank President, previous letters concerning the UNSG selection process, and expression of interest for the World Bank President post.

Dear Madam, Dear Sir,

Referring to my letters dated June 14 2006, November 29 2005 and earlier ones addressed to the UNGA, to Country Leaders, and/or to IO Chiefs, I take the liberty of writing you again to make additional comments on my platform (of reforms) to defeat poverty, to address the related issue of your search for a new World Bank President, and to express my interest for the post of World Bank President.

1) Back ground facts, your search for a new World Bank President, and my platform of reforms to defeat poverty and to resolve the related global problems.

In November 29 2005 (<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/let11-29-05.htm>) and June 14 2006 (<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/let6-14-06.htm>), I wrote to you or your colleagues or predecessors to present a platform of proposals to defeat poverty and to resolve some related global problems, and to offer my service. I had already described most of these proposals in earlier letters send to G8 leaders and IO Chiefs (and politicians) from June 1999 to June 2005 (see letters at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indprop.htm>). The proposals were the result of a long work I started in 1993 after I was fired and threatened by a local French administration (see explanations at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indlwfr.htm>), and that lead me to first design a **computer project proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the world wide level** (see some detail about this work at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indprop.htm>).

My work was done in a very special context since I was victim of a very 'advertised' political scandal in France (that lead to a senator being sent in jail), and then I sought asylum in Switzerland, Belgium and the US where I was given the refugee status. My difficulties did not end there since I had/have to fight in Court again here in the US to defend my rights (see details of problems I had in the US at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indlwus.htm> and this letter's section 4). Despite many letters of support from experts around the world, and from some politicians (for my computer project proposal), 'you' did not respond to my recent letters describing my platform and offering my service for the post of Secretary General, so I must give you some additional arguments.

In my letter of June 14 2006, I had 'talked' about the UNSG and World Bank President selection processes (in fairly detail), and Mr. Wolfowitz's recent resignation gives 'us' again an opportunity to address this issue of the reform of certain IO Chiefs selection processes (UN. WB, IMF). As you know, there is a tradition that the World Bank President be a US citizen, the IMF Director General be a European and the UN SG be not from a

country permanent member of the Security Council, and more generally come from a region that rotates over the years. These traditions lead last year to the selection of a UNSG from Asia (Mr. Ban Ki-Moon) after China put all of 'its influence' to insure that an Asian gets the job. I know I am not the only one to think that these traditions are not good for the world (4 US House of Representative Committee Chairmen also stated that an international search for the WBP post would be better, I believe.), but I have related this issue to the more general strategy to resolve our global problems I presented you, so I feel I must intervene again.

It is very sad that countries like the US, France, China, Russia, England that are very advanced in many areas cannot present candidates for the post of UNSG (**and/or more importantly present platforms of reforms to tackle our international problems**), and that, at the same time, the US automatically chooses the President of the World Bank – an institution responsible to resolve the poverty problem - although the US - the richest country - shows **great 'weaknesses'** on poverty related issues **at the National level** [I refer to the about 35 millions leaving under poverty level, 45 millions without health care coverage, the 2 millions homeless every year, the lack of a fair legal aid system, the unfair remuneration system, the bad result on CO2 emission, ...]. I had explained this in my last letter, but it is definitely a good time to explain it again, and perhaps you will all use this chance to make the world improve in this particular area.

Apart from the obvious limitation (in term of potential candidates) that such 'discriminatory' selection processes impose, a big problem is the fact that the program or the strategy to resolve our global problems (these international organizations have vocation to resolve) **always comes second**; in fact it is not at all important (or inexistent) as we have seen last October when Mr. Ban was selected. The report of the UNA-USA association on the UNSG selection process (that was prepared with the aid of many country permanent representatives of the UN General Assembly, I believe) had stressed the necessity to have (or importance of having) the candidates present a platform to tackle our world problems, but since 'old habit die hard' as we say, we must try again to push this issue for the selection of the next World Bank President, I believe. And since the US – the most advanced country in the World - holds 'many of the cards' on this selection process, we may be able to progress this time (despite Mr. Zoellick's recent nomination).

Most of the time, we know (long ahead of time) when these high level positions (UNSG, World Bank President,) become available, and if not these institutions have often created the post of 'deputy chief' that may hold the highest responsibility while searching for a new leader, so it should not be so difficult to require countries or candidates to be well prepare and to come up with serious ideas on how to improve our international 'systems' and the world conditions [the selection of towns to organize the Olympic games require the presentation of detailed project proposals, so it is not unrealistic to require candidates for IO leading posts to prepare detailed strategies to resolve our problems]. I think that one of the reasons we live the situation we have today with Mr. Wolfowitz resigning early is that no one forced the US to think about this selection process and everyone simply thought about maintaining the tradition of having a US citizen president, so everyone is responsible not just the US.

Even if there is no doubt that Mr. Wolfowitz had serious qualification and experience, his most recent experience (at the Pentagon) was not an ideal preparation to manage the World Bank and to try to improve the situation of the poor, or even to give him a chance to think about what the World Bank could do to help the poor [working as a director at Goldman Sachs (that 'cares' only about rich people) is not either a good preparation, I believe]! I personally believe (and also repeatedly explained you) that we should establish a 65 age limit for IO chiefs (and government leaders), so Mr. Wolfowitz was not (for me) the right choice for many other reasons too. The reasons of his dismissal give, however, additional chances to consider in more detail my proposals, in particular the reform of our unfair 'remuneration system'. It appears clearly that Mr. Wolfowitz increased a little too much the salary of his girl friend, and of course I perfectly understand why this caused serious problems to the World Bank employees and the countries members of the World Bank, and why it is in contradiction with the World Bank objectives.

But, if the World Bank Executive Board rightly pointed out this error, it should also point out (or at least ‘understand’ and then act on) the more general problem we have with our remuneration (economical) system that let an individual make \$90 millions in a year for playing golf, another one make more than \$300 millions in a year for telling shocking jokes on the radio (Mr. Howard Stern made this amount I believe last year according to the Forbes magazine) or an executive like Mr. Gates make about \$2 billions or so a year during his more than 20 years as head of Microsoft (while the soldier in Iraq loose his life for \$50 000 a year). **These unfair salaries are not in relation with the relative contribution to the progress of society of these individuals**, and they de-valorize the work of others – civil servants for example (including the work of the World Bank staff and President whose salaries, it seems, are limited to \$350 000 a year or so).

This problem has many implications in our society and according to a fairly recent study (last year) of the World Bank, it has also a negative impact on the fight against poverty [a recent (last year) study pointed out that growth was not enough to defeat poverty, we also needed a fairer redistribution of the wealth, I believe]. **These disproportionate salaries also creates indirectly a very corrupt system** – we see in the US that politicians spent a great deal of their time raising funds to finance their campaign, and of course, it is mostly the very rich that can afford to support these very expensive political campaigns (and this lead to very little progress on poverty issues). So the recent misadventure of Mr. Wolfowitz should definitely encourage you to review or reconsider my proposals that I will now summarize again in this section, and discuss briefly again in the next few sections of this brief.

My proposals suggest **a slight shift in our strategy to defeat poverty** since they stress the importance of paying a more careful attention to what is going on in rich countries to defeat poverty or of addressing the underlying causes of poverty that to me lie mostly in rich countries as I explained in my 11-29-05 letter (<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/let11-29-05.htm>):

*‘You may now see more clearly why the fundamental causes of poverty – whether there are the ‘psychological’ or ‘will’ reasons or systemic reasons - are in rich countries (and not in poor countries). The impact of these problems is simply tenfold in poor countries, and leads to the outrageous poverty statistic (about 3 billion people living under \$2/day, etc). Poor countries cannot reform the international financial system to create a fair remuneration system, they cannot do research to find a honest legal aid system, they cannot prevent rich countries pollution or change the Internet Governance, only rich countries can do it, and it is critical to do it to defeat poverty. Since one of the advantages of our new information society is (or **should be**) that everybody is informed on the community’s problems, the **obvious** system’s imperfections **should be** resolved fast -in fact demonstrating our capacity to resolve these problems **rapidly** would be a better promotion for democracy than bombing a country (fortunately some countries remain to be convinced)’.*

Of course, I do **not** believe that we should lower the amount of help given to poor countries (Africa,) or that the World Bank should start making loans to the US to finance its health care reform, but I believe that International Organizations should play a more important role in the process of resolving some rich countries problems that are related to the global poverty problem and in the process of improving our international (dysfunctional) systems (international financial system for example,). I had summarized my platform of reforms as follow in my 11-29-05 letter:

*‘**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); (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 word free of poverty, and to promote (the people) justice while continuing to encourage charity].*

***We must tackle the systemic causes of poverty** like (4) the unfair remuneration system that is a key issues 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,); (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,). **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.

Finally, (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).'

I will now bring you some additional arguments to support these proposals.

2) The environment problems and the related fight against poverty, and the World Bank President role.

Our environment problem is, of course, our most obvious global problem. If China that has about 1.3 billion inhabitants (more than 4 times the US population about 300 millions), polluted only as much as 3 times more than the US population pollute now, the US and China alone (2 countries only out of about 200) would pollute as much as the entire world does pollute today! This would mean that no matter how much France, Germany and other advanced countries reduced their pollution levels, the world would still be over-polluting and be in great (great) danger. And it shows that no country can resolve the problem alone, even if rich countries have strict national environment policies (or strong national pollution reduction objectives), we absolutely need to have an international coordination (and cooperation) on this problem **because these national objectives must necessarily be relative to other countries national objectives.**

It also means that the two problems **environment and poverty are not dissociable** [again the reduction of poverty leads to (or need) an increase in economic activities and increase in pollution in poor country] and that it is therefore wrong **to limit** our environment problems to associating China or India or the US (only) into the protocol as England suggested it after it published the result of its recent (Mr. Stern's) study stressing the necessity to take urgent action. The study was a good initiative, of course, but I certainly doubt that it is in the interest of China or India (**or that it would be intelligent from China and India**) to accept pollution limitation from rich countries **that totally ignore the relation between the environment and poverty reduction problems.** China must take 100s millions of people out of poverty; how could it impose on itself 'absolute' national pollution limit when at the same time it must impose on itself a high economic growth level to have a chance to take out of poverty 100s millions of people [especially with an unfair 'international remuneration system', and when rich countries (like the US) refuse to respect the Kyoto objective and to make serious effort to improve the life of its (35 millions of,) poor or millions of homeless].

In fact as long rich countries dissociate the environment issue from the poverty issue – **at the political level** (scientists have already accepted this relation a long time ago), and only fix themselves '**absolute**' objectives in decrease of CO2 output, **the various threats they make about the gravity of the problem will only result in a greater fear to defeat poverty worsening the poor's situation**, and in the creation of a world with billions of slaves or poor who have no right to consume and pollute while a tiny group can use up all the planet resources for themselves. The possibility to sell or buy pollution credit (on special markets) given by the Kyoto protocol **is also completely unfair and inappropriate**, since it

is equivalent to giving the possibility to sell or buy the right to kill the poor! It seems that the European pollution market did not work well, so it is urgent to change this part of the Kyoto protocol and to add instead poverty reduction objectives.

We understand that rich people are reluctant (1) to put any restriction on their way of living, any limit in their consumption of the world resources, and don't want to feel any responsibility toward the poor [although their disproportionate wealth is due to undeserved very high salaries and profits resulting from our unfair economical (remuneration) system], and (2) to admit that they consume way too much of the world resources and pollute too much because it would be an indirect way of **admitting their responsibility in the poor suffering**. Rich countries are reluctant to the idea of adding poverty reduction objective to the Kyoto protocol because associating the poverty problem to the environment problem would force them to take into consideration poor countries economic growth in their equation and may lead to the imposition of stronger CO2 reduction objective for them, which in turn may affect their economic growth **if we do not design special mechanisms to prevent it.**

Again the resolution of the poverty problem will bring a steady and long lasting economic growth in rich countries that will compensate for any eventual economic slowdown due to the necessary reforms of rich countries industries. Both rich and poor countries must understand that they have responsibility toward each other and that all the people of the world must be associated in the global effort by attributing behavioral changes, for example (poor countries must also change certain 'inappropriate' behaviors that prevent a rapid resolution of the poverty problem). We (including the new World Bank President) must reason both rich and poor countries because we do not have any other **honest** solution to the rapid worsening of our environment problems, and of course to end the suffering of billions of poor. Rich countries must be honest about the fact that their pollution level **by inhabitant**, and their consumption level of the world resources **by inhabitant** demonstrate a total disrespect for poor countries and the poor in general.

And poor countries must understand that if rich countries make effort to reduce their consumption of the world resources and their CO2 output, they must also make greater efforts to reduce poverty by changing certain inappropriate behaviors too. To resolve the environment problem (like other global problems), time and coordination is critical, and any delay in addressing the two (environment and poverty) problems at the same time will lead to very little result and in a complete misinformation on the issue. The new World Bank President should be reminding everyone this reality, and encourage both rich countries and poor countries to act in concert in their respective capacity. **Having a WB President that only focus on Africa is not the solution.** The World Bank must not lower its help to Africa and other poor countries, and it must, at the same time, urge rich countries to act more efficiently on the underlying causes of poverty like environment or the design of a fairer remuneration system (or redistribution of the wealth system) or the use of the Internet, as I will mention again below.

[Mr. Bush's recent call for CO2 limitation in 15 countries is not enough to resolve the problem, even though it is an obvious admission that the US has not done enough in this area for many years now (and as such it is important, of course). It is also in complete contradiction with the previous US position that stated that the Kyoto protocol was not appropriate because it did not include all the countries in the world (including poor countries). **Again an agreement between a limited number of countries cannot be the honest solution to our environment problem.**]

3) The unfair 'remuneration' system, a urgent and grave global, psychological, political and development issue,

The unfair remuneration system (or unfair redistribution of wealth system) also can only be resolved efficiently and honestly with an international coordination and cooperation. **Even China that is said to be communist country has several of its citizens that are billionaire while at the same time it has 100 of millions of people living under \$1 a day.** It is not just a technical (economical) problem, **it is also psychological problem** because while some rich people have a wrong perception of their real contribution in society's progress, others feel oppressed, humiliated and robbed which in turn lead to frustration and

more hate. It is also a grave political (and justice) problem (as I explained in my 11-29-05 letter) because **the way people are remunerated for their contribution to society's progress defines our political system**; in democracy for example, it should be the people that decide who get rich and in which proportion, not the very manipulated market or the rich people only as it is today.

Finally, it is a critical development issue as the recent study of the World Bank mentioned above pointed it out (economic growth is not enough to defeat poverty, we must also improve the redistribution of the wealth). Of course, it is a difficult problem to resolve because the unfair national remuneration system leads to an unfair redistribution of wealth at the global level, which makes rich countries reluctant to take serious action at the national level (they are afraid that they may not be able to take advantage of poor countries as easily if they designed a fairer system!). Big corporations (or even small rich countries like Norway) can accumulate enormous revenues [due to the variation of commodities (like oil) costs, or simply by taking advantage of poor countries labor force] while other countries like Iraq are completely destroyed and/or see their populations suffer.

It is also a difficult problem to resolve because those who receive inappropriate high salaries do not want to see any change in the system of course. Even rich people like Warren Buffet who gives billions of dollars to foundation or international organizations to help the poor, refuse to admit that the system that allowed them to accumulate so much wealth is completely unfair (although it is obvious). Mr. Buffet has accumulated in his about 40 years of work about \$40 billions while the 7 or so US presidents who worked during the same time received only at most \$16 millions (perhaps \$32 millions if we double their salaries to include the outside benefits). This means that Mr. Buffet's contribution over his lifetime is evaluated to be more than 1000 times more important than the 7 US presidents contribution during the past 40 years (Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, Bush) [when Mr. Buffet gives \$30 billions of his wealth to charities and at the same time does not denounce the unfair remuneration system that made him so rich, he shows that he thinks very high of himself and that he feels these presidents (and other civil servants) are lower than nothing (which shows serious **psychological** problems, and also 'courage and dignity' problems)].

Finally it is a difficult problem to resolve because the present system allows some politicians who are not paid in relation with their important work in society as we saw above, **to become rich indirectly (and it is not labeled as corruption)**. Mr. Cheney's wife, for example, made for writing a book more than twice as much money as her Husband made during his 8 years as US Vice President, I believe. Why should Mr. Cheney bother to resolve the problem of the country and change a unfair remuneration system when he accumulates huge amount of money even though his salary rewards him so little?(!) Mr. Clinton also started making millions of dollars with speeches immediately after he ended his presidency and his wife made millions dollars for writing a book although they both were probably only making few 100 000s during Mr. Clinton presidency. [As mentioned above US politicians are also more and more dependent on the rich to finance their campaign **which makes it difficult to change the system**. And of course in some poor countries, the unfair remuneration system let also some leaders accumulate a lot of wealth while the population of the countries they lead remain very poor].

The difficulty of the problem should not make us ignore that **this problem has been obvious and that it has been worsening for many years now**. The disproportionate salaries we see like a 27 year old or so receive a 90 millions dollars yearly salary given to golf player, more than \$300 millions in a year given to shocking jokes radio star, the \$500 millions dollars given to an executive for going 5 months in jail, or 1 or 2 billions dollars yearly salary given to a Warren Buffet or Bill Gates while the president makes \$400 000 or a senator or chief justice makes \$250 000 a year; are obviously outrageous and are always increasing **even though the press and media talk about them regularly**. There is no sign that it will change; on the contrary the unfair salaries are even used by businesses and by the press and media to manipulate the public opinions, which is, of course, very dangerous (and also rich people and stars receive a 'greater attention' from the press and media than poor, which amplifies the problems and creates a vicious cycle).

Some poor countries like Bolivia have recently tried to nationalize their oil or gas fields and to obtain a more favorable redistribution of the wealth issued from their oil resources, which of course is a way to show that the problem is serious, but sadly this effort alone or without a request at the international level to design a new fairer financial and economical system or fairer remuneration system, will have a limited impact, and **means that the country simply wants to be able to become 'very' rich or to benefit when another country like Iraq (Palestine...) unfairly suffer a tragedy** (the war in Iraq contributed to an undeserved high price of oil), **which is not an honest objective**. Moreover, the decision of Bolivia affects only one sector while rich countries take advantage of poor countries in many different ways, not just by setting a disproportionate level of income for their work on oil resources or other natural resources. Now big internet companies make huge amount of money with the information people or organizations (of other countries also) put on their internet sites, for example! [Some rich countries government (Japan, Mexico) that have recently decided to lower the government members salaries, simply worsen that situation instead of improving it, since it creates a greater gap between the highest salaries in the private sector and the highest salaries in the government].

Of course it is in the best interest of society to reward talent, integrity, hard work, intelligence, innovation, imagination and courage, and it is in our interest to promote private property, but **we must be careful to design a coherent system that reward the people more in relation with their relative contribution to society's progress and we should review the definition of private property in our world with limited spaces, limited resources, limited capacity to pollute, and an expending population**. There must be limits (or at least much 'slower' increase rates) **(1)** on the salaries one can receive in the private sector and **(2)** on the private property one can accumulate. In my 11-29-05 letter I gave some direction to address this problem, and suggested that the UN takes the lead on such reform, but the reform of our international financial system fits perfectly with the World Bank (and its sister organization IMF) responsibility also. The new World Bank President can also play an important role in the other reforms I proposed in the Internet area for example, or in the promotion of greater respect for the poor and the new generation.

4) The other proposals: reform of the internet, development of computer applications that can be used by every country in the world, etc., and my lawsuits in the US and France.

The development of global computer applications like the one I presented you (to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the World wide level) and the creation of new Internet organization would help to defeat poverty as I explained you. They even give a real hope to defeat poverty **rapidly** which is important in the present context because as mentioned above we must find ways to compensate eventual decrease in economic activities due to the CO2 reduction objective. I will not come back on these proposals here, but you surely understand that here again the new World Bank President can play a critical role in the realization of these projects, especially after the UN chose a career diplomat to head its operations. The other proposals I mentioned (improving the legal aid systems, making administrations more accountable, the coordination of the effort of churches in the domain of poverty or the 65 age limit for country leaders and IO Chiefs) should also be of great concern for the new World Bank President.

I will address (most of) them here with my personal example, by describing you certain aspects of the various problems I had in the US [<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indlwus.htm>] and in France [<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/indlwfr.htm>]. As you know, in February 2004 I filed a lawsuit against the Los Angeles County, the State of California, and the Federal Government (INS or USCIS). Because of the impossibility to find a lawyer and because of the extremely difficult living conditions, I had limited myself to one cause of action (misrepresentation for which public entities should not be entitled to any immunity in the social services area according to some existing legal authorities). Instead of trying to resolve the problems I was having and instead of addressing the issues of the case that points out obvious wrongdoings in these 3 administrations, they chose to hurt me as much as possible and to take advantage of my difficult situation.

The US removed the case to the Federal Court, the State of California used the 11th amendment to avoid being judged at the Federal Court, and the LA County and the US used the immunity for misrepresentation although they knew it should **not** apply in the social services area. The various Courts (District Court, 9 Circ. Appeal Court, US Supreme court) let them do that mostly (except for the 9Circ. Court that pointed out that the use of the 11th amendment was not appropriate). So after waiting almost 2 years (in an extremely difficult situation – I was even put on disability by the County mandated doctors,), I had to re-file my complaint against the State of California again at the State Court in September 2005. I also chose to re-file at the same time a complaint against the US and the LA County (and some civil servant in their individual capacities) at the Federal Court, but this time I used different legal theories to avoid the immunity for misrepresentation.

Unfortunately and again, the 3 administrations made no effort to end the lawsuits, they continued to avoid discussing the factual issues (the problems or wrongdoings, some of which were even crimes), and took advantage of my extremely difficult living conditions [money is not an issue when it comes to robbing a poor and covering up civil servants wrongdoings]. Again the Judges both at the Federal Court and State Court helped them in their effort by using unfair immunities, by delaying the decisions and even by cheating or committing crimes [see letter to the Attorney General at <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/lettattgen.htm>]. Recently, the 3 judges of the Appeal Court ignored all my obvious arguments justifying that the State of California is liable (after waiting more than 3 years to have a court address the legal issues properly), and confirmed the ‘undeserved and illegal’ immunity of the state employees and of the State of California as you can see in **my petition for rehearing** [<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/petrehearingvsstatecal.htm>]. If they do not correct their obvious errors and omissions in the rehearing, I may never obtain justice!

The only ‘admission’ of the well founded of my complaint or allegations came from the Los Angeles County (only after more than 3 years) when it did not respond on time to my new complaint for negligence [see <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/lacneglicomp2.htm>] after the Federal Court denied supplemental jurisdiction on this cause of action. As you know, there is a 30 days limit to respond to complaint and failure to respond within this period may lead to an entry of default. In this case I did file the request to enter default (after the County was 20 days late) as the law books advise it to do and as the clerk office had advised me to do, but the Superior Court still refused to enter default after the county’s lawyer filed a late response! I had to petition the Appeal Court and **then the California Supreme Court that is now reviewing my case** [see <http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com/htm/petitionforreviewsc.htm>]. While all this was taking place the Social Security Administration denied me the disability benefits, and the Federal judges denied an injunction so that I cannot receive basic social benefits, and stole documents to make sure I could not appeal their decision, to let me live without even \$2 each month do the laundry or buy tooth paste!

All this although you surely understand **that I do not look like a terrorist**, and although you can see after reading my proposals that I work (ed) hard to try to resolve our problems and improve society! These problems **underline more general serious problems the US has when it comes to dealing with or helping the poor**. There is no (or almost no) housing assistance for the poor (a great majority of them) that don’t live in public housing (so poor can be sent in the street while they ask the justice to correct the problems that put them in a difficult situation). There is no efficient health care system for the poor [last week a woman died in the emergency room of the hospital I go to. She was crying from pain and for help **on the floor of the emergency room**, and the nurses and doctors called the police to have her picked up. The police came put her on a wheelchair to take her out and she died before she even got to the police car!]. There is no legal aid system either, especially when one complaint about the dishonest behavior of lawyer.

There is no minimum revenue on a year long basis (if states simply have any), so unless you become sick like me or are ran into by a car like I was in 2004, and you are put on disability, you simply loose the very little aid you receive after 6 or 9 months. Administrations know this, of course, and this is why they don’t hesitate to cheat or lie or worse commit crimes, when you are poor because they are sure you cannot possibly defend

yourself in such a situation. And last, but not least, the judges and many civil servants are given unfair immunities to do their work, so that they can cheat as much as they want to and they are not responsible in front of the justice. This is a very bad management policy, justice is an important management tool (for administrations) that is lost when the law gives civil servants unfair immunities. When you know that the US send robots role on the planet Mars, **it is obvious that keeping such unfair systems is an obvious intellectual dishonesty (to say the least) that poor countries should point out or denounce, especially when they are asked by a poor like me to intervene, because it affects them indirectly.**

Rich countries are wrong also not to point out and address these problems, it is more important than changing (or maintaining) our systems to make sure that Howard Stern can make \$400 millions next year for telling shocking jokes on the radio, or that Tiger Wood can make \$120 millions next year for playing golf! The refusal to talk about the 65 age limit for country Leaders and IO Chiefs, is also wrong; China, the most populated country, has imposed a one child limit per family, which is a much 'harder' limitation imposed on the people that the one I am proposing, and we should be happy they did it, so addressing this 65 limit issue for a tiny group of people is not outrageous! By letting me in a difficult situation and ignoring my work, although I have done obviously many efforts to present serious proposals (and to even obtain the support from experts), rich countries give a terrible example to poor countries, and they show little courage.

5) Conclusion.

To conclude, the recent resignation of Mr. Wolfowitz gives 'us' a new opportunity to reform the selection process of certain IOs Leaders (WB, UN, IMF, breaking the tradition to select a US citizen for the World Bank would open the door to a better selection processes for the UN and the IMF chiefs). The selection process of the new World Bank President should also be a chance for member countries of the World Bank (1) to think again about their strategy to defeat poverty (not just a chance for the US to push it views on the subject, especially when you know that the US does so badly in this area at the national level) and (2) to address the important actual issues I mentioned above (the relation between environment and poverty reduction, the unfair remuneration system, the fact that the causes of poverty lie mostly in rich countries,).

The US Government and US Congress should admit that the US make very little effort to improve the situation of its poor at the national level and demonstrate great weaknesses (at the national level) in this area of the fight against poverty (no legal aid system, no minimum revenue, no housing assistance for poor living outside public housing, 45 millions people without health care insurance, 35 millions people living under poverty level, 2 millions homeless each years, very unfair remuneration system, bad result in term CO2 pollution.). **It should be easy to admit this because at the same time the US has many strong points** (its engineer that send robots role on the planet Mars, its surgeons that separate twins attached by the head, its industry that build the 'biggest aircraft carriers',). With this in mind, the US should not impose a US citizen (Mr. Zoellick) as World Bank President; it should open the door to a reform of the leader selection processes at the UN and the IMF (this is critical if we want to improve the situation of the World); and it should push for a Word Bank President that will also help the US improve the situation of the poor in the US (not just focus on Africa).

I call on the World Bank staff that plaid an important role in this crisis in pointing out Mr. Wolfowitz error, not to let the US make such a mistake as imposing a new World Bank President from the US again. You can easily evaluate the US results on poverty at the national level and **see that although it is the richest country in the World, it maintains many people in extremely difficult living conditions while it gives outrageous salaries to other who does not deserves them (\$300 millions in year to tell shocking jokes on the radio!).** You can also notice that the US makes not enough effort to address the environment problems and to decrease significantly its CO2 emission, which is critical in the fight against poverty. Your role in society and in the world is to help countries resolve their poverty problems, you can do this also with the US by simply saying: *'we don't want our President to be from the US until the US makes significant progresses (or progresses related to its level*

wealth) on the poverty issues, especially as long as the selection process is not an opened international search!

Of course, I also call on the other member countries of the World Bank (1) to help the US admit its weaknesses in the area of the fight against poverty and in our related environment problem at the national level (whether you 'like' or 'dislike' the US), (2) to reform the World Bank President selection process, and open the door to a reform of the UN and IMF Chiefs selection processes, and (3) to give you (member countries) a chance to review the strategy to resolve the poverty problem and to analyze the actual situation and evolution of our society to take the appropriate actions in favor of the poor. I must ask all of you again to consider the proposals I presented you and to analyze the supporting arguments for these proposals. It is not because the problems (unfair remuneration system, necessity to link the reduction of CO 2 emission to the poverty reduction effort and increase in economic activities in poor countries, inappropriate use of the Internet to defeat poverty,) are obvious that 'we' should ignore them. [I also call especially on Mr. Sarkozy, the new President of France, to admit that I was very unfairly treated by the French administration although I was an obvious victim of a very advertised political scandal, and to correct the injustice I was victim of in France.]

I have put many documents about my work and about the difficulties I had in France and here on a website (<http://pgenevier.5gbfree.com>) to help you understand the intellectual process that lead me to make my proposals. My case shows that the difference between a homeless and a millionaire **can simply be** that one is denied justice and the other is granted justice (if the California Supreme Court accepts to enter default against the LA County as I am convinced I am entitled to, or if the State Appeal Court corrects its errors in favor of the State of California, then I am entitled to **a \$2 840 000 compensation or so**), and it points out some weaknesses of our systems that affect all the poor, so it may be of interest to you. And finally, the preparation of my platform to defeat poverty, the special and practical knowledge on poverty issues I have acquired, and the legal work I have done while defending my case in 4 different countries, gave me an unusual and useful experience to assume the World Bank President responsibilities, so I would be grateful to you if you could also consider my application for the post of World Bank President.

I look forward to hearing from you and remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Genevier