

Pierre GENEVIER
423 East 7th Street, RM 528
Los Angeles, CA 90014
email: p_genevior@yahoo.com, pierre.genevior@laposte.net
Tel.: (213) 622-1508 (message only)

Mr. President of the United Nations General Assembly
Ms. The President of the United Nations Security Council
Mrs./Mr. Permanent Representatives of Members States of the United Nations

Los Angeles, June 14 2006

Object: Formal expression of interest for the post of Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Dear Mr. President of the General Assembly,
Dear Ms. The President of the Security Council,
Dear Mrs./Mr. Permanent Representatives of Members States,

Referring to my recent letter dated November 29 2005 and my previous letters addressed to you, to Country Leaders, and/or to IO Chiefs, I take the liberty of writing you to formally express my interest for the post of Secretary-General.

In my last letter of 11-29-05, I presented you a plan of action (or 'platform') to tackle some of our most urgent international problems and also offered my service to help in the implementation of this plan (or informally expressed my interest for the post of SG). Since then at least two reports or discussions on the selection process of the next SG were published (Canada's 'Non-Paper' and the United Nations Association-USA report on the selection of the next SG; Ambassador Allan Rock made also some verbal comments), and the President of the Security Council recently informed the GA that the Security Council would start considering names in July. Even if the two reports do not necessarily represent all member states positions, they identify a certain number of issues that are relevant and present the points of view of some you (I believe), so I would like to use this opportunity to (a) explain how my proposals address 'your' concerns, to (b) contribute to your debate on the UNSG selection process, and also to (c) clarify my points of view on some of the issues to facilitate your selection work.

The Selection Process [Gender issue, Unwritten regional rotation rule, Canada's one term limit proposal, the GA role, Transparency].

I would like to start my comments with the selection process, and more particularly with the gender equality 'factor'. The UNA-USA report mentions that no woman has ever been SG, and therefore that the '*gender equality should be viewed as an important criterion*'. I agree that it should be viewed as a criterion, but I must also point out that the recent elections of 3 women as country leader in Germany and in Chile and as President of the GA [a possible woman winner candidate in French presidential election...] **are proofs** that significant progresses have been made regarding to this gender equality issue even though more progresses should be made around the world, of course. Moreover, gender is not the only 'quality' that divides the world almost equally, since, with about 3 billions people living under 2 dollars a day, the very poor represent surely more than ½ of the world population [and these poor are not at all 'represented' in high level management positions, and, of course, rarely heard]. There are also about 20 millions refugees who see their professional life (or life) completely stopped (or destroyed). Since eradicating poverty is the n 1 Goal of the UN and protecting refugees an important UN task, the election of a **poor** and a **refugee** at the post of SG would have a strong symbolic signification too [even a greater signification than electing a woman, I believe (no offense Mesdames)].

Concerning the unwritten regional rotation rule, which is, of course, a way to avoid a form of **discrimination** that would prevent certain regions (poor or rich) to be given a chance to propose a 'candidate' and to have a national (or regional) as SG, I think that it would be sad if China, Permanent Member of the Security Council, had not stressed that Asia, with 2 billions inhabitants, can 'produce' a qualified person to lead the UN, but at the same time I feel like some of you pointed out that it would also be sad to limit ourselves and to give up the possibility to appoint a qualified candidate whose 'platform' may represent more precisely the objectives of member states and who may not necessarily fit in this regional rotation rule. [As I will explain below, I believe that member states should not look only at the candidate's qualifications or national origin, but that they should also think about **what they want the UN and its next SG to do or to achieve during the next five or ten year.**]

The geographical or nationality 'limitation' does not just exist in the UNSG selection process, since there are even stricter limitation for the selection of the World Bank President and the IMF Managing Director, for example. Intellectually speaking, there is (or there should be) no difference between these three IO leader selection processes. And just like I think the US citizenship necessity to assume the Presidency of the World Bank is a rule very detrimental to the world **and to the US**, the regional rotation rule for UNSG, even though it is not as strict, could be detrimental to the world including Asia. On this subject I would like to mention that Mr. Wolfenshon who visited more than 80 countries to have good look at poverty forgot, it seems, to fly in downtown LA or San Francisco, or simply to walk at night in Washington DC to have a good look at the homelessness problem in the richest country in the world where a basket ball player can make \$18 millions a year salary, a golf player can earn \$60 millions a year salary or an executive can earn \$2 billions a year during 25 years for managing a 50 000 employees company!

As the result, no one (on the international scene), not even the World Bank President, who '*dreams of a world free of poverty*', worries too much about this outrageous situation, and this is why the US makes so very little progress in this area. Unfortunately, this lack of concern for this US problem has a great negative impact around the world also. There is no good poor and bad poor, the poor living in the middle of Africa or Bangladesh are not good poor (that must be aided), and the homeless downtown LA and New York are not bad poor (**that must suffer just few miles from the multi millions dollars home!**). As long as there will be just **one** homeless in the US or in France, you can be sure that there will be no **full** 'commitment' in the fight against poverty from the US or France [**it is very easy to solve the homelessness problem in the US or in France!**]. This being said, I also agree (with the UNA-USA report) that the nationality (or unwritten regional rotation 'rule') should be a '**factor**' in the SG selection process, but in general the international community should avoid any geographical restriction (or discrimination) in the selection process of international organizations' chiefs (and managers).

In fact, if I were selected SG, I would defend the possibility to have other nationals than US and European citizen to lead the World Bank and IMF (see also remarks on management reforms). Of course, as far as I am concerned, the regional restriction rule **is not really applicable** because as a refugee ['rejected' even by the country (US) that gave me the refugee status] I cannot really be associated to any country or region. I represent more the 20 millions refugees and the billions very poor (many of which live in Asia) than any region or country, **and I don't think that any government would be accused of discriminating any country if you selected a refugee and a poor as SG**. To conclude on this subject, I would like to say also that having a national from Asia to lead the UN is not either an insurance to see the 'Asian' interests better represented on the international scene. Unfortunately as we have seen it during the past 15 years, despite 2 African SGs the situation in Africa has worsened or at least did not improve very much (the various tragedies that hit Africa: Rwanda massacre, problem in Sudan, aids,, confirm this point)!

I would like now to comment the one term limit that Canada's Ambassador has put forward in his 5/18/06 interview. I have some reserve about this one term limit proposal because I believe the SG selection process should not be just a measurement of every candidate qualifications or qualities, but also a chance for the GA to (**informally**) review the new knowledge, the technological evolution and the world situation to (**informally**) define -

perhaps in concert with the candidates (particularly the next SG), what it thinks the UN and its SG should accomplish during the next 5 to 10 years. As the UNA-USA report pointed out, a critical step in the SG selection process is the presentation of a 'platform' by candidates describing the most pressing issues and how the candidate intends to resolve the problems. This 'platform' that will be (**informally**) evaluated by member states may require more than a 5 or 7 years term, so to limit the SG mandate to a one term period may be detrimental to the UN effort.

I must say that to implement the 'platform' I presented you, a 10 years span would be more suitable than a 5 or even a 7 years term. For example, the creation of a new Internet international organization I suggested in my plan would already require about 5 years. [To develop a computer system takes about 3 years from analysis (design, programming, testing) to implementation, this means that to create the computer program (s) that this organization would need to set up a fair internet tax or fee system would take about 3 years and could not be started before mid 2007 or probably later. Moreover, we must also plan for an orderly transition or migration or fusion of the tasks accomplished by registrars, registries, country registries or root name server administrators, which would (or could) lead to the creation of this organization toward the end of the first 5 years term.] Then, of course, this organization is (or should be) also a tool that must allow us to develop other programs that can be used by every country's administration, and this related task would then be done in a second 5 years term even if some efforts can be started earlier, of course. [These two related tasks are necessary to develop and implement world wide computer applications that would be very helpful to all countries, particularly poor countries, and therefore they can be viewed as one common objective.]

Then the proposal to add poverty reduction 'related' objectives (like behavioral changes,) to the Kyoto protocol (**a**) in order to associate every country (and every citizen of the world) in the Kyoto protocol [and in the effort to protect our environment and to solve the problem of poverty], and (**b**) in order to fight the fear people have that the reduction of poverty would lead to more pollution in poor countries that would destroy the planet [fear that handicaps our effort to defeat poverty], the time span is similar. **The definition of a set of poverty reduction related objectives** (behavioral changes,) by each country, and the obtaining of an international agreement on these objectives (including the formalization of a new protocol or treaty) would require probably the entire first 5 years term (about until the Kyoto protocol expires in 2012, I believe, even if specific efforts can be started earlier). And it therefore would lead to the implementation of that treaty during a second 5 years term. [Concerning the 2 other proposals, the reform of the international financial system and the development of a fair legal aid system, the work involved would also be significant, but I would rather not give you a general time frame now. The 65 age limit proposal for leaders, the work (or dialogue) with religious community to define their role in a modern society and a world free of poverty, the 'abolition of Royalty', or the effort to make administration more accountable, will probably be a 'continuous' work (even if steps can probably be sketched)].

Like the 'two reports', I believe that the GA should play a more important role in the SG selection process because, among other reasons, it must (**informally**) think about a set of important tasks it wants the UN and the selected candidate to accomplish during the 5 or 10 years. These tasks will necessarily involves every member state, it is at least the case for most of the proposals I make, so they should have their word to say, and even play an active role. Of course, I also agree that the SG selection process should be more transparent so that all member states can review (and express their point of view on) the various candidates qualifications and objectives (and that the public can appreciate the seriousness and fairness of the work done). Canada also proposes that the GA meets with the potential candidates to learn more about their view on the role of the UN and their vision of their task as SG which, of course, is a reasonable request. [As far as I am concerned, you know that for the past several years I have repeatedly written to you, IO Chiefs, Country Leaders and politicians to analyze some of our problems and to propose you solutions to these problems, so this 'dialogue process' has already started long ago (but, **of course, I would be happy to meet you and to respond to your questions verbally**).]

Role and qualities or qualifications and criteria, and a missing quality.

The two reports or discussions address these issues of role and qualities in a slightly different 'angle', but they come up to comparable requirements, even if the UNA-USA report is more specific in many ways, so I will comment only the most important arguments to give you an idea of where I feel I stand. **Canada lists as criteria:** '(1) Extensive experience in the conduct of international relations; (2) demonstrated commitment over time to the objectives and purposes of the United Nations; (3) proven leadership ability and managerial skills, including experience of modern management methods and a commitment to transparency and ethics; (4) strong communication skills'. **The UNA-USA states that there is:** a 'general agreement that any candidate should have (a) outstanding diplomatic skills and possess strong leadership capabilities'; that the next SG should be (b) a 'unifying figure' that can develop solutions to challenges in diplomatic, economic and humanitarian fields; with 'ability to bridge the gap between the North and South and to repair the deep division that emerged in recent years; and with the capacity to work with all member states and to stand up to the P-5 if necessary...'; and that he/she should have: (c) a 'abroad understanding of the global issues facing the UN today; a commitment to carry out needed reforms; a strong vision with an outlook toward issues of the future; and the ability to translate ideas into concrete action'.

You may agree that anyone meeting UNA-USA criteria (b) and (c) or capable of 'developing solutions to challenges in diplomatic, economic and humanitarian fields', having a 'broad understanding of global issues...'; and having the capacity to 'repair the division that emerged in recent years...' would necessarily have acquired in some way a 'extensive experience in the conduct of international relations', have 'proven leadership ability and managerial skills', and have 'strong communication skills'; and therefore that it would meet the Canadian criteria (1) (3) (4) and UNA-USA criterion (a). So I will first comment on Canada's criterion (2) alone and then address the UNA-USA criteria (b) and (c) only. I could not have written my 11-29-05 letter (or this one) if I had not been committed over the past 14 years to the objectives and purpose of the UN. In 1993, I started working on my computer project proposal to resolve one of the UN problems - the integration of the large volume of statistical data handled by many different IOs or UN agencies. Then I constantly analyzed UN and other IOs (or even some countries) reports on international problems to propose solutions, some of which have already been proven relevant [for example the reasonable 65 age limit proposal for country leaders that could have (if properly and publicly presented) convinced Saddam Hussein (65) to step down without killing]. All this work shows a strong 'commitment over time to the objectives and purposes of the UN'.

Next, I agree that the next SG should be a 'unifying figure that can develop solutions to challenges in diplomatic, economic and humanitarian fields' and you will note that I propose you 'unifying' projects or proposals - proposals that associate every country in the world. The proposal to add poverty reduction related objectives to the Kyoto protocol, for example, is a 'solution to a diplomatic, economic and humanitarian challenge' that associates every country. It is obvious that some countries including the US have refused to participate in the Kyoto protocol (because among other reasons, only few countries were imposed strong greenhouse gases reduction efforts). Adding poverty reduction related objectives (like behavioral changes) to the protocol will make sure that every country in the world is participating in the protocol (a diplomatic challenge) and is doing an effort to improve both the environment and the poverty situation (which are strongly related as we know). It will also help fighting the fear people may have to see poor countries destroying the planet as they start coming out of poverty and start polluting more (which will help us to defeat poverty). Finally it will create growth in rich countries, which should more than compensate the eventual diminution in economic activity due to the lowering of greenhouse gases production.

The proposal to create a new Internet International Organization (or new UN specialized agency) and to develop a new fair internet (site) fee system that is dependent on the use of the resources and the income generated (by sites) is a solution to economic and humanitarian challenges. It is obvious that the use of the Internet increased exponentially (about 1 billions user), but that it faces serious problems including the unfair registration fee paid by sites to registrars and registries. This proposal together with the computer project proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data, and the proposal to develop similar computer applications that can be used by every administration in the world will help to

resolve various economic and humanitarian problems. I also believe that it will be a major diplomatic achievement because **it will encourage countries to work together instead of fighting each other.** These proposals (together with the proposal described in the previous paragraph) by the way will also help to *'bridge the gap between the North and South'* and to *'repair the deep division that emerged in recent years'*.

Finally, the proposal to reform the international financial system to create a fair remuneration system and to prevent the outrageous differences in salary we see (an executive that makes 500 millions dollars and become a billionaire during her 5 months in jail...!), is also a solution to a great economic and humanitarian challenge. And it concerns you also, I don't know how much money a permanent representative at the UN makes, but it is surely not the million dollars that the University of Colorado football coach makes (not even for Mr. Bolton I am sure) although I am sure you all feel (and I agree) **that your work is very important to improve the life of billions of people around the world** (in fact much more important than the work of this football coach). It is critical that the people of the world see that 'we' understood that our system is still very unfair and imperfect, and that 'we' (you, the leaders of the world,) take steps to make it a better system.

To Make these proposals is not easy, it requires a very hard work, *'a broad understanding of the global issues facing the UN'*, *'a strong vision toward issues of the future'* and the *'ability to translate ideas into concrete action'*. It also requires to *'be able to work with every country in the world (all member states)'* as you will read below I contacted more than 150 country statistic directors to present my computer project proposal, before that I contacted many countries to obtain to information on their public health information systems, and, of course, I also contacted you and leaders regularly since 1999. And unfortunately for me, it requires also to *'be able to stand up to p-5 countries'* since as you know, not only I did not receive any help from France and the US, but on the contrary they have created me all the problems they could possibly create me, which forced me to denounce their dishonest behavior to the International Community and to the justice.

To conclude this section, I would like to 'say' that the very thorough UNA-USA report is still missing an important quality the next SG should have, or that it has ignored an important economic, technological, and societal reality of our time (2006). The UNA-USA has ignored (1) that there are already about 1 billions Internet USERS (perhaps 3 to 5 billions within the next 5 to 10 years, if we act intelligently; one estimate projects 1.8 billions in 2010), and about 70 millions sites; (2) that the Internet, at least in rich countries, is present in every economic area; (3) that it is already generating an important part of our economic activity, and (4) that administrations use it more and more to interact with citizens. The UNA-USA report has also ignored (5) that **computer applications and our information systems are key elements** to improve our economies; and (6) that very few economic reforms could be done without (or are not resulting from) the improvement of our information system. And therefore (7) that **a key element** to bridge the gap between the North and South, to resolve our economic problems, to resolve our development problems and to reach our millennium Goals **is the improvement of our international information systems and a better use of the Internet.**

This is a reality of our time, and the GA and Security Council must take this into consideration when selecting the next SG (that will be here hopefully for the next 5 to 10 years). An important role of the next SG will be to spread (or develop) the use of the Internet in poor countries and **to use it as efficiently as possible to resolve our global problems,** and this requires **more than** a 'good understanding of information technologies and information systems' (or **than** outstanding diplomatic skills); **it requires a proven ability to resolve computer applications and information systems problems at the world wide level.** The support letters for and the evaluation of my computer project proposal demonstrate that I have acquired this ability and that I can advise you on these complex technological issues. Since the UN has an important coordination role (the SG is chairman of the CEB), and, of course, UN missions coordinate in countries the UN effort in many different areas, it is critical to have a SG who understands the technical 'details' behind the development of Internet based computer applications common to every administration in the world (to eradicate poverty, and resolve our other global problems). This will take place during the next 5 to 10 years if we set our mind to it.

Computer project proposal, Letters to Country Leaders, IO Chiefs, Politicians and GA, my dispute against France and the US, a 14 years work.

I will now briefly describe the contents of my letters, discuss my work **over the past 14 years**, and ‘talk’ about my dispute against France and the US. The important first step was the submission of my computer project proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the worldwide level at the European INCO-Copernicus program on **September 24 1997**, even if this work started in 93 really (research from 1993 to 1997). The proposal was in a form of a cooperation project with partners in Armenia, Bulgaria, Poland, Greece, and England. Out of about 1300 projects presented in the call for proposal (and about 200 selected), this project ended up in the second place on the reserve list (I was told), and was found to be among other ‘*innovative, and well formulated*’. After I presented the proposal to country and international organization experts, several international organizations specialists sent me their encouragement and more that 20 countries responded (I contacted more than 150 countries, all the directors of the statistic office I could find the address of).

I also presented the project to Mr. Chirac on **April 29 1998** together with a brief explanation on the difficulties I had while working in a very corrupt local administration (I was fired in 1993 and threatened to have problems for the rest of my life if I did not accept to go without any compensation), but despite his encouragement, the government led by Mr. Jospin did not accept to finance the research or project, or even to give me a job. I then wrote a first letter to G8 leaders (excepted France) and to several IO Chiefs on **June 23 1999** to present my computer project proposal, and also to make some remarks concerning the grave unemployment problem in France (that affected me personally). On **November 23 1998**, I wrote a second letters to 7 IO chiefs (including MM. Annan, Wolfensohn ...) in which I commented into more detail the various responses I received from (international and national) experts around the world (or even from politicians like Prime Minister D’Alema of Italy), and I asked again these IOs to give me a job so that I can continue my effort in the appropriate environment (an IO).

On **April 23 2000**, I wrote again to G8 countries leaders and some IO. Chiefs to make additional remarks on the cause of the high unemployment level in France and the ‘poor’ result on the fight against poverty around the world. I stressed the importance of paying attention to the ‘time factor’ (and of showing that we have a strong conscience) to defeat poverty (I first introduced the idea of respecting the 65 age limit for Country Leaders and IO Chiefs in this letter). On **June 23 2000**, I wrote another letter to G8 Country leaders and IO Chief to denounce the lack of response (to my letters and proposals) from the World Bank and the UN Chiefs and asked MM.Wolfensohn and Annan to resign from their posts (I asked Mr. Wolfensohn to respect the 65 age limit, and for Mr. Annan, I commented the UN report conclusion on the Rwanda massacre, and reminded him of his comment on the UN being the conscience of the world!). On **March 27 2001** I wrote again to these leaders, and talked about the implications of some scientific discoveries (among other subjects). [The Appeal Courts reversed my justice decision and made me owe the administration \$20 000. And in 6/2001, the Administration pretended also it made a new error on the payment of my housing assistance to make me owe it another \$2000 and to sent me in the street (at the same time the Senator President of the administration that fired me was finally sent to jail!) On August 1 2001 I went to seek political asylum in Switzerland].

I wrote another letter to IO Chiefs, Country Leaders, the President of the GA, the Pope., on **December 23 2001** from Switzerland in which I explained the benefits of the 65 age limit proposal (**including to maintain peace around the world**). I also described the difficulties I had in my asylum application in Switzerland. In **February 2002**, I sought political asylum in Belgium, it was denied at the end of March 2002 with an illegal decision (non conform to the European convention principle, see ‘arret Conka’ sentencing Belgium). I arrived in the US on April 16 2002 and applied for political asylum soon after. On **May 29 2002**, I wrote to 8 large University Presidents to ask them for their support in defending my proposals and my application for asylum in the US. [In this letter I also mentioned that the 65 age limit proposal could eventually prevent a possible war with Iraq (Mr. Saddam Hussein was 65 in early 2003)].

On **January 14 2003**, I wrote a letter to Mr. Bush, US Congress leaders, some US personalities (MM.Turner, Gates, Schmalensee, Rehnquist, Greenspan,), Mrs. Frechette, Mr. Stern, to remind them of the importance of my 65 age limit proposal to prevent the then more than

possible conflict with Iraq, to stress the importance of not lying in our information society and to describe my difficulties with the US administration (only the UN responded an inappropriate response on behalf of Mr. Annan). **On April 7 2003**, I wrote to you, members of the UNGA and Security Council to denounce the silence of Mr. Annan on the 65 age limit; I discussed the issues behind the Iraq conflict, and reviewed Mr. Annan's work in various area including the management reform, Africa,. **On November 10 2003** I wrote to the US Congress,, to discuss some problems in the US (failure of political parties and universities to prepare young political leaders, unfair remuneration system,).

On March 10, April 28 and July 14 2004 I wrote 3 small letters to the US President and Congress to discuss some issues related to my lawsuit against the LA County, State of California, and the US, and to ask them to settle the lawsuit. Only Mr. Santorum responded an inappropriate response, so I responded to him **on August 23 2004**, in a letter also addressed to the US congress, the GA, IO Chiefs and the Nobel committees. In this letter I explained the link between the 65 age limit proposal for country Leaders and IO Chiefs and the unfair remuneration system that limit civil servants salaries while there is almost no limit to executives' salaries or stars' salaries. **On December 10 2004**, I wrote another letter to the US congress and government, the UNGA, EU parliament ... in which I described in detail my motivation, and my experience to make the computer project proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the world wide level. Then **on May 4 2005**, I wrote another letter to the US Congress, Government, the UNGA, politicians around the world to propose to associate **poverty reduction related objectives** (behavioral changes,) to the Kyoto protocol. [I also asked King and Queens to step down to respect the **article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the fundamental principle of democracy.**]

Finally, **on November 29 2005**, I wrote to you, to politicians and to personalities around the world to present some general remarks on our international problems (poverty, environment,) and proposed you a plan of action (or 'platform') to tackle our most pressing international issues. I discussed the conclusion of the WGIG and proposed to create a new Internet international organization to resolve the Internet problems (including develop a fair registration fee system) and to develop new computer applications that could be used by every country in the world like the one I presented you. I also described the petitions I filed at the US Supreme Court (so that it discourages civil servants to lie in the context of social services delivery) and at the European Court (so that it denounces among others the unfair legal aid system in France). All these letters were of course either supported by international or national studies or report or other research work, **and each of them contains details about the problems I had with the various administrations.** [If you want to receive a copy of one of these letters, please send me an email with a fax number and I will fax it to you]. To conclude this section and as a parenthesis, I would like to point out few elements of my dispute with France and the US, and ask them to end my undeserved difficulties.

[After the administrative Court ordered (in 10/98) the corrupt administration that illegally fired me in 93 to pay me about \$80 000 in compensation (and some retirement benefits, the judgment was ambiguously written), the administration first refused to pay and then made 3 payments over a nine months period adding up to about \$20 000 only! At the same time (2/99), it appealed the decision although I was obviously a grave victim of a grave corruption scandal and **the legal decision was more than justified.** There is no way that this administration could honestly appeal the decision and justify the firing of a conscientious employee (I had a good evaluation from my superior) **while at the same time it started to pay the wife of the President for no work** (a higher salary), especially when the President was committing fraud on his travel expenses and I was developing (and implementing) a computer application that would have prevented the fraud on travel expenses (moreover , at the same time in the related criminal case, the president and his wife had been found guilty, but they were not asked to return the illegal salaries because of a mistake of the administration)! About 9 months after the appeal, the new President of the administration signed an authorization to **defend** my appeal, and **after the hearing** (about 12 months after the appeals), he signed and filed an authorization to **appeal (document presented after the hearing should not be accepted according to the law)**. The court canceled the hearing (**that had already taken place**), accepted the document, reversed the judgment and made me owe the administration \$20 000 although I was very poor and had used up the money to live and to work on my project, I had stopped receiving welfare (GR, 'RMI')! It was not just the justice that cheated me, but also the new President of the administration, a politician, when he signed the authorization to appeal although he should have protected my interest (an employee victim's interest) in the criminal case that was going on at the same time against the former president and his wife (I was necessarily the

first victim of their frauds)! They covered up part of the administration and of the former president wrongdoings and made me pay twice although I only had done my work honestly, and of course, they tried to prevent me from defending my project! (Mr. Chirac, the Government, the local administration, and the justice were all informed about my proposal to the EC program.)]

[Here in the US, the INS issued me a verification of status stating that I am a refugee or that I had been granted asylum (I had applied for political asylum), but some (4) INS employees pretended that the status verifier had made a mistake in reading the record, and at the same time the LA County stopped paying me (after 2 months only) the refugee benefits to send me in the street! I questioned the status verifiers again, and they confirmed me that they had not done any mistake, and that they even had the date my asylum was granted, so I filed an administrative complaint. The judge certified my refugee status and ordered the LA County to pay me the refugee benefits, but the County refused to pay, and refused to follow the formal appeal procedure to criticize the decision. There is a principle called Res judicata that states that when an issue is addressed in Court and completely adjudicated (not appealed), it cannot be questioned afterward in another court of law (this applies also to administrative law judge decision). My refugee status was therefore certified, and it was even confirmed again in 12-14-04 by the DHS Nebraska refugee center when it issued me a refugee employment authorization card based on this judge decision, not on the INS record that had been in the mean time illegally altered. Despite all these certifications and confirmations, and the fact that the INS district director never terminated my refugee status (pursuant to 8 CFR 207.9, the appropriate procedure to terminate a refugee status), several civil servants and administrations pretended that I am an illegal alien to continue to send me in the street (to steal me the refugee privilege) and to prevent me from finding a job, from resettling, and from having a compensation from the civil court for all the trouble I had and the damage I suffered!]

[I again ask France and the US to acknowledge that the problems I encountered are (or were) significant of grave problems in France [repeated important corruption scandals in Paris region (Ile de France, Essonne,) and France (Elf.), problem of 'emploi fictifs',] and in the US [immigration problem (11 millions of illegal aliens, unfair asylum application process, unfair treatment of asylum of seekers ...), bad treatment of the poor...] and to recognize that I have been very unfairly treated by their administrations although I have always worked in the best interest of the community and explained my problems to justice in a proper way. I also asked them to end my unfair difficulties, to render me justice, and to compensate me for the unfair difficulties I had/have.]

UN Agenda and priorities, MDGs, Management reforms.

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', some of which I had not directly addressed in my letters, so I will make few remarks on 2 of these subjects (it would be too long to address them all here or to go into too much detail), but of course it is always possible to address again these subjects during future meetings. I will start with the millennium development goals because they will be affected by the plan to defeat poverty I presented you. The MGD were prepared by MM. Annan, Wolfensohn, Camdessus, and Johnston and the International Organizations they managed in cooperation with all member states, I believed. **MDG Goal 1 – to halve extreme poverty by 2015** (often called ambitious!), **was to me a little 'harsh', not to say inhuman.** To halve the number of people living in extreme poverty or living under \$1 a day by 2015 means that in 2015, after 15 years of effort from the International Community, **there would still be about 600 millions people living under 1 dollars a day!**

This objective should be re-evaluated I believe. As I mentioned in several of my letters, the 'time' is a critical factor in the fight against poverty because we absolutely must break the vicious cycle that lead to a number of poor that increases faster than the number of rich people. With about 3 billions people living under 2 dollars a day, it is obvious than more than half of the world population can be considered as poor and that the children of these poor will not inherit any money from their parents. A higher objective and a greater effort over a shorter period of time might therefore be a better strategy to tackle the poverty problem (or to break this demographic vicious cycle) than setting up low objectives over a long period of time [this is why I proposed you to attack the poverty problem from various angles]. I believe

also that these four gentlemen (and their colleagues) did not evaluate properly the evolution of the Internet and the possibility the Internet brings to defeat poverty.

Because of the rapid evolution of the Internet these last few years, of the great possibilities it brings to resolve the problems of poverty (and other global problems) faster, and of the proposal to add poverty reduction related objectives to the Kyoto protocol, I would be grateful to you if you accepted to re-evaluate **this Goal 1** and asked me (if you selected me as SG) and the 3 other organizations concerned to study the possibility to reset this particular objective to: **eradicating completely extreme poverty by 2016** (not 600 millions people, but 0 person living under \$1 a day by 2016). On this subject I would like to say also that the two proposals I make (adding poverty reduction related objectives to the Kyoto protocol, and creating a new Internet International Organization to, among others, develop application that can be used by every country in the world) would strongly support the objectives of **Goal 7** (Ensure environment sustainability) and **Goal 8** (Develop a global partnership for development). So of course, you should take this into consideration in your selection work, I believe.

I would like also to talk about the UN management reforms that seem to create some problems between members of the GA and with the vote of this year budget. I don't think anybody doubt that the UN needs an intelligent management reform, not even those who voted to delay the implementation of the plan of action presented by Mr. Annan on March 7 2006, or more precisely those who asked Mr. Annan and the UN Secretariat to present additional studies explaining the difference between this new set of reforms and the one presented in 1997 and later by the same Mr. Annan (who, by the way, had called them at the time the *'most extensive and far-reaching reforms in the fifty two years history of this organization'*). I think we now know that these *'extensive and far-reaching reforms'* lead to the greatest corruption scandal the UN has known in its 60 years history, so the request of the G77 and China are, to me, more than justified. [This task will force the UN Secretariat to think about what it has done wrong and to explain why what it wants to do is much better.]

Moreover, it is important to point out also that most of the problems described in the proposed reforms plan (human resources, IT, budget, procurement) took place at the Department of Management, and that this department has been lead for the past 10 or 20 years (it even seems to be a requirement or a 'tradition') by a US citizen recommended by the US government (I believe), so if there is one country that has had the chance to influence the organization and functioning of this Department over the years, and therefore that has an important responsibility (more than any other country in the world) in the actual UN problems, it is the US. So the US should first (a) offer **not** to 'impose' a US citizen as head of the Management Department, and second (b) ask to organize a formal **world-wide** search for the best possible candidate every time that this position is vacant (I would certainly suggest this reform if I were selected SG). Moreover, even if we understand that the US is eager to correct its errors (or to try to do better), it should be cautious, and not try to impose new (**possibly partly inappropriate**) reforms **with a threat to stop the payment of its dues**. [Especially after it presented incorrect information on WMD in Iraq to the Security Council in 2003].

Democracy does not give the possibility to the citizens who pay the highest taxes to vote the law or take the government's decision (even if rich democracies should make serious effort to prevent corruption), and in democracy the vote of the very poor has as much weight in the ballot as the vote of the very rich (or at least should have), so the effort to stop the payment of UN dues to impose a point of view or a reform is not conformed with one of the UN basic objectives (**the promotion of democracy**). The UN is **not** either a **business** in which member states are shareholders, and where the shareholders having the biggest stake (or the majority of stake) takes all the decisions. The UN is an international administration that is financed by **the people** of the world to perform specific tasks **in accordance to certain principles**. Rich countries or important donors of the UN should be careful not to encourage such a way of doing **because it will impede their efforts to promote democracy**. [It is also to me dangerous to create (or to 'maintain') a *'dictatorship of the rich'*, which gives (a) a right to decide what is good for society to the ones who pay the highest taxes or contribution to politicians campaigns only, or which gives (b) the possibility to **the market** and to **the rich people** to decide who and in which proportion people get rich.]

[In the US, the disproportionate salaries and the increasing costs of political campaigns have led to a dangerous disproportionate influence of the rich in the political process, which explains in part the lack of significant improvement of the living condition of the poor (about 2 millions homeless, 35 millions people living under the poverty level, 45 millions without health care coverage although the country has become significantly richer). I have addressed this issue in my last letter of 11-29-05, and of course **I believe that it is a fundamental issue the UN and the world have to face or to deal with urgently; this is why** I proposed you to address it by reforming the international financial system (and taking some related steps I described in my letter) to create a **fairer remuneration system** that would take more into consideration everyone relative contribution to society's progress and everyone's integrity. And I believe that the G77 + China have shown with their vote that they have understood one of the fundamental principle of democracy, and that they value the fact that their vote means something even though they are not the richest (or the strongest), **which is good for everyone**. [China is not yet a democracy, so the fact that it defends this principle at the UN is a good sign that it will be a great democracy one day, probably soon.]

Of course, I encourage every country to continue to work (or to start working again) **to reach a consensus on the reforms proposal** (some of which seem to be good sense reforms) **and budget associated problems** (to avoid that the UN Secretariat run out of money to finance its programs and operations), **and even to work on a more general reform of the UN Charter** (Security council composition...), **but** the G77 + China (and rich countries) **should not give up on the basic objectives of the UN (promotion of democracy and of human rights), and on the fundamental principles of democracy**. Au contraire, they should help the US (and other rich countries) to improve their political system (**to improve their democracies**). US politicians are under a lot of pressure to vote laws that please the important (and rich) contributors of their campaigns, and they are not at all paid in relation with their important contribution to society's progress. A representative, for example, is elected **every 2 years** and makes around \$250 000 per year, which is much (much) less that a football player or a movie star although his/her role in society is critical (and obviously his/her job is very 'unstable'). The US and its politicians need the help of the UN (other UN agencies) and of other countries (particularly poor countries) to change this imperfect political and remuneration systems.

If I am elected SG, I will work to improve the US, French and other rich countries remuneration and political systems (as much as I will help poor countries) because it is critical to solve our global problems. I have criticized France and the US for the wrongdoings of their administrations (in my case and in general) and for the imperfections of their systems, but, at the same time, I believe that 'we' are closer in France and in the US (or some other rich countries) to build a perfect **modern and industrialized** society and political system than 'we' are in the Burkina Faso (no offence to our friends from the Burkina Faso). This is why I encourage everyone of you and every country to (**peacefully**) help France and the US (and other rich countries) to build this perfect political system (while continuing to improve 'your' 'own' political system). And, of course, I encourage everyone of you (**including US and French politicians**) to 'seriously consider' my 'platform' or set of proposals, and my application for the post of Secretary-General so that 'we' get closer from this perfect political system and form of society, protect our environment more actively, and take billions of people out of poverty including me.

Conclusion.

To conclude, I would like to thank the Canadian UN mission, the United Nations Association-USA, and those of you (and others) who contributed to the UNA-USA report (if others published their point of view also and I did not see it, then I apologize to them, my work conditions are still precarious). Even if the points of view expressed in the reports do not necessarily represent the GA positions, they give the possibility to candidates to comment them and to express their own views on the relevant issues to facilitate your selection work. I want also to say that I perfectly understand that this SG selection process is an '*important matter*' and serious job for you, and that I hope you understood that it is also a very '*important matter*' for me.

The 'platform' I presented you aims: at (1) **giving governments** (and the people they represent) **a better control over what is going** on in their countries and around the world by

pace the greenhouse gases reduction to the poverty reduction (or increase in economic activities and pollution in poor countries), and by reforming the international financial system (to create a fair remuneration system.); at (2) **bringing more justice in the world** by improving our legal aid system and making civil servants more accountable, particularly toward the poor (including judges); at (3) **'coordinating' the effort of 'churches' and religious groups in the fight against poverty** (encourage them to start thinking about their role in a world free of poverty, to promote justice while continuing to encourage charity.); and at (4) **showing more respect toward the new generation and the poor** by imposing a 65 age limit for country Leaders and IO chiefs, and by correcting obvious injustices like the privilege given to Kings and Queens head of states.

Finally, there is (4) a strong emphasis on **the improvement of countries and IOs information systems, on the development and intelligent use of the Internet** to resolve our global problems, and on a **better use of our information society**. I believe that member states should **take** the rapid evolution of the Internet and the great possibility it brings to resolve our global problems **into consideration when selecting the next SG**. And that they should recognize and stress that computer applications have played an important role in our society's recent progresses and can help building a better world by selecting a SG who not only understands this important role, but has also a proven ability to resolve computer applications and information systems problems at the world wide level.

I stay at your service to bring you any precision you may need to evaluate my application and remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Genevier

PS: I have tried to fax my letters to as many missions as I could, but sometimes the fax is busy and I cannot resend it, so please forward this letter to the missions I would not be able reach. Thank you.