

Pierre GENEVIER
18 Rue des Canadiens, App. 227
86000 Poitiers

Tel. : 09 80 73 50 18 ; Mob. : 07 82 85 41 63 ; Courriel : pierre.genevier@laposte.net.

Poitiers, February 7th, 2020

Dr. James P. Clements
President
Clemson University
201 Sikes Hall
Clemson, SC 29634

Object: Proposals submitted to the International Community; difficulties encountered while doing the research work; and Clemson University's help to evaluate the significance of my research work and proposals. [PDF version at: <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-dr-Clements-7-2-20.pdf>].

Dear Dr. Clements,

1. I am a former student of the Department of Mathematical Sciences (87), and I take the liberty of writing you (1) to present you a research work I made and some proposals I submitted to the international community, (2) to describe you briefly the grave difficulties I encountered mainly because of my work and proposals, and (3) to ask you for your help and the help of Clemson University to evaluate the significance of the work and proposals I made. The proposals concern all the UN member states, so Clemson University's and *your* evaluation of these work and proposals would **be useful to many people around the world**, and *you may* accept to help even though this kind of request may not fall within Clemson University's duty or yours.

2. Before I start, I must say that I have *discussed* some of the subjects I will mention here with Dr. Kostreva, a former professor in the Math Sciences Department, who is now retired, and who was very kind to write me a letter in 2018 ([exh. 0.3](#)) to help me in one of my legal cases, so I attach here the letter I am sending him concurrently ([exh. 0.2](#)); and I am also writing concurrently to Dr. James ([exh. 0.1](#)), who heads the School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences. I have also written several times to the UN General Assembly, to the US Congress, and to 8 US University Presidents to talk about the subjects I will discuss here, including on December 6th, 2017 ([exh. 1](#)), and more recently in 2019 [see my application for a position at the UN on 8-16-19 ([exh. 2](#)), my complaints against France to the *UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of Human Rights Defenders*, [exh. 7](#), [exh. 8](#) (French)], but, so far, I have not received an appropriate answer ([exh. 2](#), [exh. 2.2](#)). If the UN member states decided to analyze the proposal I presented **in my 8-16-19 application** at the OHCHR ([exh. 2](#)), they would need some time to do it because many people are concerned (in each country), so they **may** still be doing it (in any case I believe it is important to discuss it publicly and urgently).

A The unconstitutionality of the French legal aid system.

3. I will first present you *the efforts I made* to have *the French legal aid system judged unconstitutional*, because to understand the weaknesses of our LA system is necessary to evaluate the pertinence and significance of **one of** the proposals I will discuss here (**no 20-21**), and because this work has caused me a great deal of problems. This work is not really within your *scientific fields* of expertise (*computer science* and *operations analysis*, I believe) or the ones of the School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences professors, but *you* (and Clemson University ...) can still give a pertinent evaluation of my arguments, I believe, because **mostly good sense** is necessary to give an honest point of view on this matter. The actual legal aid law in France was passed **in 1991**, but I only started denouncing its unconstitutionality twenty years ago (**in 1999**) when I was forced to use it in the context of an administrative proceeding to contest my illegal dismissal from the Department of Essonne in 1993 [please see detailed explanations in the 12-6-17 letter ([exh. 1, no 14-15](#))].

1) The main problems of the law, and the lies and treacheries of the highest Courts in France to refuse to judge on the merits my petitions to have the law judged unconstitutional.

4. I have described the problems of the law in my December 6th, 2017 letter ([exh. 1, no 3-13](#)), so I will only summarize them here. The legal aid law assigns (1) *an hourly rate* to be paid to the legal aid lawyer (which is **around 50 euros per hour**, and has changed very little since 1991), and (2) *a number of hours* to be paid for each type of **proceedings** [like *first instance administrative complaint, appeal in administrative complaint, first instance civil complaint, first criminal complaint, ...*; for the proceedings in front of the Supreme Courts, it is a fixed amount of **382 euros**, paid to *the specialized lawyers* in these Courts]; but, even though the *hourly rate* paid is not so bad for a beginner lawyer, it represents only 1/3 (ore less) of the *average hourly rate* charged by an average law firm having 2 or 3 lawyers (with a secretary); and *the number of hours* paid (for each type of *proceedings*) represents – in most *cases* - **only 1/10 or less** the *number of hours* that an experienced lawyer would charge to his normal clients, so the lawyers who are **assigned** to legal aid missions have to finance (very) significant amounts of money every time they do a legal aid mission, which they cannot do (most of the time) and have no real honest reason to do (or simply do not want to do), so the poor rights are violated constantly and systematically in front of the justice.

4.1 As examples, I would like to use two of my legal proceedings: **(1) in 2012**, I filed a petition in the administrative supreme court, and the **specialized** lawyer assigned to my case was asking a **4500 euros fee** for the proceeding, and the legal aid law paid only **382 euros**, so he pretends that he financed **4118 euros**, but, in fact and instead, he did not provide the service he provides to his normal clients, and I lost the proceeding; and **(2) in my (2011 to now) criminal proceeding** that I described in the letter to Dr. Kostreva ([exh. 0.2](#)), the legal aid law pays **200 euros** for this kind of proceeding, although my particular case has (1) facts over a **more than 30 years period** (1987 to now), (2) **more than 10 criminal offenses**, and (3) several complex legal issues linked to the types defendants involved (business, top business executives...), so an average lawyer would ask a **minimum of 7 or 8 000 euros just to start** on this complaint (!).

4.2 Money is an important and obvious problem [the UK spends **5 times** what France spends for its legal aid system although it has a **population size** and a **level of wealth** that is **equivalent** to France's!], **but it is not the only problem**; there are also several other grave problems that affect the quality of the service rendered like: (1) the fact that the LA lawyers have no obligation to do their work properly and honestly, and that there is no way to control the work they are doing; (2) the fact that the poor cannot complain against the lawyers and the legal aid offices employees who do not do their job properly and honestly (...) (see also [exh. 10.3, no 20](#)).

5. Also about 100 000 legal aid requests are denied every year **without even analyzing** the contents of the requests according to a 2014 parliamentary report ([exh. 1, no 3-3.1](#)), so the poor are also robbed of their chance to justice at the level of the legal aid offices (!). Several parliamentary reports since 2001 (see [exh. 1, p. 39](#)) have pointed out these graves problems (and others too), but they never clearly stated that the legal aid law was unconstitutional, even if they indirectly recognized it. The lawyers, the government, and the politicians pretend that the lawyers do a great job, and are very generous since they loose money all the time, but, in fact, the poor are robbed constantly, and they (almost) always loose their cases [according to the statistics, the lawyers obtain the payment of their normal fee (when the case is won) in only **0,01 % of the cases**]. First, I have denounced the dishonesty of the law at the European Court **in 2001**, and in my **2002** US asylum application; and since we can now (since **2010**) denounce the unconstitutionality of law in front of the Constitutional Court (with a screening process in front of the lower courts), I have denounced it in front of the judiciary and administrative supreme courts, and at the Constitutional Supreme Court in 2015, but they cheated to avoid judging **the merits** of my petitions.

6. In the most recent decision **on 9-25-19** ([exh. 10.5](#)) taken in the context of my criminal case, the judiciary supreme court pretended that my **question** (petition, QPC, [exh. 10.4](#)) was **not serious** because **the legal aid law's objective is to guarantee that the poor have a fair trial**, which is a **very absurd and dishonest ground** to refuse to forward the petition to Constitutional court, because the objective of the QPC (my petition, my critic of the LA law) was precisely to ask the Court to decide whether the objective of the law is reached, namely to decide if the law pays enough fees to the lawyers to make sure that they can defend the poor honestly and efficiently in Court (which is obviously not the case as we have just seen it, see also [exh. 10.3, no 37-41](#)). The most recent parliamentary report dated **7-23-19** ([exh. 10.2](#)) is also very dishonest because **it ignored** all the arguments and accusations I had presented to the 2 representatives who wrote it, to justify the fact the law violates the poor rights **systematically**, and several other grave problems of the law that the previous parliamentary reports had identified [I have commented the dishonest report at [exh. 10.3](#), but it is **in French**, so it may not be immediately useful to you.].

2) The grave consequences of the dishonest law, of the dishonest decisions on my petitions to criticize the LA law, and of the recent parliamentary report, for the poor, for the French Society and for the International Community.

7. The consequences of the dishonest legal aid law, of the dishonest decisions on my petitions to criticize the LA law, and of the recent parliamentary report on the LA law, **are very grave** (a) for + **14 million French poor**, including me, (b) for the French society, and (c) for the International community **(1) because** the dishonest LA law robs the poor **systematically** in Court, increases significantly the cost of justice, and makes the justice and society **very corrupt**; **(2) because** the dishonest decisions on my petitions to criticize the LA law prevented tens of thousands (if not millions) of poor, including me, from obtaining a compensation for the injustices they were victims of since 1991 because of the dishonest law [when the constitutional court finds a law unconstitutional, it can also allow the victims of the dishonest law to obtain justice **retroactively**; this means that, in this case, all the poor victims of the LA law **since it was voted in 1991** could ask for a compensation for the injustice they suffered; for me the LA law was used to rob me of my chance to obtain justice **in 5 different cases since 1998** (!, see **no 8-9**); **(3) because** the decisions on my QPC, the refusal of the UN to send **an urgent appeal**, and the recent parliamentary report on the LA law, **will help the government to maintain the dishonest LA law** or a similar new law, and **to continue robbing the poor**; **(4) because** the decisions on my QPC, the UN refusal to send **my urgent appeal** (**exh. 7.2, exh. 2, no 5.1**), and the recent parliamentary report on the LA law **rob me the intellectual work I have done** to criticize this law, and indirectly **diminish the pertinence of my proposal to develop a new more efficient and less costly LA system** [that can be used everywhere around the world, which will hurt billions of poor and less poor around the world), and the pertinence of **the strategy** I defend to defeat poverty, to decrease inequalities (and more generally to resolve our global problems, environment ...) and to achieve the SDG [see vision statement, **exh. 4**, **no 12-27**].

8. **On December 24th 2019**, the administrative supreme court **confirmed** (it was **implicit** since 2010) in one of its decisions that the victims of the unconstitutionality of a law can ask for the compensation of the prejudice they have suffered because of the dishonest law when the constitutional court has found the law unconstitutional, and if the Court has allowed such compensation in its decision, so you understand that when the judiciary, administrative and constitutional supreme courts cheated several times **either (a)** to prevent the transfer of my petition on the legal aid law to the Constitutional court, **or (b)** to avoid judging the merits of the petition for the constitutional court, they did not just rob me of my chance to justice and to obtain a compensation for the prejudice I suffered in 5 different cases since 1998, but they also robbed 100 000s of poor (if not millions of poor) victims of the law since 1991, and covered **many criminal offenses**. Also the problem is not just the legal aid law, there are also **several rules of procedure** like *the obligations to have a lawyer in court (in many different types of proceedings)* and *the short delay to file certain memorandum* that **are also unconstitutional** when the legal aid law is unconstitutional [!, **exh. 1, no 5-6, 17-19**, my QPC, **exh. 10.4** (French)].

9. To explain better the gravity of the problem, I would like to give you a recent example. Few years ago, President Hollande's government passed a **tax law** forcing large corporations with foreign subsidiaries to pay a new additional specific tax; and after 3 or 4 years, a lawyer of one of these corporations noticed that this new tax law was unconstitutional, so they filed a complaint and a petition to have the law judged unconstitutional, and the Constitutional Court agreed with them, abolished the law, and judged that these big corporations were entitled to obtain their money back, **about 10 billions euros**. The government negotiated with them and it eventually paid **5 billions euros** to these big corporations. In the case of the legal aid law, the consequences of the unconstitutionality of the law are **not only financial** or the loss of money for the victims, since the unconstitutionality of the legal aid law has also caused **the violations of criminal statutes** (or criminal offenses); for example, in my criminal case, it has been used to obstruct justice; this means that to recognize the unconstitutionality of the legal aid law, **could be used to reopen many criminal cases** over 30 years periods, or even to press charges against some judges, politicians and lawyers (...); and **this is, in part, why, I believe, the courts have repeatedly cheated on my petitions** to have the law judged unconstitutional, **why** the politicians refuse to admit that the law violates consistently the rights of the poor, even though it is obvious, and **why they rob me and persecute me**.

9.1 Presenting a petition to question the constitutionality of a law is not illegal obviously (since we can officially do it in France since 2010), **but a petition against the legal aid law** that has been in effect since 1991 **and whose unconstitutionality lead to many criminal offenses** every year is necessarily a **grave criminal accusation** made against **the highest judges** in the country [like **the Presidents** of the **judiciary supreme court** and of the **administrative supreme court who run** (with the lawyers) and maintain the dishonest LA system for the poor; **who are** some of the highest experts in the law; and **who have** a duty to design honest legal aid and **justice systems**], and they perfectly understand that. The (dishonest) organization of our justice system makes it impossible to make the justice system progress as we see it here on the legal aid subject. **The highest judges** in France (of the judiciary and administrative supreme courts...) who are supposed to judge whether the legal aid law is (or could be) unconstitutional or not, are **not impartial judges** on this particular LA subject **because they run the LA system** with the lawyers (when they judges whether a legal aid application presents a serious cause of action or not), and **they are also guilty (1) of having maintained** the dishonest legal aid system (that violates the rights of the poor systematically) for almost 30 years and **(2) of having committed** probably **millions criminal offenses** against the poor over a 30 years period, and they don't want to admit that, so they cheat and the problem is not resolved

9.2 And the UN (and M. Guterres, UNSG) who can and has (have) a duty to denounce the dishonesty of the French LA system, of our judges (and politicians), and of the organization of our justice system, **so far says (say) nothing - perhaps -** (1) because France is one of the **5 permanent member of the UN Security Council with veto power** (including for the selection of the UNSG), so covering up the dishonesty of M. Macron (...) will help M. Guterres being reelected, (2) because **so far** the press and media have not talked about this problem (...), **- perhaps -** (3) because talking about this problem would, at the same time, trigger a discussion on my proposals and point out the UN's grave failure to use the Internet more efficiently (there are probably other possible reasons too like the hate for the poor, the incompetence and dishonesty of some employees).

3) How Clemson University could help on this issue.

10. The **implicit** argument of the government, judges and lawyers on this legal aid subject is that *'the hourly rate paid (to the lawyer...)* and the **number of hours paid to do a complex intellectual work** have no impact on the quality of the intellectual work that is done (by the lawyer ...)' which is **necessarily false** because if it were true, we would pay the President of France (...), the politicians, the judges, the **professors of mathematics** ..., the minimum wage to do their work, and obtain the same quality of work; and we know this is no true and it is not possible. The amount of money paid to the lawyer is not the only problem of the LA law (as explained above and in my various letters, and you have to remember also that, because of **the many obligations to have a lawyer** in court, **the poor are forced to use the LA system!**), but this problem put forward a **grave intellectual fault** that cannot be innocent, and the refusal of the politicians, judges, and lawyers to admit it, is very grave, so a group of **interested** professors could point out (**publicly** in some way) this grave intellectual fault as well as some of the other obvious problems of the law I identified (and encourage the UN and France to admit that there is a grave problem).

11. The unconstitutionality of the French legal aid system was a key issue of my US asylum application in 2002 (!, [exh. 1, no 14.1, 14.5](#)), so to establish that the law is unconstitutional confirms – even more – (a) the well founded of my asylum application and (b) **the grave injustice** I was victim of in the US when the US administration deported me with a deportation order saying that I never applied for asylum (see no 28-34).

B The 1997 proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the worldwide level (presented in a European Program), and the strategy to defeat poverty (...) it underlines.

1) The strategy to fight poverty presented by the 3 recipients of the 2019 Nobel Prize in Economic.

12. To justify **the significance** of my proposals made to the International Community, I would like first to talk to you about *my scientific adversaries* (or *the competition*, if I can say so) in the area of **the strategy to defeat poverty**. Even though **my 1997 proposal** to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the worldwide level [see [exh. 11.1](#), [exh. 11.2](#), [exh. 11.3](#)], and *my more recent proposal to develop a more efficient and less costly legal aid system*, no 20-21] is (are) **complex technical proposal** (s) that aims (aim) to resolve a **specific global problem** (s), it (they) also underlines (underline) **a strategy to defeat poverty faster** (... , **and to resolve other global problems faster**), so I will compare my work and strategy to the work and strategy of **the 3 economists** who won the Nobel Prize in Economy in 2019 [Mrs. Duflo of France, Mr. Banerjee of India, and Mr. Kremer of the US]. These 3 professors have *'introduced a new approach to obtaining reliable answers about the best way to fight global poverty'* [according to the Nobel committee, it writes also *'in brief, it involves dividing this issue into smaller, more manageable, questions – for example, the most effective interventions for improving educational outcome or child health. They have also shown that these smaller, more precise, questions are often best answered via carefully designing experiments among the people who are most affected'*].

13. I am not questioning the interest of the science behind *their approach (strategy)*, or the benefits this approach brings to resolve **certain** poverty problems, I am just saying that *the approach (strategy)* I presented in 1997 **has much greater benefits** than the one they proposed. I proposed in 1997 that we **take advantage of** and **built on** the knowledge and experience we have acquired in rich countries in certain areas to develop **global computer (Internet) applications** and **systems** that can help us **(1) resolve** certain global problems, including in poor countries, of course; and, at the same time, **(2) 'transmit'** to poor countries the knowledge and experience we have acquired. And, as example, I had used *the problem of integrating and transferring statistical data (at the worldwide level)*, and proposed to create **an international classification and codification of all the statistical data** [used in International organizations ...] and to develop *a methodology and a computer system* to transfer the statistical data *in real time* from countries to international organizations. **The benefits** of such a strategy (approach) in the fight against poverty (...) **are enormous**.

2) The many benefits of the strategy to fight poverty I presented together with my 1997 proposal.

14. For example, the Nobel Committee wrote *'As a direct result of one of their studies, more than five million Indian children have benefited from effective programmes of remedial tutoring in schools. Another example is the heavy subsidies for preventive healthcare that have been introduced in many countries.'*, of course, helping five million children is always a good result, but, in comparison, **the development of the new more efficient and less costly legal aid system** and of the two global computer applications necessary to implement it around

the world [including the creation of an international codification and classification of the case types that are judged every years around the world] **could help** potentially **billions of poor people around the world** [as explained in 8-16-19 UN application ‘an estimated **4 billion people** are not living under the protection of the law’, see [exh. 2](#)], and the entire planet also because such system presents also **many significant benefits** in areas like (1) the fight against terrorism, and transnational and organized crime; (2) the diminution of the overall cost of justice systems, and the improvement of their efficiency; (3) the diminution of unsolicited immigration (...).

15. The strategy I proposed allows us (a) to reach **billions of people at the same time** [with the development of one or more specific applications], and (b) to transfer [- to poor countries -] the knowledge and experience we have acquired in rich countries and the advanced computer systems we will develop, so it can save a lot of money and **years of trials and errors** like we did it in France in the legal aid area! Of course, such a strategy can only be applied to resolve certain specific **common global** problems, like, for example, in the justice area where all countries have agreed to respect human rights (even if they not all succeed equally), but there are still **quite a few areas** where it can be applied (environment, economics,). Since 1997, I described these many benefits to the UN, World Bank and other International organizations managers, and, of course, to France and its politicians; and I also explained the consequences this strategy had on the effort to find the most appropriate **Internet Governance**, but they have ignored my remarks completely, and they have failed completely in the area of the Internet Governance. As example, the 4 Internet Governance proposals presented by the 2005 WGIG that were rejected by the US, were completely inappropriate (see no 23-25).

3) How could Clemson University help on this issue.

16. As you understand it, I am not jealous of Mrs. Duflo and of the other 2 2019 Nobel Prize Winners in Economics; they have used statistics and economics to help find better solutions to certain specific poverty problems, so they have done a serious job. Moreover, there are not so many women who get the prize, so this prize has also a wider purpose; and, since defeating poverty is difficult, we should use all the possible techniques to do so. But, intellectually speaking and for the benefits of the billions of people living on earth, it is still important to point out (1) that the practical solution and approach to defeat poverty faster (**and to resolve several other common global problems**) I presented **in 1997** (at about the same time, as Mrs. Duflo and her colleagues presented their solution) has been ignored by the UN, World Bank, their leaders and others [including by the MIT poverty lab ..., and several important economists I contacted at the time, like Mr. Stiglitz, Chief Economist at the World Bank (in 1997...), or Jeffrey Sachs, a Special Advisor (on the MDG and SDG) to several UN Secretary General (s) (!)], and (2) that **it should be discussed publicly** and used for everyone’s benefit. And here again, a group of *interested* Clemson professors could point out (**publicly in some way**) this grave intellectual fault and the urgency to correct it.

17. Also, *the persecutions* that I was victim of for doing my work that has clearly at least one of its objectives that is identical to Mrs. Duflo (et al.) objective to fight poverty, and **the complete silence** about my work and proposals **while, at the same time**, Mrs. Duflo and her colleagues were well supported in their work since the mid 1990, and then received the highest distinction for a scientist for their work (!), **are disproportionate**, and must be mentioned publicly, I believe. It is due **in part** also to the refusal of **the economists to loose a part of the intellectual influence** they had during **the 20th centuries at the profit or benefit of the computer scientists** (application software development ...) and experts. **8 of the ten richest Americans** have become very rich because of one (or several) **computer application (s)** they have developed or sold [**Bezos, Gates, Zuckerberg, Ellison, Page, Brin, Bloomberg, Balmer**], so we can say that the development of computer applications has plaid a **very important economical role** in the world during **the past 30 years about**, but, at the same time, we have not seen any change in the structure of our *international (...)* institutions; **the chief economist position** is still the main *intellectual* position (if I can say so) at the World Bank and the IMF for example; and **the head of data processing** is still **the fifth wheel of the carriage** (as we say in French) at the UN [although almost all the economical progresses we make *nowadays* are mainly due to the improvement of our information systems, and therefore to the computer applications we develop and implement.].

18. And the economists show very little respect for the computer science and applications experts. I have read quite a few books, articles, and reports to the UN, written by Mr. Stiglitz, Mr. Sachs [...], and some French economists (Piketty, Bourguignon, ...), and there is no doubt that they are bright and knowledgeable, but Mr. Stiglitz, Mr. Sachs, mainly (and also Mrs. Duflo, and some of her colleagues) **that I contacted starting in 1997**, have made, I believe, an important and grave mistake (fault) when they ignored my proposals (and the underlying strategy) and when they did not see the important role the Internet could play to help us resolve our

economical (and other global) **problems**, and in particular the poverty problem [when they were *Chief economist* at the World Bank, and Special Adviser of the UN Secretary Generals]. Mr. Annan appointed an economist to head the WGIG in 2005, and this was also grave management fault that has cost the lives of (and suffering for) many people around the world. [The World Bank InfoDev Program sent a stupid response to my 1997 proposal, I believe also.]

19. The timing of the prize. **May be** the Nobel Committee hurried up to give them the prize **this year** in case somebody finally starts talking about the proposals I made and compares the possibilities they give to resolve the problem of poverty faster with the strategy they proposed. Also, at the same time, the Prize gives some credit to **Harvard** and **MIT** for helping in the fight to defeat poverty even though they obviously missed several opportunities to support in some way my research and proposals since 2002 (and after) when I wrote to them to talk about my proposals; and they (Harvard and other famous law schools, Columbia,) have failed to develop a fair legal aid system (**and more generally a fair justice system for the poor**) in the US. I am sorry (and I am disappointed) that these famous universities' **school of law** did not point out the fact (1) that the French legal aid system is very dishonest and robs the poor systematically, and (2) that it makes our entire justice system a fraud and very corrupt; doing it would have pointed out **their own failure** also, so perhaps they preferred to remain silent. Sadly, the intellectuals in France (professors of law,) also have an obvious responsibility in the fact that the dishonest LA system was maintained almost 30 years (at this day!).

C The 2015-2019 proposal to develop a (more efficient and less costly) legal aid system and the 2 necessary global computer applications (to implement it around the world), and the proposal on the Internet Governance.

1) The many benefits of my proposal to develop a more efficient and less costly legal aid system (...).

20. I proposed to develop a more efficient and less costly legal aid system and the 2 necessary global computer applications to implement it around the world in the context of my (informal) 2016 UNSG application ([exh.3](#); and [exh.4](#)), and my 2019 application ([exh.2](#)); and I described it into more details in my 12-6-17 letter to the UN, US Congress ... ([exh.1](#)), and in my 3-30-19 letter to the French Parliament (French, [exh.8](#)). It aims (1) at correcting all the problems of our very dishonest legal aid system (**and at improving the entire justice system**) in France, and (2) at finding an organization that allows us to improve significantly the efficiency of the system while at the same decreasing the cost significantly; and it requires (a) the creation of **a group** of dedicated-to-legal-aid **judges** [under the joint responsibility of countries' administrations and the UNOHCHR] who will be in charge of judging the legal aid requests, of organizing and encouraging a mediation whenever it is possible, and, if not, of preparing the cases sent to the regular court systems and of rendering well motivated decisions; and (b) the creation of **a group** of dedicated-to-legal-aid **lawyers** [under the joint responsibility of countries' administrations and the UNOHCHR] who will be in charge of helping the poor in the mediation phase and in front of the courts.

21. The two global computer (Internet) applications necessary to implement it will help **(1) the judges** in their effort to judge the legal requests, to encourage mediation (and if not to prepare the cases to simplify the regular judges' work), and **(2) the lawyers** in their effort to help the poor; and, at the same time, they will record the time spent by both groups to resolve the different cases. The system requires also the creation of **an international classification and codification of all the different types of cases** judged every year around the world, so that we can easily (a) compare the calculated statistics between the different countries, (b) optimize the efficiency of LA and justice systems everywhere, and (c) improve our international and national justice information systems. *The classification and codification of all the types of cases will be eventually (in time) used* by the regular or **entire justice system** (not just the one dedicated to the judgment of the legal aid requests of the poor) and will help us improve the efficiency of the **entire justice system** in each country. I already described you above some of the many benefits of such a system, and you can probably imagine them also. As seen above, the initial 1997 proposal had consequences in the debate **on the Internet governance**, and this new proposal confirms the pertinence of my proposal to create a new Internet IO.

22. Dr. Kostreva sent me (in 2018) an article written by mathematicians who developed **a high-level simulation model of the criminal justice system** to help the managers make better decisions ([exh.18](#)), their simulation model is able to help the managers answer certain management questions with **a limited amount** of information. I was not surprised to read that some mathematicians were trying to help improve the functioning of the justice system, but one of the keys to improve the efficiency and to decrease the cost of our justice systems is to be able to evaluate

precisely the time that the different *parties* (policemen, prosecutors judges, ...) spend to resolve (investigate, judge...) a particular case, this is why it is so important to have the appropriate computer systems and an efficient information system to do that. Also because **(1) of the nature of the modern criminal activities** (terrorism, transnational and organized crime,), and **(2) of the high cost of developing and maintaining efficient computer systems**, it is also important to have access to the information other countries gather, and to cooperate to develop common global systems to resolve our common problems, and to diminish the cost and to improve the efficiency of our justice systems.

2) My (related) proposal to create a new Internet IO and how Clemson University could help on these issues.

a) **The arguments I presented to support the creation of a new Internet IO.**

23. The two proposals I made are – technically speaking – complex proposals to implement and to maintain, so, after I presented the proposal in 1997, **the question** of which international organization (UN, OECD, World Bank, IMF ...) should be *the coordinator*, **was**, - at least for me and indirectly or implicitly for the organizations I contacted, **an important question**. And it is obvious that none of the Ios had the technical competence and expertise to manage such (**full scale**) project; and since **they** refused to give me a job and to finance **my 250 000 ECU (or euros) research project**, which would have given them and us important information on the different problems we could encounter, and some expertise in this area, they [in particular the UN and the World Bank] did not present **an appropriate Internet Governance Solution** that the US could support (for example through the WGIG in 2005). And the worst is that they completely ignored the arguments I presented in this subject during their own debates at the UN [please see my proposal on the Internet Governance described in the 11-29-05 ([exh. 3.4](#)) and 12-6-17 ([exh. 1](#)) letters, my 2016 vision statement ([exh. 3.2](#)), and the 2016 letter to US Congress ([exh. 12.1](#))].

24. Many people (**100s of millions, billions even**) have suffered **(1) because of the refusal of France** (and politicians like **M. Strauss-khan** who, we now know, **was very corrupt and dishonest**, MM. Chirac, Jospin,) to support my 1997 proposal with a job, or a recommendation for a job in an **International organization** (like the UN, OECD, World, ...) or simply by financing **the extra cost** above 250000 Ecu that was my (part-time) salary for the project; and **(2) because of the refusal of the UN and the World Bank** (a) to support my 1997 proposal with a job to work on my project (among other duties), or by financing **a part of my project** for the World Bank (through the InfoDev program), (b) to use the Internet more efficiently (and to develop global computer applications ...), and (c) to take into consideration my pertinent arguments on the Internet Governance. **I am not blaming the US Senators and Representatives on the Internet governance issue**; in 2005 the WGIG (UN) proposals were not good and appropriate proposals, so, to me, **the US had to reject them**, and it did (many people in the US do not like the UN, and some think that the US pays a contribution to the UN that is too high, but it was not a reason to present bad proposals!).

25. And then later during their hearings (including in 2015-2016), they listened **(1) to ICANN high-level officials** (a) who defended the work that they were doing (and the multi-stakeholder governance architecture they had put in place), (b) who wanted to maintain the same type of Internet governance, (c) who obviously were not knowledgeable on (and not interested in) the global problems the UN and its members states have to resolve, and (d) who ignored the many benefits for the US associated with the creation of a new Internet IO, and **(2) to independent experts** (who were not either knowledgeable on and not interested in the global problems the UN and its members states have to resolve), **but no one** from the UN or the World Bank came to explain to them how the Internet could help us resolve the global problems we (the UN, UN members states, World Bank, ...) have to resolve and **why a new Internet IO** presented many benefits **for the US**. It was a grave **management** fault, the UNSG and the President of the World Bank should have been at these hearings and explain why a new Internet IO was **good for the US** and for the World.

*** **25.1** The US Senators and Representatives asked some very good questions; and they wanted to take a good and not partisan decision (most of them at least, it seemed to me), but some very important arguments were not discussed, and some ICANN officials tried to scare them of (equaling the UN to China and Russia, for example; although it is obvious that several other countries like the US, France, the UK, Japan ... have also an important influence at the UN, and there are 192 members who have an equal vote!).***

b) **Concerning my proposal to improve the legal aid systems around the world.**

26. Concerning *my proposal to improve the LA systems*, the arguments I presented to support it have not been discussed **publicly** in France or even taken into consideration in *the Députés* recent report (dated 7-23-19, [exh. 10.2](#), see my remarks on this report at [exh. 10.3](#)). And the UN is (it seems at this time) ignoring the problem and the

solution I propose; and, at the same time, it covers up the dishonest behavior of French politicians and of the successive governments on this subject (see no 9.1-9.2, [exh. 2](#), [exh. 2.2](#)) So **to have** a group of *interested* Clemson's professors pointing out the pertinence of my arguments and critics on the LA law, and the many benefits of the proposal to improve the LA systems around the world, and of the related proposal on the Internet Governance, **would be useful** for many countries and people. Developing a new LA system that can be used everywhere around the world is *the right place to start* developing global computer applications, because many countries (even rich ones like the US) do not have a public LA system in other areas than criminal defense, and obviously some rich countries like France have one that is very dishonest; moreover, the system will allow us to introduce a new justice *information system* that could be implemented everywhere overtime.

27. Operations analysis is according to Internet definitions: '*the study of operational systems with the aim of identifying opportunities for improvement. It has many guises and is sometimes called Operational Research or Industrial Engineering.*'; or '*a method of examining the current performance of an operational (or steady-state) investment and measuring that performance against an establish set of cost, schedule, and performance parameters. (...) It should trigger considerations of how the investment's objectives could be better met, how costs could be saved, and whether, in fact, the organization should even be performing a particular function.*'; or '*the systematic examination of a tactic or other military procedure usually by mathematical and statistical methods to determine its efficiency and to devise or indicate possible improvement*'. So you may say that the study (analysis) I made of the problems of our legal aid system (and law), and (more generally) of our justice systems, and **the proposals I made to improve them fit this definition** and could be analyzed by experts in this domain **like yourself** as well as by mathematical sciences experts and computer sciences (and applications) experts from Clemson University.

D The persecutions I was victim of for the past 25 years even though (and because) I made these (useful...) proposals and I rightfully denounced the dishonest LA system in France.

1) The grave and undeserved difficulties I encountered in France and the US.

28. I have been victim of all sorts of persecutions although I had made the effort (a) to present a complex proposal in 1997 useful to everyone, (b) to denounce the unfair LA system, and (c) to explain the many benefits of the strategy of developing global computer applications to help us resolve certain global problems. As explained in my 12-6-17 letter ([exh. 1, no 14-15](#)), in France I was victim of a **very advertised corruption scandal** [from 1993 to 2001] when I was illegally fired from the Department of Essonne in 1993, and **threatened to have problems for the rest of my life**], and after I obtained a **judgment in my favor in 1998** for the illegal dismissal, and had presented my **1997 proposal** [which **confirmed**, in some way, **my professional competence and the seriousness of my job search**], the government and administrations [that had two good reasons (if not a legal obligation, **no 28.1**) to **give me a job** or to recommend me for one in an IO] have (instead) let **the Department of Essonne and the justice cheat (1)** to refuse to pay me the compensation the first judges had granted me, (2) to rob me of my judgment, and (3) to make me owe a significant amount of money to the administration. And, to do that, they used (1) the dishonest LA system and the obligation to have a lawyer in court [which was not even supposed to apply to my administrative appeal procedure (!)] and (2) a dishonest decision to sue (**no 28.1**).

28.1 When a civil servant is illegally dismissed, the justice usually orders his/her *reinstatement*. The administration (Department, equivalent of a county, in this case) needs a **decision, an authorization to sue or appeal**, signed by the President and the other politicians leading this administration; and, in this case and because of the administration's President frauds, they had **no honest reason** to appeal the judgment in my favor, and they did appeal it **without this authorization**, so I should never have lost the appeal.

29. Then, **after I applied** for political asylum in the US ([exh. 12](#)), **I asked for the support** of 8 US university Presidents [see [exh. 1, 14.1-14.5](#); and 31], and **I obtained** the refugee status according **several INS official documents and an AL judge decision** (verification of status, [exh. 13](#), refugee employment authorization cards, [exh. 15](#), AL judge decision, [exh. 14](#)), I was also victim of all sort persecutions from 2002 to 2011 (send in the street repeatedly, cheated by several administrations and judges, **put in home detention...**, see details in [exh. 1](#), and unfairly deported). On 2-3-11, I was deported with a full of lies deportation order ([exh. 17](#)) without allowing me to go back to my apartment to pick up my belongings and the little money (few hundred dollars) I had [few days earlier they had asked me to come to the INS office for an appointment, and they had put me 4 days in detention before deporting me]. I never missed an INS appointment over the 10 years there, and I had several legal cases still going on in court (including one against the LA County in which I demanded a **3 million dollars compensation** for the injustices I was victim of), so I was **not** at risk to go anywhere and to hide

(!); and if they had told me that I had to go to the airport to be deported, I would have done it [and take my clothes and other belongings with me (mostly documents from my legal cases)], what else could I do (!).

30. I never violated the law in the US (or in France), and the deportation order was full of lies, so I had no reason to start violating the law, or the orders of the INS (or DHS, USCIS). I was deported with **only a shirt on my back**, and I arrived in Paris airport with 20 dollars in my pocket **only in the cold winter (!)** because of a **full of lies** deportation order (!). This is very unfair and unjust in the context of my work and proposals, and of the injustices I was victim of in France. And as soon I arrived in France **on 2-4-11**, it was the same again, I was immediately forced to start to 2 legal proceedings, and to denounce again the dishonest legal aid law, and the justice has been harassing me since them. In my criminal case, despite Dr. Kostreva ([exh. 0.3](#)) and Clemson University's letters ([exh. 32](#)) confirming that I lived and worked at Clemson on 5-11-87, *the judges and prosecutors* refused to admit that I was at Clemson, and lied on several other important facts to refuse to give me justice [see the attached letter addressed to Dr. Kostreva, exh. 0.2, and no 31].

[**31.** In my 2011-2020 criminal case, I was victim of an identity theft **on 5-11-87** when I was still living and working at Clemson, and the bank that made the loan necessarily knew that **the loan contract was a forgery** and hid it from 1990 to 2011 when they sent me an order to pay the remaining debt; I filed a criminal complaint in 2012 against the bank and its top managers, but, to refuse to prosecute the criminal wrongdoings of the banks, the prosecutors and judges **lied** to pretend that I made the loan in 87 (**made false accusations against me**); and they cheated and harassed me during 8 years to avoid any investigation (!), and **on January 29, 2020** the Supreme court covered these lies and false accusations against me to cover up the frauds and the dishonesty of the bank and its top managers and of the legal aid law also (...), [exh. 0.2](#)].

2) *The harassment and other persecutions typical for human rights defenders.*

32. Not only France, and the UN have refused (1) to recognize the significance of my research work and the many benefits it would bring, and (2) to take into consideration my arguments on the Internet governance, but, at the same time, France and the US have let their justice (a) harass me, (b) prevent me from finding a job, and from obtaining a compensation for the grave injustices I was victim of, and (c) rob me the difficult legal work I did to write and support my complaints in Court; and in France also to denounce the dishonest legal aid law. Presenting civil, administrative or criminal complaints in France and the US is not easy (when you want to do it right and you are not a lawyer), it requires to do a lot of research and to write complex pleadings, so when the prosecutors and judges lie about the facts, the rules of law, and the legal authorities you present, to rob you of your chance to obtain justice, they do not just steal the compensation and justice you deserve, they also rob you the difficult intellectual work that you did; and, in France, **the work necessary** to justify the unconstitutionality of the legal aid law is a **significant** work when you know that *the intellectuals* (university law professors, experts in this area of constitutional law and criminal law), the highest judges, the politicians, and the lawyers never presented my arguments before, and this since 1991.

33. As an example, and as explained in my 12-6-17 letter ([exh. 1, no 44.1](#)), in California, I explained the meaning of a **130 years old** civil code procedure statute that the judges and the two main law-guides had been unable to explain since they presented contradictory explanations, but the California appeal court and the 2 Supreme Courts refused to honestly judge my appeal and petitions on this issue, and, at the same time, they stole me **the 3 million dollars compensation** it entitled me to receive, and the intellectual work I had made to explain the very logical reasoning behind the statute! It took me some time to understand why these two law guides, and the judges were giving contradictory interpretations of the statute, and to explain what was the right answer **and why** (among other I had to use **an 1870 decision** from the California Supreme Court!). In France, it took me **5 months** (full time) **just** to prepare my criminal complaint, and I had to read **several thousands pages** of research (booklet) *articles*, legal authorities, law books, and, since law changes regularly, I had to read again recently (during the supreme court proceeding) all the updated research booklets I had read to take into consideration the changes since 2011-2012.

34. The *moral harassment, wrongful imprisonment, false accusations, ...*, are **typical persecutions** for *human rights defenders* according to the *UN Special Rapporteur on human rights defenders* annual reports (see [exh. 6, no 4.2](#), French), but here the consequences are not just grave for me and the 14 millions French poor because, at the same time I denounced the unconstitutionality of the legal aid law in France, **I made proposals** to improve the legal aid systems **around the world** and to help the international community defeat poverty faster (...). So I was not just robbed of my rights to justice along with millions of other poor

in France, and persecuted, (a) I was also robbed of the benefits that the intellectual work could bring me (like a job, ...), and, at the same time, (b) I was implicitly made responsible for the fact that billions of people around the world were robbed of the benefits that my proposals could bring to them, so you and Clemson University may accept to help correct these grave injustices.

3) The consequences of the evaluation of my work and proposals on my efforts to obtain justice.

35. The unconstitutionality of the legal aid law in France was an important issue of my asylum application in the US (even if not the only one); and, in France, it was used to rob me of my chance to justice **in 5 different cases** I presented or tried to present in front of the French justice **since 1998**, so your evaluation of the arguments supporting my accusations against the legal aid law could help me obtain justice in the US and in France. In the US, the unconstitutionality of the LA law **makes** (a) my refugee status **unquestionable**, and (b) the 2008 **full of lies** deportation order ([exh. 17](#)), and (c) the treacheries of the LA County, State of California, the INS (DHS,) and the justice, **even more dishonest**. And, in France, it is a key issue in my 2011-to-now criminal case, it was a key issue in my illegal dismissal proceeding from 1998 to 2001, and it would help me reopen the 3 others cases I presented (eventually the one against the US, if they refused to admit their fault). Also and as already explained, the unconstitutionality of the LA law supports my arguments on the well-founded of *my proposal to develop a new more efficient and less costly LA system* that could be used around the world.

[**35.1** In my 12-6-17 letter ([exh. 1, no 14.1, 14.5](#)), I asked the 8 US University presidents I contacted in 2002 if they could tell me **if they had played a role in the grant of my refugee status in 2002**, but they did not respond to my letter, and did not comment my arguments on the LA law and my proposals. I understand that I put them (or at least one of them, if one intervened) in a difficult situation because, if one of them did intervene, then he knows the INS official who granted me the refugee status, and they never pointed out the injustices I was victim of **after that**; moreover, several persons, including some high level INS officials, necessarily committed criminal wrongdoings in my case, so it is probably difficult to speak in favor of a French man while at the same time accusing US civil servants of criminal wrongdoings (!). But they cannot ignore that I was victim of a grave injustice (**no 29-30**), and that, because of my poverty and dishonest deportation (and, then in France, of the dishonest LA system), I could not ask for and obtain justice; **so their silence (including on the problem of the LA system) is severe for me**; and France has used the unfair legal problems I had in the US when I returned to France, to harass me again even more, so I was unfairly treated, robbed ... over **a 26 years period**.].

36. The fact that the evaluation of my work and proposals could help me obtain justice cannot be a **determinant** motivation for you to do it, but I still had to mention it, and to stress the fact that these injustices prevent [or are (have been) used to prevent] the realization of my proposals. So if you found my proposals and arguments pertinent, and *you* (Clemson university) wanted to help me obtain justice also, you could, for example, forward my case to **some** South Carolina **Senators and Representatives** [**Lindsay Graham; Tim Scott; Jeff Duncan; Joe Cunningham; ...**], and ask them **(1) to present** my case to the US Department of justice, to point out the grave injustices I was victim of from 2002 to 2011, and to ask the Attorney General **to correct** and **compensate** these grave injustices I was victim of during 10 years about in California, and **(2) to defend** my proposals **in front of their colleagues**. In December 2019, I forwarded a copy of some of the documents I sent to the UN and I wrote on the legal aid subject to one of the US representatives I contacted in 2017, so they may have already received a copy of my recent proposals, but I don't now if they or the UN have studied them at this time.

E Conclusion.

37. I believe **(1)** that *the research work* I made **(a) to justify** the fact that the **French legal aid law** is **unconstitutional**, **(b) to come up with** (i) my 1997 *proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the worldwide level*, and (ii) my (2015-2019) *proposal to develop a more efficient and less costly legal aid system and the 2 necessary global computer applications to implement it around the world*, and **(c) to present** my arguments on *the Internet Governance* supporting the creation of a new Internet IO, **is a significant work** (a) that could help improve the lives of billions of people on the planet, and therefore that should have been and should be discussed **publicly**, and **(2)** that the UN (and the World Bank) should have presented my arguments on the Internet governance during the different debates on the subject, used the Internet more efficiently, and pointed out the dishonesty of the French LA system and of the injustices I was victim of because of it; so I am asking for your and Clemson University's help to evaluate the research work and the proposals I made, and (I hope) to point out their significance.

38. I would like to say also (1) that I do not ignore the **political** dimension and implications of the proposals I made, and (2) that I know that no one can force any country to accept using a global computer application to resolve a common global problem, but, at least, **the advanced, democratic and rich countries** (a) that regularly sanction some poorer countries for violating the human rights (like France, the UK, European countries, the US.), and (b) that have dishonest or inefficient justice systems (in particular for the **poor** like France, the US.), **should discuss publicly** these proposals to inform the people of the possible solutions we have to resolve our problems, and **should precisely (and publicly) motivate** their refusal to use such global systems if they decide to refuse to use them. Also, if European countries or only 70 or 100 countries out of 192 UN members states used these **global** applications, it would already help many people around the world, so the refusal of one country should not prevent the others [and in particular **European countries** that have created the European Union precisely to cooperate and to find common solutions to certain specific problems] from implementing the proposals.

39. The subjects I have discussed here are complex, so I hope you will forgive me for the length of this letter, and, of course, if you need any additional information, I would be happy to send them to you, or to talk to you over the phone to give you any precision you may need. I remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Geneviev

PS: Some of the attached documents are in French, so they may not be immediately usable for you, but they contain some important information, so it seemed appropriate to make them available just in case. I attach to this letter the **paper version** of only few of the documents listed. And the PDF of the deportation order and the ALJ decision are imperfect, I scanned them around 2008 with a very imperfect scanning system obviously.

Exhibits (Internet links only, except for few documents that are noted with a **Paper Version** at the end).

- Exh. 0.1: Letter addressed to Dr. Kevin James, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-dr-James-7-2-20.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 0.2: Letter addressed to Dr. Kostreva. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 0.3: Email/letter from Dr. Kostreva, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/email-DR-Kostreva-31-7-18.pdf>].
Employment confirmation, Clemson University (0.32), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/attes-clemson-22-6-12.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Clemson's transcript (0.33), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/clemsontranscript.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 1: Letter to the UN (...) dated 12-8-17, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-ung-unga-usa-uni-8-12-17.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 2: ASG-HCHR application, 8-16-19 ; [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/ASG-HCHR-appli-8-16-19.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
UN response to my application (2.2), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/AR-rep-ASG-HR-appli-9-10-19.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 3: UNSG application dated 4-11-16, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/UN-cand-UNSG-11-4-16.pdf>].
Vision statement (3.2), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/vision-8-4-16.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 4: Letter addressed to the UN, 23-8-16 (4.1), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/UN-cand-UNSG-3-23-8-16.pdf>].
Letter addressed to the US congress, 23-8-16 (4.2), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-us-congress-23-8-16.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 5: Résumé, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/cvfr-12-8-19.pdf>]. French.
Exh. 6: Letter to M. Forst, 11-6-19, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-forst-UN-3-11-6-19.pdf>]. French.
Exh. 7: Letter to Mrs. Bachelet and Mr. Forst, 15-4-19; [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-bachelet-forst-15-4-19.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Sample letter to send to Mr. Rivasseau (7.2) ; [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/urgent-appeal-15-4-19.pdf>]. **Paper Version.**
Exh. 8: Letter, 30-3-19, to M. Macron, Mme Bachelet (...); [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-pres-parl-bachelet-30-3-19.pdf>]. French.
Exh. 9: Letter, 5-2-19, to the députés and sénateurs, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-parl-AJ-PNF-2-5-2-19.pdf>]. French.
Exh. 10: Letter to Mrs. Moutchou, 11-6-19, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-moutchou-parl-11-6-19.pdf>]. French.
Mrs. Moutchou's report on LA, 7-23-19 (10.2), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rap-AJ-Moutchou-23-7-19.pdf>]. French.
Brouillon, remarques sur rapport Moutchou, 8-11-19 (10.3), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rem-23-7-19-rap-AJ-8-11-19-draft.pdf>]. French.
Contestation and QPC, 8-7-19 (10.4); [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/cont-nt-OPC-AJ-etc-a203-8-7-19.pdf>].
CC decision on the QPC, 9-25-19, (10.5); [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/dec-CC-OPC-25-9-19.pdf>]. French.
Exh. 11: INCO Copernicus program proposal 1997 (31 p., 11.1), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/incoproposal7-1-11.pdf>].
EU commission evaluation and letters of interest (20 p., 11.2), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/incopropandletsup1.pdf>];
and (11.3) [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/incoletsup2.pdf>].
Exh. 12: AR de ma demande d'asile politique du 14-5-02, [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/htm/asylumappliackreci5-14-2.pdf>].
Exh. 13: Vérification de mon statut de réfugié du 5-9-02, [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/npdf/verifstat9-5-02s.pdf>];
Altered verification of status, (13.2), [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/npdf/altered-verif-of-status.pdf>];
8 CFR 207.9 procedure (13.3), [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/pdf/jpg/8CFR207-9.pdf>].
Exh. 14: Décision administrative confirmant mon statut de réfugié du 5-2-03, [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/htm/aljtolentinodec2-5-03-2.pdf>].
Exh. 15: Premier permis de travail de réfugié (A3) du 12-10-04, [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/pdf/eacard12-10-04+explanation.pdf>].
Exh. 16: (A03) permis de travail de réfugié du 12-3-08, [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/htm/refeacard12-3-08-2.pdf>];
Exh. 17: Ordre d'expulsion rempli de mensonges du 10-1-08, [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/htm/deportorder1-11-08.pdf>].
Exh. 18: Article sent by Dr. Kostreva, [<http://pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/Dr-Kostreva-art-on-justice-2018.pdf>].