

Pierre GENEVIER  
18 Rue des Canadiens, App. 227  
86000 Poitiers  
Tel.: 05 49 88 72 32; mob. : 07 82 85 41 63; Courriel: [pierre.genevier@laposte.net](mailto:pierre.genevier@laposte.net).

Mr. Antonio Guterres, Secretary General of the United Nations  
H.E. Mr. Miroslav Lajcak, President of the 72<sup>nd</sup> Session of the General Assembly  
H.E. Mrs. and Mr. Permanent Representatives of UN member states  
MM. McConnell, Schumer, Ryan, and Mrs. Pelosi; Mrs. and Mr. US Senators and Representatives  
Mrs. and Mr. Presidents of 8 US Universities (or former Presidents of University) [Mr. Lee Bollinger (Dr. George Rupp) President of Columbia University; Mr. John J. De Gioia, President of Georgetown University; Mrs. Drew Faust (M. Lawrence H. Summers) President of Harvard University; M. Morton Shapiro (M. Henry S. Bienen) President of Northwestern University; M. Marc Tessier-Levine (M. John L. Hennessy) President of Stanford University; M. Michael Fitts (M. Scott S. Cowen) Tulane University; M. Max Nikias President of University of Southern California; M. Peter Salovey (M. Richard C. Levin) President of Yale University]

Poitiers, December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017

**Copy:** Mrs. and Mr. Heads of State and Government of UN members states; Mr. Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, UNOCHR.

**Object:** The *unconstitutionality* of the French legal aid (LA) system; the efforts I made to denounce the dishonest French LA system **from 1999 to 2017**; the importance of designing and developing an efficient LA system usable everywhere; the UN's role in developing such a LA system; the *Human Rights up Front Initiative*; my main proposals to help countries achieve their SDGs; and **the North-Korea crisis**. [PDF version at: <http://www.pierre-genevier.eu/npdf2/let-ungsg-unga-usa-uni-6-12-17.pdf>].

Dear Mr. Antonio Guterres,  
Dear Mr. Miroslav Lajcak,  
Dear Mrs. and Mr. Permanent Representatives of UN Member States,  
Dear Mrs. and Mr. US Senators and Representatives,  
Dear Mrs. and Mr. Presidents and former Presidents of US Universities,

1. Referring to my letters dated **4-11-16** ([exh. 55](#)), **7-5-16** ([exh. 56](#)) and **8-23-16** ([exh. 57](#), [exh. 58](#)) presenting my platform of proposals to help countries achieve their SDGs and my UNSG application ([vision statement](#), [exh. 59](#)), I take the liberty of writing you (again for some) **(1)** to talk about **(a)** the *unconstitutionality* of the French LA system, **(b)** the efforts I made to denounce its dishonesty (for the poor), **(c)** the importance of developing an efficient LA system usable everywhere, and **(d)** the UN's role in this effort; and **(2)** to make few remarks on **(a)** my main proposals to help countries achieve their SDGs, and on **(b)** **the North-Korea crisis**.

2. I have written (several times) to Mr. Ban Ki-moon (and to the UN Secretariat) to talk about the *unconstitutionality* of the French LA system and about my platform of proposals, but Mr. Ban Ki-moon did not pay attention to my letters; and, as you will see it below, the response I received from the UN Secretariat **in 2016** ([exh. 61.5](#)) is **not** appropriate, I believe, so I must now present my remarks and proposals **to Mr. Guterres** because they are **still** critical if we want to achieve the SDGs and to resolve some of the world's problems. I have sent also my **2016** letters **(1)** to the **Permanent Representatives UN member states**, and **(2)** to the **US Senators and Representatives**, so this letter will keep them informed **on my recent efforts** on this subject and point out the lessons we can learn to resolve other problems **like the N-Korea crisis**. Finally, I am addressing also this letter to **the 8 Presidents of US Universities** that I contacted **in 2002** to ask them (among others) for their support to defend my asylum application in the US ([exh. 100](#)), and to their successors, for those who have retired. My **2002** letter reserved a large part to the French LA system problems, and I believe they could contribute significantly to the resolution of some of the problems I will address here.

**\*\*\*2.1 Part I** summarizes the French LA system problems, their consequences, and the possible solutions to resolve them; **part II** describes my efforts to denounce our LA system's dishonesty and explains why it constitutes *a large scale corruption system*; **part III and IV** talk about the importance of developing an efficient LA system for everyone and about the UN's role in this matter [**in part III**, I give certain details about my immigration case in the US and my criminal complaints in France **for 2 reasons** : **(1)** to support my argument on the cost of justice and the well-founded of my proposals; and **(2)** to give some proofs to Mr. Guterres and to you that I was victim of harassment and persecutions in France and in the US]; and, finally, **part V and VI** briefly talk about my main proposals to help countries achieve their SDG and **about the N-Korea crisis**. I apologize for the length of the letter, but the subjects I address are complex, technical and linked, so I must be fairly precise and **discuss them all to give you a coherent argumentation**.\*\*\*

## I The *unconstitutionality* of the French LA system, evidence of a large scale corruption system.

### A *The poor loose (almost) systematically the cases they try to present to the justice.*

3. Our LA system in France has **two main problems** : **First**, the judges who adjudicate the legal aid **never** base their LA decisions on the contents (or on the facts and argumentation) of the LA requests (no 3.1); this means that the **about 100 000** poor who see their LA demands **rejected** every year lose their right to a fair trial or their right to access to the justice system ('*their day in court*'); and in criminal matter, they can be victim of '**an obstruction to justice**', a criminal offense [please see no 17]. **Second**, the **about 1 million** poor who obtain the legal aid are still deprived of their rights in most cases because the LA system does not take into consideration (1) the **legal and factual** difficulty of cases, and (2) the competence and notoriety of the lawyers who make the LA mission; moreover, the amount of money it pays for most types of cases is **well below** what it should be for the lawyer to do an **efficient** work to defend the case (no 3.2). These two problems have grave consequences (as seen at no 7-8), and not just the fact that the poor lose systematically their cases and that the French administration **never** recover the (little) money it pays to the LA lawyers [**or in only 0,01% of the cases according to some 2013 statistics, ...**].

[3.1 The [2014 sénatorial report's](#) conclusions on this LA system subject pointed out the first problem when it stated in page 30 : '**aucune instruction n'est faite** (sur les demandes d'AJ), **ni aucune décision n'est prise au regard du fond du dossier, alors même que l'article 7 (de la loi sur l'AJ ...) dispose que l'aide juridictionnelle est accordée à la personne dont l'action n'apparaît pas manifestement irrecevable ou dénuée de fondement...**'; and my **20-7-14** criminal complaint ([exh. 30](#)) confirm this conclusion.

3.2 **The lawyers** admitted to the 'députés' and senators that they could **not** defend properly the poor in court (the [2014 sénatorial report](#), p. 22) says that le Conseil National des Barreaux admits that '**les niveaux de rémunérations actuels ne permettent pas, en tout état de cause, d'assurer correctement la défense des personnes concernées**', but **they** are of **obvious bad faith** also because they refuse to admit that the poor's fundamental rights **are violated systematically** to maintain the system, **to preserve the many benefits it brings them** and to continue robbing the poor! (One of the few types of proceedings for which the LA system paid enough **was** the proceeding for an amicable divorce when the two spouses take the same lawyer (!), but these procedures do **not** go through a judge **anymore**, and the two spouses must now have a different lawyers, I believe).]

4. To give you an example, the lawyer designated to help me in the case I presented to the administrative supreme court was paid by the LA system **380 euros** for the entire proceeding although he asked, for a similar case, **4500 euros** to a normal client; I lost my case, of course [he withdrew 3 of the 4 arguments I had presented to obtain the legal aid; see also no 27-30]. Another serious problem that I did not mention yet, is that, in most proceedings in France, **you are forced - by law - to have a lawyer** to submit your case to the justice, so the poor **are forced** to use a system that makes them loose systematically! The French law books underline that this obligation (to have a lawyer in court) is conformed to the constitution because we have a LA system (!); so technically, establishing the **unconstitutionality** of the French LA system would force the government to change all the code articles imposing the obligation to have a lawyer; this is not the first reason why the two supreme courts and the Constitutional court **cheated** on my QPC proceeding to make sure it would **not** be ruled on the merits, **because the first reason was to maintain the dishonest system and to cover up the very dishonest behavior of French governments, politicians, judges, and lawyers** (see part II); but it did not help me.

### B *The system is designed to prevent any efficient complaint against the system and those who run it.*

5. Another system's flaw is that the law and the system make it impossible to complain about it. For example, **article 7** of **Décret no 2005-790 du 12-7-05** which regulates the lawyers' obligations stipulates that : '**L'avocat ne peut être ni le conseil ni le représentant ou le défenseur de plus d'un client dans une même affaire s'il y a conflit entre les intérêts de ses clients ou, sauf accord des parties, s'il existe un risque sérieux d'un tel conflit**'; this means that the lawyer **cannot be the 'Counsel' or 'Representative'** of two different '**Clients**' who have conflicting interests, **which, you probably agree, is a reasonable rule**. And this rule makes it (almost) impossible to complain (a) about the LA system (which is managed in part by the lawyer's association) or (b) **about the lawyer association** (which designates the lawyers for the LA missions) (1) **because the lawyer assigned to help the poor who complains about the LA system** (through a QPC as I did) or about the lawyer's association (as I did it also with my criminal complaint), would be – at the same time - the '**Representative**' of the lawyer's association [designating him and which is therefore his '**Client**' in some way since he will perform a service for it], and the '**Counsel**' of the poor, his other '**Client**', and (2) **because these two different 'Clients'** have necessarily conflicting interests as we have seen above [the poor is robbed while the lawyers and lawyer's association gain many advantages from the dishonest LA system].

[5.1 The fact that the system's dishonesty is difficult to denounce is one of the **required features** to be qualified as *a corruption system* according to the **French definition** ([exh. 3, no 15](#)); and you will see below that our LA system constitutes *a large scale corruption system*.].

6. Also, if the poor defends himself **alone** in court, he is still faced with **insurmountable** obstacles **(1)** because the obligation to have a lawyer in several types of proceedings and various other similar limitations **prevent him from winning** as it happened to me (ex.: the obligation to have a lawyer was **illegally** used to dismiss my proceeding in front of the Conseil d'Etat); and **(2)** because the judges who manages – in part and with the lawyers - the LA system, **(a) regularly rob** the poor during the LA request proceeding [as the **parliament report on this subject noted it, see no 3.1**], and **(b) then do everything to make the poor lose** their case in the regular proceedings. This is not just the theory, it happened to me **even** with the highest possible judge, the President of the Constitutional Court when he refused that I speak to defend my case **at the public hearing for my QPC** against the LA system – supposedly because only lawyers can speak in this type of proceedings, but he did not take into consideration the fact that I was complaining **against the LA system** that prevented me from being helped by a lawyer, and that the judges and the lawyers had cheated on several occasions to make sure I would **not** get the help of a lawyer in this proceeding (!, see letters 4-11-16, [exh. 55, no 18-19](#), 12-7-16, [exh. 43, no 15-29](#)).

*C. The consequences of these LA problems for the justice system, for the French society, and for the poor.*

7. Our LA system's unconstitutionality has **grave** consequences **on** (among others) **(1) the integrity, efficiency, and cost** of our justice system; **(2) the integrity** of politicians, of political parties and of administrations (...), and **(3) the level of poverty and of inequalities** (for several reasons). **First**, the dishonest LA system and *the obligations to have a lawyer in court* make our justice system a fraud and **corrupt** because they force the poor to use the dishonest LA system that makes them lose all the time under the eye and with the consent of judges and prosecutors of all levels (!). Moreover, the dishonest LA system *obstructs the justice system*, affects its efficiency and **increases its cost** because many cases could be resolved **in mediation** before they even reach the court system [to obtain the legal aid, you must show that **your cause (s) of action is (are) serious (not frivolous)**, so most cases should directly go to mediation first to try to resolve *this strong cause of action!*]; and an efficient LA system would decrease the judges workload (who often complain that they do not have enough time to do their work), improve the entire justice system efficiency, and lower its cost ([exh. 4.1, n 19-40](#); in France, **about ¼ of cases** include a party with LA).

8. **Second**, the dishonest LA (and overall justice) system makes the poor loose systematically against the administrations, the rich, and the businesses (as seen above), so **it covers up the dishonesty** of administrations and of politicians who lead them, among others; and this affects the integrity of politicians, of political parties, and of administrations, and facilitates corruption. Finally, **the dishonest LA system** and the resulting lack of integrity of politicians and administrations **create poverty and increase inequalities**. I have already mentioned some of the French statistics on poverty in France (in my previous letters), but I must remind them. The number of people living under the poverty level in France (European standard) went from **7,3 million in 2001 to 8,7 million in 2010, plus 1,4 million in 10 years** about, so it is obvious that the dishonest justice system is very corrupt and create poverty and inequalities when you know that, during the same period, the fortune of the late Mrs. Bettencourt went from **15,2 billion euros** in 2000 to **30 milliards** in 2013 (and to **40 milliards** in 2015), the ones of Mr. Arnault from **12,6 to 29 billion**, and of Mr. Pinault from **7,8 to 15 billion** [the old dishonest economic system has also **a part** of responsibility in this result (of course), but, if it is still in operation, it is also because politicians do not pay enough attention to justice and to the fact that it violates the human rights (it leads to *a degrading treatment*) as I explained it already; I will come back on this **in part V**].

*D. The recent Court of accounts report on the management and financing of the LA system and the proposals to fix the system.*

9. **The behavior** of the French governments who maintained (and continue do so, and took advantage of) the dishonest LA system, **is inexcusable** because there are some solutions to resolve the problems (even if not too many). At the end of last year, the French **Court of accounts** sent the results of its study on the management and the financing of the LA system to the Justice Minister; and it made few proposals to resolve the various problems ([exh. no 4.2](#)); and the Justice Minister responded **in March 2017** ([exh. 4.3](#)), but they **both forgot** some important problems and consequences of the problems they were mentioning, and they also made **some argumentation errors**, I believe, so I did write to them to make few comments on their two documents **on 4-5-17** ([exh. 4.1](#)). For example, the Court of accounts criticizes (among others) **(1) the significant increase** of the LA system budget (**450 million euros** now to run our LA system); **(2) the inefficiency** of the mechanisms put in place to

decrease the system's costs; and (3) the fact that the real cost of the LA system were unknown; and it proposed (among others) that we change *the system's architecture*, that we create a *Legal Aid Agency*, similar to the system they have in the UK (with lawyers dedicated to the LA missions); and that the Ministry of justice computes the entire cost of the LA system and keeps the management cost **under 5%** of the total cost (...).

10. But it forgot to mention (1) that the UK spends **5 times** what France spends to make sure the rights of its poor are protected [*2,5 billion Euros vs 450 million for France, about*], although France and the UK have **similar population size and wealth level (!)**; (2) that, with the actual LA system, it is **impossible** to compute the **total cost** of the LA system (*exh. 4.1, no 10-12*); and (3) that the poor rights are **systematically violated** (because of the two main problems I mentioned above). In his **3-15-17** response (*exh. 4.3*), the Justice Minister also forgot to mention that the rights of the poor were **systematically** violated, and that I had filed a QPC on the LA law that had been **illegally** dismissed by the supreme courts (...); he criticized the proposal to create a (public) *Legal Aid Agency* because (he pretends that) it is not proven that it is economically viable, and **because the lawyers are strongly opposed to this solution**; and he made several reasoning errors I believe also. As explained in my **11-17-14** letter (*exh. 13*), in my QPC **8-5-15** pleading (*exh. 68*), and in my **4-5-17** letter (*exh. 4.1*), and **because of the many constraints that we have to respect**, the creation of a *Legal Aid Agency* (with dedicated and public lawyers) is **the only way** we have to build an efficient LA system, with the smallest budget possible, and that respect legal (constitutional,) and organizational constraints.

11. But, as seen above, we also need to fix the LA requests judgment problem, and for that **we must also create a new entity** composed of judges specialized in **legal aid and mediation technics** to make sure that the LA demands are properly studied and judged, and that **the majority of cases** (or at least a large number of the cases) **are resolved through mediation**, before they even go to court. Such a way of working would not only save quite a lot of money to the justice department (as explained above), but also improve the quality of the decisions. I also recommended that **the poor resources' evaluation** to determine their – financial - eligibility for legal aid be done by the Internal Revenue Services (IRS) and not by the LA office clerks who have no business in looking at the poor's level of wealth; a proposal that **would also allow us to save quite a lot of money** because this resources evaluation could be done at the same time for other social minima like the ones paid by the social security, the unemployment agency (...). Finally, (as explained in my 2016 vision statement, *exh. 59*), I proposed to develop **two computer applications** to help run these two new entities (to help the lawyers of the legal aid agency, and the judges responsible to evaluate the well-founded of the LA demands), **preferably in cooperation with other countries** that would accept to support *this LA system architecture* (see no 61-66).

*F Conclusion on the LA system flaws, their consequences and the possible solution to fix them.*

12. First, I must say that I could not describe you all the problems (of our LA system), all their consequences, and all the parameters that we must take into consideration to design the best possible LA system, but the few arguments and explanations I gave you here, leave no doubt, I hope, that : (1) **the rights** of the more than **14 million poor** concerned in France are (almost) **systematically violated**; (2) the politicians, the lawyers, and the judges cannot (could not) pretend they do (did) not know that the LA system is a fraud and that they were benefiting from it at the expense of the poor and society; and (3) there are solutions to resolve the different problems efficiently for everyone (even if only few, I believe); namely the creation of a **National LA Agency** similar to the one used in the UK, and of a **National LA Office** composed of specialized judges, and the development of 2 computer applications to support the work of these 2 new entities in cooperation with other countries. These 3 pages summarize what is written in **the 8 to 10 official reports** on this subject **since 2000** (*exh. 81-89*), **the various pleadings** of my QPC procedure (*exh. 63-80*), and **the different letters** I sent to politicians (and the UN) to denounce these grave problems (*exh. 1-26*).

13. Another important remark is the fact that even the Court of accounts (which is responsible to make sure the public money is spent according to the law and to serve the purpose it is intended), and **the Justice Ministry** (who is supposed, among other duties, to make sure that everyone has a fair trial) have forgotten important arguments and information that prevented the urgent reform that is needed (**certainly intentionally for the Justice Ministry**); so, **in this kind of situation**, the UN has **an important role to play** because it must remind the country's politicians who maintain the dishonest LA system, that they must respect the rights of the victims, and at the same time accompany

them in the implementation of the new more efficient system. Before I come back on the UN's role, I will now look at (1) my effort **over a 20 years period** (about) to denounce the dishonesty of our LA system and (2) at the – **criminal - responsibility** of our governments and politicians **in the large scale corruption system** that our LA system constitutes; and talk about the recent letters I sent to the Parquet National Financier (PNF), the French national office in charge of prosecuting *the complex and large scale corruption system*, because, as you will see, there is no doubt (I believe) that the politicians (...) have deliberately (designed and) maintained the system for the many benefits it brings to them, to the lawyers (and their rich clients) and to the judges.

## **II My efforts to denounce the unconstitutionality of the French LA system (from 1999 to 2017) and why our LA system constitutes a large scale corruption system.**

### *A The first legal aid problems I encountered in 1999, my 1<sup>st</sup> complaints, and my asylum application in the US.*

14. About **18 years ago** I used the dishonest LA system in France during my illegal dismissal (from the *Department of Essonne* in 1993) proceeding at the administrative appeal court of Paris (CAA). The 1<sup>st</sup> instance Court (TA of Versailles) had rendered a judgment **in my favor** ordering the administration to pay me a significant compensation for the illegal dismissal ([exh. 28.1](#)), but the *Department of Essonne* refused to comply with the decision, and even decided to appeal it although it had **no honest reason** to do so (the President was being judged at the same time at the criminal court, and the objective of my dismissal was to facilitate his fraud **on the travel expenses**) and **no formal authorization** to do so either. The lawyer assigned to help me did not really want to hear about the fact that I had been dismissed to facilitate the travel expenses fraud of the Department's President (judged at the criminal court at the same time), because the LA system does not pay enough for a complicated case, so he withdrew. I explained the situation (and denounced the dishonesty of the LA system) to the CAA judges who **ignored my arguments and cheated and lied** to make me lose my judgment [they used *the obligation to have a lawyer* which did **not** apply in such case (!) and the dishonest LA system to reverse my judgment; see details in the 11-17-14 letter ([exh. 13](#)), the 1-18-15 letter ([exh. 12](#)), the QPC 8-5-15 pleading ([exh. 68](#)), and the 11-7-17 letter ([exh. 1.3](#))].

15. So I explained why the appeal decision was incorrect and (at the same time) I denounced the CAA judges dishonest behavior and the LA system dishonesty to the (administrative Supreme Court) *Conseil d'Etat* judges, but they also used *the obligation to have a lawyer* to reject my appeal. And at the ECHR, they rejected my case with a summary decision (for no reason). I wrote to the Prime Minister (M. Jospin at the time) to describe the grave injustice I was victim of ([exh. 79](#)), but he did not respond. To avoid further persecutions and threats, I went to seek asylum in Switzerland in 2001, Belgium, and then the US in 2002. The fact that the LA system violated the poor rights was **one of the main legal issues** of my asylum application (including in the US). The US granted me the refugee status, but then I had all sorts of troubles, and eventually returned to France in 2011 after I was illegally deported from the US (see no 15.1-15-5, and no 32-45). I talked also about the dishonest LA system in my letters to the UN Secretariat, but it ignored my remarks; and I was **not 'protected'** as I should (or at least **could**) have been for my efforts, on the contrary. Before I talk about the efforts I made on my return to France in 2011, I would like to make a parenthesis about my letter to 8 US University Presidents in 2002.

### *Parenthesis concerning my asylum application in the US and my letter to 8 US University Presidents.*

[14.1 I arrived in the US on April 16, 2002 (after Switzerland and Belgium denied my asylum in early January 2002 and end of March 2002); and I applied for asylum on 5-15-02 (it took me a month about to write a precise asylum application in English; in the US you must respond to several specific questions on a formatted questionnaire). After I filed my asylum application, I wrote on 5-29-02 a letter addressed to the 8 US University Presidents who are listed above ([exh. 100](#)) to ask them for their *intellectual* support to defend my asylum application. After my first two asylum applications, I had understood that the immigration judges **did not care about** (or simply **did not understand**) the issues of my asylum case and did not pay attention to the arguments and the obvious proofs I presented to justify the well-founded of my application, so I decided to ask for the support of **intellectuals and experts** - who hopefully would make the effort to read and understand my arguments -, this why I chose 8 universities (around the country) that had **well-known law schools**, engineering schools, (...), and that had experts in the subjects that I was addressing in my asylum application (for example, Mr. Bienen, the President of Northwestern, was/is a political scientist, **professor of public and international affairs**, with an interest *in political and economic development*, among others, so he could easily understand the benefits of my cooperation proposal presented to the EU program).

14.2 As you can read it ([exh. 100](#)), and as the University Presidents concerned may remember it, I first presented *my cooperation proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the world wide level* that I submitted to a European program, and that I defended in front country leaders and IO chiefs (see the Inco-Copernicus proposal at [exh. 25](#),

and the EU evaluation and letters of interest at [exh. 26.1](#), [exh. 26.2](#)); and I explained to them that an important issue of my *asylum application* was the evaluation of *the pertinence and scope of my proposal* because it was not easy for an immigration officer who is not necessarily an expert on this subject to make such an evaluation and to determine if this work could have caused me some of the difficulties I encountered **in the context of** my legal case against the French administration. Then I talked also about **the important legal issues** of my asylum application, namely *the unconstitutionality (dishonesty) of the French LA system*, and of the related *obligation to have a lawyer in court* problem, and the ECHR unfair legal authorities on this subject. It was already obvious - at the time - that the dishonest legal aid lawyer's fee system violated the fundamental rights of the poor (right to a fair trial ...) and led to the injustices I was victim of, but I did not have all the information that I have now (all the parliamentary and experts reports.), **so the support of experts** who could confirm that the dishonest LA system had caused **the violations of my constitutional rights** which, in addition to **the threats** I had received and the other evidences, **justified the well-founded of my asylum application and the grant of asylum, was important.**

**14.3** You will note (1) that I had explained to the 8 University Presidents that (at this time already) it was very difficult for a poor to complain about the dishonest LA system at the ECHR (we did not have the QPC proceeding at the time), (2) that I had addressed this main issue fairly precisely, and (3) that the 8 University Presidents had **enough** material to – **formally** - support my asylum application **in front of the INS** (their local INS with whom they necessarily interacted regularly); and **I believe that there is a strong possibility that one of them did** (even if I don't know who intervened, - if anyone did -). There is one thing that is sure, **every one of the 7 university presidents** (still alive, M. Sample died not so long ago, I believe, and I was sorry to hear that) **can confirm that I was victim of a grave injustice** when I was deported from the US with a – **full of lies** - deportation order ([exh. 95](#)) stating that I **never** applied for asylum. At the end of **July 2002**, after the Director of the LA INS asylum office told me that he would transfer my case to the immigration court, I wrote a short email to the 8 University Presidents I had contacted (**M. Bollinger took office in between**, I believe, so I probably addressed my email to him at that time, and not to M. Rupp) to inform them that my case had been referred to the immigration court **and that I would be sent in the street shortly**, making it more difficult for me to defend my case; and **on 9-5-02**, when I asked for the social services' help, I was sent to the immigration office for a verification of immigration status **and learned that I had been granted asylum** (and I received social help).

**14.4** What happened after that is beyond anything I could have imagined before, and perhaps that you could imagine, although I am sure everyone of you have had the chance to see quite few unusual things in your life. From the moment I returned to the social services from the immigration office **with my verification of status - signed and stamped by the INS - stating that I was a refugee** (entitled to refugee resettlement benefits, [exh. 91](#)), the social workers, the immigration officers and lawyers (...), did everything they could to rob me (**the little I had**) my refugee status and the few social benefits that go with it. Even *the catholic charity*, specialized in refugee resettlement **to whom I was sent to by the social services, refused to give me the housing assistance** I was entitled to (the **most important benefits** in LA because housing is very expensive). They offered to give me the job training that I did **not** need because I had studied 5 years in the US, but refused to give the housing assistance! The former World Bank President defined corruption like this: '*corruption, robbing from the poor the little they have*', and I can tell you, if you are very poor and the little you have is, **the refugee status and the right to a cup of coffee** every morning, the US administration will do everything it can to rob you **the refugee status and the cup of coffee**, I have seen it first-hand (the French administration does the same, **so please don't take this personally**).

**14.5** **Even after an administrative law judge confirmed my refugee status** and my right to housing assistance, among other benefits ([exh. 92](#)), and after his decision became final (**for collateral estoppel purpose**), they continued to rob me and to refuse to accept that I had been given the refugee status by the INS (!). I did obtain the housing assistance I was entitled to, **but only after 6 years, in 2008**; and by that time, they were already trying to deport me with the deportation order full of lies! **If** one of the university presidents did intervene and support my asylum application (and perhaps was informed **that I was granted refugee status**), I would be grateful to him **if he could tell me what he did** or **confirm me** that he did give **his expert advice** and recommended that I be given refugee status, and that an INS official did grant me the refugee status based on this expert advice - **without hiding himself obviously** - since the INS-alien-immigration-status **verifier** (and his **supervisor**) **confirmed me verbally that I had been granted the refugee status**, and **that they even had the date at which I was granted refugee status** (see details below at no 32-44). Since I came back to France **in 2011**, the French administration has used my poverty and indirectly the injustices I was victim of in the US to harass me and to prevent me from finding a job and from obtaining justice, so the intellectual support of these University Presidents and/or the confirmation of one of them that he did intervene in my asylum application, could help understand what really happened, help me obtain justice in France and in the US, **and help resolve certain complex and grave problems as we are going to see it below.**].

*B My letters to the French governments, the 'députés', the senators & the press and media from 2011 to 2017.*

**15.** After I came back to France **in 2011**, I was confronted to the same LA problems, so I started complaining about the LA system again, and I wrote several times to the government, the députés and senators, and the press and media **to point out the LA system problems** [see my letters to Mrs. Taubira of **18-3-13** ([PJ](#)).

no 26) and 25-4-13 (PJ no 25) ; my letters to Mr. Hollande (...) of 25-4-13 (PJ no 23), 28-8-13 (PJ no 22), 13-9-13 (PJ no 21), 23-4-14 (PJ no 20), 30-6-14 (PJ no 19), 17-11-14 (PJ no 18), 20-1-16 (PJ no 17)], but they did not respond [or the 2 responses I received in 2013 (exh. 25.2) and 2015 (exh. 13.2) were not appropriate, and even dishonest in the context, for the response from the Justice Ministry, see comments at exh. 17, no 15-16]. As explained last year, after my 20-1-16 letter (exh. 17) explaining the fraud of the highest court to reject my QPC on the LA system, Mrs. Taubira, the Justice Minister, **resigned** [which, to me, is **an evidence** that she knew she had a criminal responsibility in the maintenance of the dishonest LA system (...)], but obviously it did not change anything since they did not respond to my subsequent letters like the ones I wrote on 5-17-16 (exh. 10) and on 2-27-17, (exh. 9) in which I asked the 'députés' and senators to discuss, among others, this important issue of the LA system's unconstitutionality.

16. Finally, on 28-6-17, I wrote to M. Macron (the new President and to several of his ministers, [exh. 1](#)) to describe the LA system problems, my proposals presented to the UN, the difficulties I encountered in my different proceedings (...), but again I did **not** receive any honest and appropriate response, and they did not talk publicly about the LA system problems although again (1) these problems concern **directly more than 14 million French poor** (and indirectly it concerns all the French people), (2) they point out a very dishonest behavior from our politicians, and (3) the number of people living under the poverty level has increased significantly (**no 8**) to reach a high level (of more than 9 million, [exh. 1.3, n 8](#)). **The silence** of the different governments on my letters is **inexcusable**; and I believe that it is an evidence of **their criminal responsibility in the maintenance of the dishonest LA system** (to continue benefiting from it and to continue robbing the poor), and that it justifies the well-founded of the accusations I made recently to the PNF concerning *the large scale corruption system* that the LA system constitutes. Before I come back on my recent complaint to the Parquet National Financier, I will briefly describe the various legal proceedings I filed in 2014-2015 to denounce the LA system problems.

*C The proceedings I started to denounce the dishonesty of the LA system since 2011.*

1) A QPCs against the LA law and a criminal complaint against the LA offices employees, lawyers (...).

17. In France, there are (I believe, at least) two legal ways to denounce the dishonesty of the French LA system : (1) one can file a QPC (an emergency question of constitutionality) to denounce the fact that a law violates the constitutional rights of an individual or a group of persons, this is what I did in 2014 in my criminal proceeding ([exh. 77](#)) and in 2015 in my administrative proceeding ([exh. 65](#)) [my QPCs pointed out the violation of *the right to fair trial, the right to access the justice system, and the right to be free from discrimination*]; and (2) one can file a criminal complaint to denounce the violations of criminal statutes by the judges who judge the LA demands **without following the rules**, by LA lawyers who defend the poor **badly**, and by the lawyer's association that assigns the lawyer to the poor, and negotiates with the government the functioning of the LA system, this is what I did in July 2014 ([exh. 30](#), [exh. 32](#)) [my complaint described three criminal statutes violations: *CP 314-1 abus de confiance* (betrayal of trust), *CP 222-33-2 moral harassment*, *CP 434-4 obstruction to justice*; but the legal characterization of the facts with these 3 criminal statutes is **not exhaustive**; we can also characterize the facts with several other criminal statutes that are usually used to characterize **large scale corruption systems** as we are going to see it below at no 21-22].

18. During my 2 QPCs proceedings, the Cour de cassation (the criminal supreme court) and then Conseil d'Etat (the administrative supreme court) **both cheated** (and even committed a fraud) to prevent the QPC from being reviewed by the Constitutional court; and then after I filed the QPC directly to the Constitutional court (in 2015) **as I can do it**, it also cheated to prevent a review **on the merits** of my QPC (see 4-11-16 letter, [exh. 55, no 18-19](#), and details in 12-7-16 letter, [exh. 43, no 15-29](#)). And for my 2014 criminal complaint, the prosecutor in Poitiers **never** responded to my complaint, and **no investigation** was done by the police **during 3 years**; so I filed a LA request to be able to file my complaint directly to *the investigative judge* as the procedure allows me to do, but the Poitiers LA office judges - **who were mentioned in my complaint** - lied to reject my request and to cover up their dishonesty. They should never have judged this case, but the change of venue I had asked for in 2015, had been denied; so I was forced to file on 28-4-17 a supplement ([exh. 31](#), to my initial 2014 complaint, [exh. 30](#)) describing (1) the grave fault from the LA office in Poitiers, and (2) the different frauds from the higher courts to prevent the review of my QPC [obtaining the LA is not just about getting a lawyer; it also pays **for the court fee**, which is not insignificant for a poor (!), so if your legal aid application is **rejected**, then it is (almost) impossible to file the criminal complaint, even though (in theory) no lawyer is needed to do so].

19. In this 4-2017 complaint supplement ([exh. 31](#)), I also added (among others) (1) the *national lawyers' association* (CNB), (2) the Poitiers lawyer association's board members [who refused to respond to my letters concerning (among other subjects) the dishonesty of the LA system and the fraud to prevent the judgment on the merits of my QPC on the LA system, in particular my 12-7-16 letter ([exh. 43, no 15-29](#))], and (3) the lawyers (designated to help me in 2015 and 2016) who refused to help me or who did not help me properly. So my initial 2014 complaint ([exh. 30, exh. 32](#)) and its supplement were now directed against **even more** judges and lawyers working in Poitiers' Court (**than the 2014 complaint**), **which made it absolutely critical to transfer the case to another court**. There is an article from the criminal procedure code – CPP 43 – which recommends and allows the transfer of cases in which a judge or a lawyer is a party in the lawsuit (which makes sense because this situation creates an obvious conflict of interests); so the prosecutor **should have used this CPP 43 article to organize this transfer in 2015**, when I first asked for it (I had only used CPP 665 at the time, but he should have made the correction himself), but he did not **although the supervising prosecutor** (had granted my request and) **made a special request to the supreme court to transfer my 2 cases** [[exh.50](#), without success, [exh.53](#)].

\*\*\* 19.1 Moreover, the fact that the prosecutor's office had not responded to my initial complaint dated 7-20-14 in **3 years**, and that it was impossible for me to obtain the legal aid in Poitiers and a fair trial obviously, was **not** just a problem for this proceeding against the LA office judges, the lawyers (...), it affected also my other **criminal** complaint against **the Crédit Agricole**, CA, ... (that had been going on since 2011) because the prosecutors and the judges in Poitiers were doing everything they could to make me lose this case as well; so both cases had to be transferred. \*\*\*

2) My 3<sup>rd</sup> request for a change of venue (filed in July and August 2017) **and my letters to the PNF (Parquet National Financier)**.

20. So on 7-24-17, I asked again the prosecutors in Poitiers ([exh. 5, exh. 6](#)) to transfer my two criminal complaints [based on two procedural code articles: CPP 43 for the one concerning the LA system (still in front of the prosecutor) and CPP 665 for the one against the Credit Agricole, CA ... (in front of the investigative judge)] to another court [and preferably to the Paris Court where **the Parquet National Financier** (PNF) is located] because, among other reasons, it was **not** possible for me to have fair trial in Poitiers after I complained against several judges and lawyers. The prosecutor's office did not respond **within the required 10 days** to my CPP 665 change of venue request for my criminal complaint against the CA, so, on 8-14-17, I filed 2 new change of venue request for the case against the CA in the Court of Cassation (one based on CPP 665, [exh. 7](#), and one based on CPP 662, [exh. 8](#)); and, for my other complaint against the LA offices (...), I wrote directly to the *Parquet National Financier* (PNF, *national financial prosecutor's office*) that has a **concurrent jurisdiction for large scale and complicated corruption case**, to ask it to start an investigation on the criminal complaint on the LA system flaws (see [exh. 2, exh. 3](#)). This PNF, created in 2014, has a **national** jurisdiction for cases involving the criminal offences listed at CPP 705 [please see [exh. 2, exh. 3](#) in which I explained why the PNF has jurisdiction over my case)].

21. As seen at no 17, the 7-20-14 complaint (and its 4-28-17 supplement) refers to **3 criminal statutes violations, two of which** are close to the criminal statutes listed in CPP 705, but the facts could also be legally characterized with several of the criminal offences used to legally characterize corruption cases like **articles CP 433-1, CP 433-2, CP 434-9, and CP 445-1, CP 432-15** (all listed in CPP 705), so I made a brief description of the complaint using these criminal statutes to justify to this PNF that it had jurisdiction over my case. **In short**, the dishonest LA system constitutes a **corruption case** because the lawyers accept to rob the poor [when they accept to defend their cases in court at a price that is **far below** what they usually ask to their normal customer and that is **not** enough to defend their rights properly (again the lawyers admitted to the senators that the LA system did not pay enough to defend the poor properly, no 3.2)] in exchange of **very beneficial advantages** [like the obligation to have a lawyer in court which gives them, in a way, a **monopoly on the justice**; the possibility to have work when they have no regular customer, without any obligations as we saw it a above; ...], so they violate **article CP 433-1** because they make a **promise** to the government and to the minister of justice that **they have no right to make**, so that the Justice Minister and the government *abuse of their influence* to give them **underserved advantages** (like the obligation to have a lawyer ..).

22. And the Justice Minister and the government violate **CP 433-2, CP 434-9, and CP 445-1, (1)** because they ask the lawyers to rob the poor and accept their offer (to rob the poor) in exchange of their *abuse of power* when they give the lawyers advantages they do not deserve; and **(2)** because, in exchange of accepting the dishonest offer from the lawyers, the Justice Minister violates the rights of the poor, and is guilty of passive corruption of persons who are not public servants. Finally, the judges (who render the decisions on LA demands that are **not** based on the contents of the file, **no 3.1**) violates **CP 432-15, CP 434-9, and CP 445-1 (a)** because they are guilty of embezzlement when they do **not** use the LA money in a proper way, **(b)** because,

in some criminal cases, they obstruct justice (they prevent the prosecution of criminal offenses), and (c) because they allow the lawyers to rob the poor when they maintain a LA system which is obviously illegal (especially when they cheat during proceedings criticizing the LA system ..., as they did with me). **As seen above, (1)** the LA system problems have been well-known for a longtime and **(2)** I have informed the governments, the politicians, and the lawyers of these problems also **several times**; but obviously they still continue (d) to do everything they can (could) to maintain the LA system the way it is [even after I filed my 2 QPCs, and my criminal complaint], so we do have a **large scale corruption system** put in place and maintained to rob the poor.

*D. Conclusion on my efforts to denounce the dishonesty of LA system.*

**23.** Even though the LA system subject is technical, there can be no doubt that the government members (politicians,), the lawyers representatives, and the high level judges who are all **law experts**, have maintained the dishonest LA system **(1) to deprive the poor of their constitutional rights** and **(2) to keep the many undeserved advantages it brings them**. As seen above, **(1)** several official reports pointed out the problems with quite a lot of details, **(2)** I personally wrote **several times** to the government members and to the députés and senators **from 2000 to 2017** to stress the gravity of the problems and of their consequences (and even gave them examples of the difficulties I encountered in proceeding because of the dishonest LA system,), and **(3)** I also filed **2 QPCs** and a criminal complaint to point out the **legal** consequences of the problems described in the official reports; **so the silence** of government members, **the frauds** of judges and prosecutors to avoid judging honestly my QPC and my criminal complaint on this subject; and **the lawyers' refusal** to address the accusations I made against them, **are – to me – proofs** of *their criminal responsibility* in the large scale corruption system I asked the PNF to investigate.

**24.** But at this day, I don't know if the PNF will press charges against the government members I contacted, the lawyers' association negotiating with the government on this LA issue, and the judges who cheats at the LA request stage; and if it did press charges instead of obtaining admission of wrongdoings from the suspects, it would be probably very difficult to obtain a sentence since the judges in France have participated in this large scale corruption system and benefited from it also; **so the UN has an important role to play in this situation**, I believe, and the 8 US University Presidents I contacted **in 2002** could also play an important role in resolving several of the problems that I described here for everyone's benefits (**no 67-69**). **On 11-10-17**, I wrote again to the députés, senators and Press and Media ([exh. 1.3](#)) to inform them of my new complaint at the PNF, and **to ask them act urgently on these issues**, but they did **not** respond (yet) and the problem does **not** just concern France. As explained last year, **many countries** have **similar** problems, and having an efficient LA system is critical to achieve the SDG, so I would like now to look into more detail at the reasons why we must work together to develop an efficient LA (and more generally efficient justice) system (s).

**III The development of an efficient LA system is an issue of critical importance for the UN and its member states for many reasons.**

**25.** There is **no international legal obligation** requiring a country to provide legal assistance (and a lawyer in Court) to every poor in other areas than *criminal defense*, I believe, but if we want to achieve the SDG, and in particular SDG **no 1, no 10 and no 16**, we must find a way to give every country the possibility to implement **an efficient LA system** at a cost **as low as possible**, so for this reason **at least (a)** the LA problems we have in France and **(b)** the development of an efficient LA system [that can be implemented in every country that wants it] **are issues of critical importance** for the UN and its members states. As seen above, an efficient LA system can help us **(1)** fight corruption, **(2)** improve the overall efficiency of administrations, and **(3)** decrease **the overall justice system's cost** while improving its efficiency; and when we know that 'an *estimated four billion people live outside the protection of the law* and those that live at or below the poverty line face institutional, legal and administrative barriers ...' [according to the background note of the **6<sup>th</sup> 2014 UN high-level event on the post-2015 dev. Agenda**], **the cost issue is definitely a very important issue** for everyone. I will talk here **about the cost of analyzing and of judging cases** and explain how my proposals can help us decrease this cost.

**26.** To give you an idea of the cost of giving a fair trial to everyone and of the difficulty we face if we want to decrease this cost as much as possible, I will use my personal experience in France and in the US

and describe you how the justice and my adversaries reacted when I asked for the help of the justice system (to try) to resolve the grave problems I was facing. My different cases (in France an in the US) will show you (1) how (a) few changes in a standard type of cases and (b) the dishonest behavior of an adversary can increase the cost of rendering justice **significantly**, and (2) how (a) the corruption of the justice system and/or (b) a dishonest legal strategy or behavior of the prosecutors and judges can also increase **significantly** the cost of judging or resolving cases for the community. Indirectly, my examples will give you a strategy to develop justice systems that are at the same time efficient and affordable (or at least **definitely less costly**).

*A Few twists and the dishonest behavior of an adversary can make simple cases much more complicated and much more expensive to resolve.*

1) A '*typical identity theft case*' made much more complicated by few little twists.

27. My *identity-theft* case against the Credit Agricole, one of the 3 biggest French banks, is a fairly typical case because there are about 200 000 *identity theft cases* every year in France, and because, even though there are various different possible scenarios, my case fits a fairly well-known type; namely a person uses the name of another person to make a bank loan or to buy a good on credit [sometimes this person is a relative, husband, wife, ex-husband, ..., of the identity theft victim], and eventually stops paying back the loan. Usually, as soon as the payments stop : (1) the bank asks the contracting party to pay back the loan; (2) the identity theft **victim** explains that he did not do the loan, and files a criminal complaint against X; and (3) the problem is resolved fairly rapidly, especially when the suspect is a relative of the contracting party, because the police and the justice confirm *the identity theft*, and the delinquent is forced to pay back the loan, or if the bank has made a mistake in making the loan (for example if it did not do the necessary-by-law verifications before making the loan), the victim can ask the justice to sentence the bank for negligence.

28. In my case though, three different '*twists*' made the case more complicated: (1) **first**, when the loan stayed unpaid **in 1990**, the bank did **not** try to get the reimbursement **from the pretended contractor – me –**, they only asked **the pretended guarantor** and it seems, the identity thief to reimburse the debt [because they knew (a) that they did **not** do the appropriate verifications before making the loan, (b) that the loan contract was a fraud and **full of lies** (for example, it stated that I lived and worked in Poitiers France when the loan was signed **in early May 1987**, when, in fact, I was - at the time - **living and working at Clemson University** in the US, the bank also did not verify the identity of the person who acted as guarantor ...), (c) that I would probably sue them for negligence at least, and (d) that some of them could lose their jobs and that the bank could lose the value of the loan]; (2) **second, the bank** that made the loan (Sofinco) was bought sometimes after by a large bank (**Crédit Agricole, CA**); and later, **in 2010**, few months before they contacted me **in March 2011**, it was merged to create a new CA entity (**CA Consumer Finance**), and this change made it more difficult to prosecute the **initial** bank's criminal wrongdoings [because it was not possible to sue the initial bank that did not exist anymore, and there is a *law void in the area of the criminal responsibility of large groups for the criminal wrongdoings of their subsidiaries*]; and (3) **third, it seems** obvious (a) that, when I returned from the US **on February 4, 2011**, some people made some research on me and learned there was a debt in my name, and used it to hurt me and to cause me prejudice, and (b) then that the bank (**Credit Agricole, and its new subsidiary, CACF**) cheated and refused to cooperate with me (and with the police) to cover up its wrongdoings from the beginning and to try to escape its criminal responsibility.

2) **The impact these few changes have on the cost of resolving the case.**

29. These 3 different '*complications*' made the case much more difficult **technically** because they mean (1) that the initial bank (Sofinco) committed several criminal wrongdoings between **1987 and 2010** before its merger; (2) that the CA also committed several criminal wrongdoings **from 2011 to now**; (3) that we must consider **two different** time periods: **1987 to 2010** and February **2011 to now**; (4) that we must **add criminal offences** that would not be used in the standard case because here the case involves also the bank that committed criminal offences while trying to escape its responsibility (my initial PACPC complaint listed **10 different criminal offences** over a **30 years span**); and, (5) depending on whether the judges accept or not the *Credit Agricole's* criminal responsibility for its subsidiary's wrongdoings (Sofinco), **we must also describe the criminal offence of concealment** to make the CA **accountable** for the initial wrongdoings of its old subsidiary that merged and cannot be sued anymore [please see technical details my **12-7-16** letter, [exh. 43, no 31-36](#)]. As a direct result of these complications, the lawyer's work is much more complicated and expensive, as well as the work of the prosecutor, the police, and the investigative judge, and the cost of resolving the case increase **significantly**.

30. The last lawyer (designated to help **in 9-2016**) estimated that **only** the work necessary to legally characterize the facts cost **7 to 8000 euros** for a lawyer; and now, after my complaint to the PNF, it has

become **even more complicated** to legally characterize the facts because my adversaries, the CA (and its top managers,) are taking advantage of the dishonest LA system and of the large scale corruption system I described above; and this behavior adds several **new** criminal offences to my initial complaint (PACPC,...). **You must keep in mind** that, - at this time in France -, the LA system pays 200 euros to the lawyer (about 4 hours of work) to defend a poor in this type of case, and that the **7 or 8000 euros** estimate does **not** include the cost managing the case [like the cost of writing, filing and defending the motions, the requests for investigations, the appeals (...), going to court,], so just **the lawyer's cost** – for this **supposedly simple type of cases** - can easily range from **15 000 euros** to **50 000 euros** (and sometimes much more). And, of course, to this cost you must add the cost of investigating and judging the case which is necessarily also much higher when the case is made more complicated for any reason. As we are going to see it now, the cost of a proceeding can also increase significantly when the prosecutors and judges behave badly or use a dishonest legal strategy.

[30.1 As a parenthesis, when I returned to France on 2-4-11, I almost immediately filed a LA **request** to denounce **the injustices** I was victim of **in the US** and to try to get back the belongings that I had lost because of the illegal and dishonest deportation, but the technical (legal) complexity of the case that I would have had to file, was **even greater** than the case I just described, **so the cost** to resolve the case would have been **much higher** than the one for my criminal case against the Credit Agricole (...). For example, to prepare the complaint and to characterize the facts, the lawyer would have had to know **the US laws** (the civil, criminal statutes, immigration and social security codes ..., that were violated), **the French equivalent laws**, and also **international public and private laws** because there are restriction (immunity,) when you try to sue a foreign state (or foreign civil servants,) in French courts; meaning the designated lawyer needed to be an expert in three different complex areas of the law, even if, of course, I knew the US laws of my case since I had filed several complaints over a 9 years periods. As the result, the LA office in Poitiers cheated to reject my LA request, and I was deprived of my right to access the justice system (of my day in court) and to obtain justice against the US!]

*B The dishonest behavior or the dishonest legal strategy of prosecutors and judges can also increase significantly the cost of resolving or judging a case !*

**31.** To confirm that the dishonest behavior or strategy of prosecutors and judges (namely the corruption of the justice system, the bad organization of the justice system,) can also make a case much more expensive to resolve for the community, I will use **my asylum application in the US** and the resulting lawsuits I filed to try to resolve the problems I encountered, and again **my criminal complaint against the CA in France**, and you will see that the prosecutors and judges have very similar behaviors in the US and in France.

1) **My asylum proceeding is fairly interesting case from a factual and legal point of view.**

*a) The verification of my refugee status, and the lies of the immigration lawyers and immigrations officers.*

**32.** Above at no 15.1-15.5, I made a parenthesis to talk about my asylum application in the US and the letter I sent to 8 US University Presidents to ask them for **their intellectual support** to defend my asylum application, so I will continue with this case that is particularly interesting and helpful to understand the flaws of the justice systems in the US and in France. As explained above, **after** the LA asylum office transferred my asylum application to the immigration court on 7-16-02, **I wrote** - on 7-28-02 - a short email to the 8 University Presidents I had contacted to inform them of this new situation; and (few weeks later) on 9-5-02, I learned from the immigration status verifiers that I had been granted refugee status, and the social services started paying me **the refugee benefits**, but **they also made a grave mistake** because, after I returned to the social services with my (signed and stamped) verification of status listing me as a refugee (exh. 91.1), they **should have** immediately sent a fax to the status verifiers to obtain the date at which the refugee status was granted.

\*\*\* 32.1 This was (at the time) a - **standard procedure** - with a - **dedicated form to file out (G845)** -; and **the purpose** was to allow **the grant of 8 months of refugee benefits starting on the date the refugee status is granted**. I suspect that the social workers did not follow this standard procedure to rob me several months (6 months) of refugee benefits (RCA), and possibly to rob me the refugee status also, **but I may be wrong**; and it may just have been a plain mistake or a negligence. Anyway, because they did not follow the standard procedure to obtain the date the refugee status was granted, they and their computer system assumed that the refugee status had been granted **on my arrival date in the US, April 16, 2002**; and **instead of paying 8 months** of RCA starting **on August 2002** about or on 9-5-02, they only paid me **2 months** of RCA as if the period **from 4-16-02 to 9-5-02** had been paid already (!).\*\*\*

**33.** Also, as soon as I received this verification of my refugee status, I went to the immigration court to explain the situation and to ask them **to close my asylum procedure** (that had been transferred from the LA

Asylum office on 7-16-02). The court clerk told me that it happened sometimes that an alien obtains his refugee status after the case has been referred to the court, and asked me to go see the immigration lawyer (a floor below) to have him close my case, so I did. The immigration lawyer looked at my verification status (signed and stamped), then looked at his computer, and said that he could **not** see on his computer that I had been granted refugee status, and that the status verifiers **had probably made a mistake** in issuing the verification (!). **I think he was lying**, so I wrote a letter to the **Director of LA asylum** [who had personally handed out to me the letter of transfer of my case to the immigration court on 7-16-02] to ask him if he could confirm me that I had been granted refugee status as written on the verification of status. He rapidly wrote me back to tell me also that he could **not** see on his computer that I had been granted refugee status, and that my application was still pending at the immigration court; he also assumed that the status verifier **had made a mistake**. **I think he was lying also** because after I received his letter I went back to see the *immigration status verifiers* (at the end of October about), and I explained that 2 of their colleagues **thought** that they had **made a mistake** in issuing the 9-5-02 verification listing me as a refugee.

b) A new confirmation of my refugee status.

**34.** They took my verification of status and went back to verify on their computer if they had done a mistake, and they confirmed me that they had **not** done any mistake. Then, their supervisor came also to tell me that **no** mistake was done (**they knew it was an important confirmation for me**), and that they **even had the date the asylum was granted**, but that they could **not** give it to me because the procedure only allowed them to give it **to the social services through a special procedure and form (G845)**. The supervisor also told me that I should go upstairs' (in the LA federal building) to ask an immigration officer to give me a new (I-94, I believe it was) form stating that I had been granted refugee status; so I did so, explained the situation to an immigration officer, and asked him if he could give me this new I-94 form confirming my refugee status, but he refused to give it to me, and again he pretended that the status verifiers (that I had just seen **less than 10 minutes** before) had made a mistake, and that '*the status verifiers were lower than nothing*' (these were his exact words) to justify the fact that I was **not** a refugee status, and indirectly that the official (- signed and stamped-) verification of status listing me as refugee [produced through a special official procedure set up with the social services, and that had already allowed me to receive **2 months of refugee** (RCA) benefits and even two weeks in a hotel] was a fraud (a false document) or had been given to me by mistake. To me, he was also **necessarily lying** because, if a mistake had been made, there were **no need** to insult his colleagues status verifiers, and because he refused to let me see his supervisor to try to resolve the issue.

\*\*\* **34.1** A possible **scenario** I can imagine to justify this non sense is **(1)** that **one of the 8 University Presidents** that I contacted, **intervened for me** in front of the INS District Director of '*his region*' (Chicago, New York, Washington ...) and justified the well-founded of my asylum application, and **(2)** that this INS Director, - who has the authority to grant the refugee status -, did grant me the refugee status and entered it on the computer with the date, so when I went to see the status verifier, they were forced to tell me that I had been granted refugee status; **but (3)** that the INS lawyer, the LA Asylum office Director, and the INS officer that I saw or contacted, **did not like the idea** that they had been **overruled by an INS official outside the district**, so they **lied about my status** and then they **also eventually altered the INS record** to cover up their wrongdoings. If it happened that way, **neither** the *University President* who recommended me, **nor** the *INS District Director* who granted me refugee status **violated the law**; it is the immigration officer (*lawyer*), who violated the law when they lied about the situation of the record because they had an easy way to correct the error formally. Also the scenario I just described explains why the LA INS District Director never used the official procedure (8CFR 207.9) to terminate my refugee status in case of error, as he could have easily done, because he did **not** want to question the position of (and decision taken by) **his - high level - colleague** (wherever he was from). I would be grateful to the President who intervene, - if one did -, if he could confirm what I just explained, or just say what he did. \*\*\*

[**34.2** I believe that I have now given **additional** (and **all the necessary**) **proofs to confirm (1)** that **my accusations** against the French LA system **were well-founded**; **(2)** that our LA system violates systematically the poor's fundamental rights; **(3)** that it was designed and used, and is still used to rob the poor and **to cover up** the administrations, the politicians, and the large corporations and their top managers (among others) **dishonest (and even criminal) behaviors**; and **(4)** that my asylum application was **well-founded** and my refugee status **well deserved**. My **two criminal** complaints are **now directed** against the 2 French presidents, prime ministers, and justice ministers, the presidents of the senate and of the national assembly, **in 2015**, several high-level judges, and lawyers representatives, ..., and also against **the 3 top managers and the board members of one of the 3 largest banks in France** (several of which are also on the boards of other CAC 40 French companies); so it should not be so surprising to hear that these people do everything they can to hurt me, to harass me ..., and to prevent me from finding jobs and from obtaining justice. Of course, (if you don't go into the details of my complaints and my QPCs on the LA law), you can think that my complaints are frivolous, but they are several obvious evidences that support my critics and accusations; and if they were frivolous, the prosecutors and judges would have pointed out what was wrong **a long time ago**; so if

one of the University President did intervene in my asylum application, **he has not done any error**, he has simply seen and pointed out that I was addressing **important issues** and I had good reasons to complain and to fear the retaliation I was promised.].

**35.** Also, the status verifiers could **not** lie on this subject, their only job is to read what is on the computer and to confirm (or not) the status of aliens, so why would they lie on this subject; and if they had lied or made a mistake in reading the record, **it was very easy** for the **INS LA office Director** to correct this error since there is a special procedure (pursuant [8CFR 207.9](#), the article) which allows him to correct any mistake that has been made on a refugee status (he just sends a letter saying that a mistake was done; and that the alien must respond **within 30 days** to justify that no mistake was done; and then, based on the response, he either terminates the refugee status or simply says OK, no mistake was done). After this meeting with the immigration officer, and after the social services **told me (1)** that they would stop giving me the refugee benefits at the end of November 02, and **(2)** that, according to an immigration officer they had talked to **on the phone**, it seemed that I was not a refugee, **I filed an administrative complaint** to explain to an administrative law judge the situation and the problems I was encountering with both the social workers and the immigration officers, and to ask him to confirm my refugee status and to allow me to have **the full 8 months of refugee benefits**, and not just 2 months.

[**35.1** Also, I want to say that a **refugee from France** is **fairly rare**, so the possibility that someone at the INS made an error in granting me the refugee status **in 2002** was **very unlikely** and difficult to believe, especially when I knew that it was deserved.].

*c) My administrative complaint against the social services on 12-2-02, and a new confirmation of my refugee status.*

**36.** It was **not** an **immigration matter** anymore; it was an **administrative matter** that affected my right to receive **the 8 months** of refugee benefits and to resettle; namely some civil servants were saying that I had been granted refugee status **and issued the proper form to confirm it through an official procedure**; while others were – **verbally, without the proper authority and without following the proper procedure** – arguing that the status verifier had done a mistake and that I was not a refugee ! I am **not** a thief and I did **not** go to the US to steel the refugee benefits, but **I did not go to the US to be robbed by dishonest civil servants either**, and I did **not** hide myself since I wrote to 8 University Presidents to ask them for **their support for my asylum application**; and the administrative law judge gave me reason on most of my demands since, first, he granted me **the aid paid pending**, and then, in his decision, **he confirmed my refugee status** (explaining that he gave **no credit to the verbal remarks** of the immigration officer and the social worker on a pretended error on my refugee status), he granted me **the 8 months** of RCA I was entitled to, and asked to social services to evaluate **again** my eligibility for housing assistance (see his decision, [exh. 92](#)). His decision was correct and honest; and several months later the Director of **INS National Refugee Center** (in Nebraska, to whom I explained the situation also) also confirmed my refugee status (after verification) when he issued me a **'refugee employment authorization card'** ([exh. 93](#)).

**37.** So the administrative law judge **and I** had **not** done anything outrageous or dishonest, **on the contrary**. But all this did not change anything, the social workers and some INS immigration officers continued to cheat and to lie on my immigration status. Worse, they even issued an **altered verification status** where the word **'refugee'** had been **erased** and replaced by **'employment authorization until 9-16-03'** [[exh. 91.2](#) and later **they also altered later the INS computer record** which had listed me as a refugee, **it seems, and this is a criminal offence**. Altering an immigration document or record is a federal offense (...), not just when it is the alien who is doing the altering !]. The LA county did **not** appeal the decision confirming the refugee status **as it should have done** since it continued to pretend that I was **not** a refugee (!), but I knew the confirmation of my refugee status was a key issue, **so I appealed the ALJ decision** on the issue that the judge had refused to rule on (namely **the opening of the homeless letters** by social workers), and (at the same time) I asked the appeal judge to confirm that the AL judge did **not** make any mistake in validating my refugee status. He had **the authority** to confirm a refugee status **'based on documents review'** as he did it for me, so he did **not** violate the law; and his decision **became final** when the decision on my appeal confirmed that he did not do any mistake on my refugee status issue!

[**37. 1** The social workers opened the homeless letters before giving the letters to them, which was an obvious violation of human rights (right to privacy ...), and one of the reasons I **may not** have received the letter from the INS explaining that I had been granted refugee status. When you are homeless, you can give your name to the social services so that they accept the letter sent to you, so I did it, but I rapidly realized that they opened the letters addressed to me **and they admitted it also**, so I complained to the AL judge about that also!].

2) My civil lawsuits against the LA County, California, and the US (USCIS) starting in 2004.

a) The very dishonest and costly legal defense and strategy from the 3 defendants.

38. Since my administrative complaint had not resolved the problems, I filed a first civil lawsuit on 2-4-04, to try to resolve *this refugee status issue*. (1) Filing a civil lawsuit is a serious matter (it can turn against you if you do not act with very good reason and with care), (2) it is not easy to do (especially if you are not a lawyer), and (3) it is expensive in term of time and money (even if you do not have a lawyer), so I limited myself to a **simple** lawsuit - **direct** to the point and with **one cause of action** only -, the **misrepresentation** of my refugee status [namely several civil servants (social workers, immigration officers,) pretended that I was not a refugee when obviously I was given refugee status and an administrative law judge confirmed it as well as the civil servants who had the responsibility of verifying the aliens' immigration status; and, of course, I had even received RCA, refugee benefits]. I sued the **Los Angeles County, the State of California, and the (federal) INS** (that had become USCIS, the immigration office) because - at least - some of their employees had argued that I was not a refugee to take away my refugee benefits and to cause me prejudice (an important prejudice); and I asked for **1,7 million dollars** compensation, increasing **by \$20 000 every month** [because this controversy had been going on for almost 2 years, I had been sent in the street **16 times** between **July 02 and October 03** (!) and it was preventing me from finding a job and resettling properly, see [exh. 96](#)]. The refugee status is a **life and death matter** and the INS could have easily resolved the matter **formally** as explained above.

39. What I was hoping was that these 3 administrations would be **forced** to explain what happened and why some INS employees were – 100 % sure – that I had been given refugee status and said that they even had **the date I was granted this refugee status**, while other employees pretended that their colleagues were **'lower than nothing'** and made a mistake. Moreover, there were also eventually **an important legal issue** to resolve, namely the fact that an AL judge had **confirmed** my refugee status, and that his decision had become - **final** on this issue - **for collateral estoppel purpose** [in US law, an AL judge **final** decision on an issue cannot be changed **even in a criminal matter** (I have found legal authorities confirming that), so it is even more true on an immigration matter], so even if a mistake had been done and I had never been granted refugee status, the law stated that I could **not** be blamed for it and that they could **not** change the AL judge confirmation that I was refugee ! I am sure that you understand (1) that there was **no way** that a judge or jury would have granted me a **\$1,7 million** compensation **if it were established** that a **mistake** had been done (**and it turned out that I was not a refugee**); and (2) that, if no mistake was done, and it was just a group of civil servants who were lying to cause me prejudice, then I deserved some kind of compensation, so the only **proper and honest** strategy and **the most efficient way to defend this case** (for the 3 administrations) was **to respond to the accusations** and to explain whether or not a mistake had been done.

40. And, if a mistake was done, to explain why several status verifiers and their supervisor had read improperly the computer record and pretended that they even had **the date at which I was granted refugee status**. But that is not what happened, the (very) **corrupt** and **dishonest** [private (for the county) **and public (for the state of California and the USCIS)**] lawyers (and judges) did **not** care (a) about **the law**, (b) about **the truth**, and (c) about **the best, most efficient, and cheapest way – for the community** - to resolve this dispute; **all they saw was a (very) vulnerable and very poor alien** who did not have a lawyer to help him and who could easily be robbed and hurt [please understand that it is **not just** a critic against the US justice system, **exactly the same thing happened to me in France** as you will see below; see explanation below **at no 47-49**]. So instead of answering the complaint and addressing directly the question of my refugee status (was it or not a mistake ...); the Assistant US Attorney (for the USCIS) removed the entire case from state court to federal court (the US cannot be judged in state court **if it does not want to** !), and filed a motion to dismiss using the **immunity for misrepresentation**; the State of California filed a motion to dismiss using the **11<sup>th</sup> amendment** (a state cannot be judged in federal court **if it does not want to**!); and the LA County filed a motion to dismiss using also the **immunity for misrepresentation!**

[40.1 There is *an immunity for misrepresentation* for federal and state agencies (I knew it before I chose my cause of action), **but** this immunity **did not (and could not)** apply to this situation (**to rob a poor alien of his basic social benefits like cash assistance, food stamps, and housing assistance, and on a life and death matter ...**); **it applies mainly on business matter**, for example, when the state or federal agency misrepresents a situation **in a business deal** with a private corporation and causes prejudice to this corporation; meaning the corporation has the responsibility to verify that the state agency is not lying when it signs a contract with a public agency. I found **many legal authorities** confirming that the immunity **did not** apply in my situation, **this why I went ahead with this cause of action**. The use of the immunity proves that the INS lied to rob my refugee status.].

b) The judges' dishonest behavior, my appeal and my 2<sup>nd</sup> complaint against the LAC, California, and the USCIS.

41. The judge who inherited the case in federal court could easily understand what I am explaining

you here; and he knew that I was in a difficult situation and that I was asking the justice to help me resolve an obvious problem that I did **not** create [I followed the procedure and I did **not** violate the law, I applied for asylum, I asked for the support of 8 University Presidents (and experts, it is not illegal), I did what I was told to do by the social services and went to the INS to have a confirmation of immigration status; **I did not bribe** the INS status verifiers so that they lie on my refugee status; I went to ask them again to confirm me that they had not done a mistake after their colleagues said that they had made a mistake; and finally, I explained the problem to an AL judge and the INS National Refugee Center Director who confirmed my point of view!], **but**, instead of asking the 3 different agencies to respond to the complaint and clarify the situation, he granted **with prejudice** the USCIS' and LA County's motions to dismiss on the ground that they had *the immunity for misrepresentation*; and **without prejudice** California's motion so that I can refile my complaint in state court (!); all this **in May 2005**, and after another year lost. And, **none of the issues had been resolved**, and I was forced to go to court again; meaning the cost of the lawsuit and the problems for the community and me were increasing significantly again. I filed an **appeal at the 9<sup>th</sup> circuit appeal court**, and the petition for writ of certiorari at the US supreme court, **but they confirmed the immunity without addressing the legal authorities and facts I was presenting** (summary decisions mostly).

**42.** Later I re-filed my complaint against **the State of California** at the Superior Court and added a negligence cause of action to my misrepresentation cause of action (exh. 98); and at about the same time, I filed a **2<sup>nd</sup> complaint** for *negligence* and *violation of civil rights* in federal court against the USCIS, the LA County and several civil servants in their individual capacities [(exh. 97), including the assistant US attorney who lied in her pleading and the judge who also lied and cheated to dismiss my complaint without addressing any issue susceptible to resolve the case]. Since they cheated to avoid responding to the complaint and resolving the problems and the judge accepted the immunity for misrepresentation, I had to use **different** causes of action; I do not go into the detail of this lawsuit because the judges lied and cheated again to cover up the different defendants and to make sure they would not have to respond to the accusations of violations of civil statutes, but the federal judge did dismiss the cause of action for negligence against the LA County **without prejudice** to let me refile it in state court [see **6-20-10** letter at exh. 61.4, p 50-52, for a more detailed account of what happened in this proceeding]. The new complaint against California was also dismissed with very dishonest decisions and obvious lies because again there **cannot** be any immunity for misrepresentation and for negligence in this context.

[**42.1** I do not mention my case against the **Social Security Administration** in which my refugee status was the main issue also, and the criminal complaint I filed at the FBI, US Attorney's office, District Attorney office, and the Attorney General office in Washington; this is after this last criminal complaint in Washington that the ICE Director issued **his full of lies 2008 deportation order** (exh. 95), as retaliation it seems or perhaps].

*c) My third complaint against the LA County in which the judge refused twice to enter default and ended up lying to dismiss the case without asking the County to respond.*

**43.** And in **January 2007**, I did file my **3<sup>rd</sup> complaint** for negligence against the La County at the Superior court (exh. 99; 4 years of legal fight and **not one** problem **addressed or resolved** because of the dishonest legal strategy and defense of the defendants and of the dishonest behavior of judges who did not try to resolve or help resolve the case and problems). After I filed the complaint, I immediately dropped a *courtesy* copy of the complaint to the LA Country Counsel office; and, about three weeks later, the police **formally served** the complaint to the County. I waited for a response as they had done for the 2 previous complaints, but it did not come **within 30 days** as it should have to avoid a **default**, so I waited again another 30 days (and even few days more) and I was not sure what to do. **It was obvious that I had been victim of grave wrongdoings** from the 3 administrations, and that they knew it (again if I were not a refugee and they had not done anything wrong, they could have easily explained it to the judge, and ended the procedure immediately to save time, money for the community, and suffering for me) ; so I thought that perhaps *the County Counsel* had decided to default on the lawsuit because it was obvious that the judges had cheated and lied, as much as the lawyers; and I filed **a motion to enter default** more than 30 days (and **even 45 days** if we use the service of the courtesy copy of the complaint) after **the 30 days** normal time to respond.

**44.** All the judge had to do to end **this madness** was *to enter default*; if the County had lost the complaint or something (made a mistake), it could have easily explained it in an appeal and the appeal court would have decided the well-founded of their arguments, but the judge refused to enter default and he did not even force the county to explain why it had not responded on time! Worse, **few weeks later**, the County put itself again in default position; this time due to a grave mistake **from their lawyer** who did not answer the amended complaint the judge had asked me to file; and instead she filed another demurer with basically the same grounds she had used in her initial demurer. To justify the right to a default in this situation, I used a civil

statute (CPP 472) dating **back to 1870**, that had been explained by the **California Supreme Court** shortly after it was written **in the 1870s**, but whose reasoning had been lost probably because it was not used often (it was designed to prevent a dishonest behavior that obviously did not happen so often because **of the threat of a default**, see my explanation on this subject in [exh. 61.4, p. 38-41](#), and [no 44.1](#)). The lawyers, who fight in court against a poor without a lawyer, know they can lie and cheat and that no matter what they do, they will win, so they do it. Here I went twice to the US Supreme court to obtain the default, but I did not obtain it, then the judge lied and cheated again to cover up the County and to prevent them from answering the complaint, so the problems (I had) were **not** resolved.

[44.1 Explaining the meaning a **130 years** old civil procedure statute that has been used probably **10 times** in that much time (or a little bit more), is not like *finding a cure to cancer* or *inventing penicillin*, and it is not a **great** contribution to the improvement of the California law either; it is just **an intellectual nicety** and a way of showing **a form of intellectual rigor** and **some respect for the judges** (and their work) that have been judging my case because it means that I made the effort: **first to identify the contradiction** between the two different law guides (Rutter Group and Matthew Bender) that have tried to explain this statute and the legal authorities referring to it; and **then** to explain why their reasoning did not allow them to establish the meaning of this statute. In this case it required to use a **1870 legal authority** from the California Supreme Court that gave precision on this statute (introduced as law recently), and to understand what the lawmakers had wanted to do with it, and the coherence of their reasoning. The fact that it gave me the right to a default and to a **3 million dollars compensation** was just *the cherry on top of the pie*. The persons who write the law books are **university professors, judges or former judges, experts**, so **they know well the law and its nicety sometimes**, and the intellectual work that I – a poor French refugee, not even a lawyer – had done, deserved to be noted by a motivated decision either from the appeal court or from the California or US Supreme court, but obviously **the hate toward the poor** was **stronger** than **justice** and **the respect for the law and for those who wrote it** !].

### 3) Conclusion on the asylum proceeding and the related lawsuits.

**45.** As seen above, the problems started with *a negligence* (at least) from the social worker who forgot to ask for the date asylum was granted; then it was a lie on my immigration status from the immigration lawyer, then another, and then the violation of criminal statutes started (issuance of **an altered** verification of status, **alteration** of an official record, ...); and then, all these wrongdoings were covered up first by the public lawyers who represented the INS and the State of California, and then by the judges who granted **undeserved immunities**, so it went **from bad to worse**; and, finally, they ended up putting me **9 months in home detention - with a deportation order full of lies - in 2008** (2 months with ankle bracelet), and then deporting me **in 2011** [[exh. 95](#), again the deportation order stated that I **never** applied for asylum, and never had any permission to remain in the USA although **it is obviously not true**, I applied for asylum, I obtained the refugee status, and then the refugee cash assistance (RCA), and an AL judge confirmed my right to these benefits, and the INS National Refugee Center Director also confirmed my refugee status when he gave me refugee EA cards, and I always had a permission to stay in the US].

**45.1** And **not one** of the important issues of this tragedy **for me** was discussed in front of the court properly or not one important information was obtained (or given), like for example: **(1)** who has granted the refugee status and when (at which date)? **(2)** Why did the status verifier confirm that I had been given refugee status, if it was **not** true (or what could justify this fundamental difference of point of view; or why was the INS **never** asked to **prove** that the status verifiers had lied or had made a mistake!)? **(3)** Why did the LA INS District Director **never** used the proper procedure (**8CFR 207.9**) to terminate my refugee status if a mistake was really done ? **(4)** Why did they (INS, judges,) refuse to apply *the collateral estoppel doctrine* to the fact that the AL judge had confirmed my refugee status and that his decision had become final (or even *why none of the judges has even discussed or considered this issue*)? **(5)** How could the INS Director (M. Moore) **lie openly** in the deportation order and say that I never applied for asylum and never had a permission to remain in the US when it was obviously not true (...what information was he using and what was his real objective) ? (...). Although justice is supposed to be about the truth (about telling the truth) and about basing the judgment **on the truth**, even the highest judges in the US Supreme Court covered up these lies !

\*\*\* **45.2** About ten years of proceeding and an **important cost** for the US administration and community because my cases have been studied by more than 50 different judges and necessarily several public lawyers and officials **(a) to end up deporting me with a full of lies deportation order**, **(b)** to avoid responding the important questions of the case, **(c) to cover up dishonest civil servants** who were motivated by hate mostly, and of course also **(d) to cause me** (- a citizen of France who studied in the US and who had come to the US to ask for protection and for help to resolve some important intellectual and legal problems -) **a great prejudice** because my refugee status was deserved; I was really victim of persecutions in France and I was denouncing a grave problem that France has, namely the fact that it maintains an unconstitutional LA system to rob systematically the poor and to cover up the dishonest behaviors of politicians, justice officials, lawyers and large corporation mainly who necessarily have to go to court against the poor regularly. I have now brought you new confirmations of this fact and of the fact that French officials (politicians, judges,) and society can't stand the idea of giving justice to a poor and of respecting their most basic rights as the right to fair trial. \*\*\*

[45.3 I must make a brief parenthesis on 'my employment authorizations and job search'. When I arrived in California, the TV and newspapers were explaining that there was a **shortage of math teachers** in California high schools, and that there were looking for some; and I studied math and I worked 2 years as a **teaching assistant** at Clemson University (I taught lower level math courses that are the higher level courses in high school); so **I tried to make myself useful** and I sent a job application **to the LA Unified Schools District**. In California a master degree is not enough to teach in public high schools, **you must also take a special test** (40 dollars, not very difficult, but easy to miss if you don't prepare). **The unemployment agency accepted to pay the 40 dollars for me**, and I took and pass the test; so I obtained an interview at the LA USD. I had **my master degree, 2 years' experience in teaching** (and even more because I often organized and taught computer classes during my professional experience as computer project leader), **my test passing certificate, and my refugee employment authorization card**; but the HR employee took my card and tried to verify its validity, and he told me that his computer did not confirm the refugee status (as I told you; **they had altered the INS record, without following the proper procedure to cover up their dishonesty**). I explained (and showed him) **that an AL judge had confirmed the status** and that I had filed a lawsuit to resolve this problem, but he refused to give me a job; so although I had the proper authorization to work, **I could not use it and find jobs** because some dishonest INS employees **refused to follow the procedure** and did everything there could **to cover up their dishonesty and to hurt me!**].

*C. These problems are **in part** systemic problems because I faced similar problems in France and why the development of a more efficient LA system could help resolve some of these problems.*

\*\*\* 46. The problems I just described (dishonest behavior and legal strategy from judges ...) are what I would call '**integrity problems**', but they are **also caused by technical or organizational** problems, meaning that if our justice systems were designed differently, we could avoid them **or at least decrease their number and consequences**. Here I will briefly explain why my proposals would help us resolve some of these problems.\*\*\*

**1) The similar problems and dishonest behaviors from judges and prosecutors I faced in France.**

*a) No effort was made to ask the Credit Agricole to give the most basic information and documents about the case.*

**47.** During the criminal case against the Credit Agricole I talked about above, I encountered similar problems than the ones I had in the US with judges and prosecutors (or public lawyers). For example, soon after I returned from the US **on 2-4-11**, I received an order to pay **the debt** (under the threat of legal pursuit) that, as seen above, **I had never done**. Again it is a fairly standard problem that the justice can understand easily, and could have resolved rapidly, **but exactly the opposite happened** although I made many efforts to help the prosecutors, the judges, and the police. As soon as I learned about the details on the debt (when it was contracted, the purpose,) I was able to explain and to prove that I was **not** in France at the time and that **the contract was full of lie**, so the prosecutor who received my complaint could have **easily sensed** that there was **something fishy** about the whole situation; and he could have easily resolved the problem very rapidly. The first thing he had to do was to contact the lawyer (or any representative) of the bank (like the chief counsel) and to ask him or her **(1)** to explain what happened (who started this request for payment when, and why, when you know that I had been away **for 10 years in the US**, it was important to know how they could find me so fast, why) and **(2)** to furnish the important documents and facts of the cases (contract, file, name of the employee who started this and worked on this case...).

**48.** But like in the US, **they did exactly the opposite**, meaning they did everything to make sure that the suspects or defendants would **not** have to answer the accusations I was making or to explain what had happened so that they try to have me pay a debt not even **3 days after** my return to France and after an absence of almost 10 years! Also, everything was done to force me **to do an enormous amount of work**, to harass me, and **to cause me the gravest possible prejudice**. The complaint (contents) is very important in this kind of situation because even though the case is fairly standard as seen above, there are several complications that makes it more difficult to legally characterize the facts, so I made **all the efforts possible to be precise** and to find the appropriate legal authorities to support my accusations [one must be careful also because **to make false accusations is a criminal offense, punishable by 3-5 years in jail and a fine**], but the prosecutor did not even read the complaint (it seems), never asked me to comment it, and never even try to organize a meeting between me and the bank lawyer or representative. It took him **3 years** to write his indictment (**exh. 47**) and **it was full of lies** and ignored most of the proofs I gave, criminal offences I described, and accusations I made.

*b) After 6 years none of the important questions have been answered or even asked, despite my repeated efforts!*

**49.** And before he did so, the appeal court prosecutor threatened me to prosecute me for false accusations during one of the intermediate proceedings I started to denounce their dishonest behavior (see the lies in the prosecutor's decisions at **exh. 51 à no 21-28**). Even after I identified the prosecutor's lies and errors in the indictment (**exh. 48**), he made no effort to correct them; it went from bad to worse, and 6 years after the beginning of the procedure almost nothing has been done, very few information have been collected (even though **the few that have been collected have confirmed my accusations and the dishonest behavior of the bank!**), **no confrontation** has been organized. None of the important questions have been answered : **(1)** how did they hear that I was in

France **so fast** after my return from the US **after 10 years** of absence (I arrived on Friday night **2-4-11** in Poitiers, and on Monday **2-7-11**, they mandated a special firm to force me to pay the debt!)? **(2)** Who destroyed (or lost) the debt contract and file, and why; what were the names of the employees who worked on this affair? **(3)** why the General Managers of the CA and of its subsidiary CACF that I contacted immediately (on 7-7-11) let the file be destroyed and did not answer personally my accusations although they knew they were causing me prejudice and they knew their subordinates were **not** giving honest answers (and they were even lying obviously)? **(4)** Why the bank never forced (or even asked) me to pay the debt **in 1990** (or later **until 2001** when I left for the US) **when it remained unpaid** ? **(5)** Why did they (the managers , the board members that I contacted also,) continue to refuse to respond to my accusations and to give the important information after I explained to them that their colleagues lied and that the LA system did **not** work for this kind of cases ? ...

**49.1** The refusal (of the investigator, prosecutor ...) to obtain or (of for the bank top managers ...) to give these information was a **planned strategy** to cover up the wrongdoings, to obstruct justice, and to **hurt me in the hardest way possible**. Not only the justice system, but also the higher level judges, allowed them to do that, and their behavior is similar to the behavior that the senators identified in **their 2014 report** for the LA judges who **never** base their decisions on the contents of the LA demands (or file)! Also, here it is clear that the government members and high level politicians covered up these dishonest behaviors and even participated in these frauds because they had the possibility (and **even had the responsibility**) to give their point of view on the LA law QPC, for example; and they made no effort to change the dishonest LA system that had grave consequences on my proceedings. So I am not exaggerating my accusations, and there is an obvious will to rob the poor (and me, in particular, who dare to complain about the dishonest LA and justice systems). We can design our justice system to make it more difficult for judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and adversaries to have this kind of behaviors, and to make sure that the cost of rendering justice is as low as possible as we are going to see now.

[**49.2** Criminal procedural code **article 30** (CPP 30) gave - **until 2013** - the Justice Minister the possibility to issue an indictment (like a prosecutor) **when the prosecutor had refused to press charges against a suspect**; but CPP 30 did not allow the Justice Minister to forbid the prosecutor from pressing charges; this means that the Justice Minister had the possibility to correct a (grave) error made by a prosecutor (but he could not prevent an indictment against a suspect); but - **in 2013** - M. Taubira, Justice Minister at the time, **changed the law - CPP 30** - (after I wrote to her to point out the problems in my case) and now the Justice Minister cannot press charge anymore and correct the prosecutors errors when they illegally refuse to prosecute, which to me is an grave error, whose purpose was (I believe) to discharge the Justice Minister's responsibility in the frauds of his prosecutors (!), [see exh. 1.1, no 41-42](#)].

**2) The first magistrate to see a case should not just do - the case's legal analysis - , but do also a fairly detailed cost analysis of its resolution; and an efficient LA system should generate revenue when difficult cases are won.**

**50.** In the US, the US Attorney office defends the federal government in Court and prosecute criminal cases; and the State Attorney General office defends the state agencies in court also and prosecutes some cases I believe, so **public** lawyers are the first ones to analyze these - public - cases; but, as we have just seen it above, they did not do **any cost** analysis of my case; and they did **not** care about **the truth**, justice and the law; they just saw: **(1)** that I was a vulnerable alien who did not have a lawyer, **(2)** that they could easily hurt me for having dared to complain against the administration, and **(3)** that they would most certainly win **if they cheated and harassed me long enough**. This is why they started by removing the case to federal court and did everything they could to avoid having to answer the accusations I was making and to resolve the problems it raised [like explain why two different groups of federal employees working in the same building **could have a different reading** of the contents of computer record supposed to give the status of an alien! (among others)]. A **cost analysis** of the case **(1)** would have revealed that: **(a)** using the immunity for misrepresentation was **risky, unfair and even dishonest**, and **could be costly** for the community (state, federal government,) because if the judge granted it, then the plaintiff could easily present another cause of action for which this immunity would not apply anymore, as I did it.

**51. (b)** That obviously something went wrong, that the plaintiff's **prejudice** (if any) was **increasing with time**, and that it was in the interest of the community to determine what had happened to avoid that it happened again, to avoid a possible injustice (...); and **(2) would have forced them to know exactly what caused the problems**. This cost analysis should be a **formal** document that everyone can see. The same thing should happen in criminal cases when the case is presented to prosecutor (or police, in France) and to **the US Attorney, District Attorney, and FBI** (... in the US). In France, (for the poor) **we do exactly the opposite**, meaning that the LA office judges (the first to see the cases) **never** base their decisions on the contents of the file although they should (**no 3.1**), so there is no legal analysis of the case and **no cost analysis** on - and **no strategy** for - its resolution; and the result leads to disasters. Of course, the cost analysis can vary with time; new causes of action may appear as more facts are known, but it is still important to keep in mind the cost issue, and to resolve the case with mediation when the case can actually be resolved in mediation. In the US, the judge can sometime refer the case to mediation (or ADR), but this process should always take place as soon as possible (even before the case is referred to a court, if possible).

\*\*\* 51.1 No public lawyer should be allowed to ask for an immunity (especially not a questionable immunity), and should obtain an immunity before he has obtained all the basic facts and documents of the case he defends, and he is able to verify, to show and prove that these facts do **not** amount to criminal wrongdoings (the facts of my immigration case amounted to criminal offences); otherwise the request for immunity is an obvious attempt to obstruct justice (!) and a form of corruption. In France, no LA judge and no prosecutor should have been allowed to take any decision on my criminal case against the CA before he/she obtained the basis facts and documents of the case (like the name of the employees who worked on the case, a copy of the contract and of the debt file, why they had sent the request for payment of this very old debt and who had informed them that I had returned in France after 10 years of absence ...); these information and documents were very easy to obtain for a judge or a prosecutor, either with a letter or with a conversation with the lawyer or the representative of the bank. And the refusal to obtain this basic information was deliberate effort to obstruct justice, to lose certain proofs of wrongdoings, to cover up the defendants' wrongdoings, and to hurt me. \*\*\*

52. If we create a N-LA office tasked to judge the LA requests, and, if possible, to resolve the case in mediation before it is sent to the regular court system, (1) the LA judge will be **the first** magistrate to see the case, and he will be able to do (a) the case's **legal analysis** of the case and (b) the first **cost analysis** for its resolution (including determining the important information to collect ...); and (2) we will be able to impose **punitive damages** on the parties who refuse to cooperate to try to escape their responsibilities (when they are fighting against a poor); and these punitive damages will help **decrease the cost** of rendering justice for the poor. Also, we will be able to keep a **percentage (10% or 15 %)** of the compensation obtained for the poor (for example when the prejudice is above a certain amount of money); and this also will decrease the cost of rendering justice for the poor [to do this when private lawyers defend the poor, is difficult to do, if not impossible]. Forcing LA judges and prosecutors' to do the cost and strategy analysis will encourage them to find immediately the basic facts and documents and the most efficient way **for the community** to resolve the case (and to avoid hurting the victims). It is also critical to **discourage the magistrate's dishonest behaviors** (that are very costly as seen above); and for that we must **make them - accountable -** for their dishonest behaviors; and we must also take steps to improve the quality of decisions.

*D Conclusion on the importance for the UN and its member states to develop an efficient LA system.*

53. As we have just seen it, several factors can have a **serious** and **significant** impact on the complexity and the cost of a usually fairly standard case, this means that **the cost** of rendering justice on a relatively standard case can easily go up to **\$500 000 or even to \$1 million**; and when the victim is a poor, **this cost is entirely at the community's expense, at least until the case is won in court** (if the country has a LA system, and if we want to eradicate poverty, **we had better have an efficient LA system in every country**). When you know that, in a country like France, there are more than **14 million** persons depending on the LA system, and that around the world, there are more than **4 billion** persons who are not protected by the justice (most of them being poor, if not extremely poor), then we must make sure that our justice systems are **the most efficient possible** at the **minimum cost possible**; we must minimize every spending and organize ourselves efficiently; and we must develop an efficient LA system that resolve **honestly** the cases; if possible (through mediation) even before they reach the court system. This is why I recommended the creation of a N-LA office composed of dedicated judges, experts in LA **and in mediation** who have the authority to obtain **the first basic information and positions of the parties** [meaning capable of identifying rapidly the important issues of a case and obtain a resolution in favor of the poor through mediation to prevent the high cost of a full legal proceeding in court; and who could follow a case through the various level of jurisdiction (1<sup>st</sup> instance, appeal supreme court..., there is no need to have different judge study the case over at each level)].

54. A fairly detailed **legal and cost analysis** of cases needs to be done immediately at the beginning to determine what is the best and cheapest way to resolve the case (what information must be obtained, how much it will cost to obtain them, is it in the interest of the community to answer immediately to the accusations, allegations ... ), and we must **also discourage** the dishonest behavior that I described above, whether they are from a poor's adversary (who cheat to try to escape his/her responsibilities), or they are from a prosecutor or a judge or a lawyer; and for that we can impose **punitive damages** on the adversaries and make the magistrate **more accountable**. As seen above, in my cases in France and the US, the only analysis that was made by the public lawyers and prosecutors was *'how can we make sure to hurt the victim the most, how can we cover up all the wrongdoings that have been committed by our colleagues civil servants or by the suspects'*; this is **not only dishonest and inefficient** for the society, **but also very costly**. If a country does not have a strong and efficient LA system, then the lawyers, the prosecutors and the judges know that the society wants to rob the poor, and they do rob them systematically, no matter how many proofs of their good faith and of their right to justice they bring. Finally, to decrease the justice system cost as much as we can, **we must mutualize** the development and maintenance of computer systems and develop common computer applications as I recommended it last year and as we will see now.

#### IV The UN's role in the implementation of fair and efficient LA (and justice) systems.

55. The example of France's dishonest LA system put forward two different types of problems that make it difficult to develop fair and efficient justice systems : (1) what I would call the *Integrity problems* [like the dishonest behavior of French government members who maintained the dishonest LA system to preserve **the benefits it brings them** and others; the dishonest LA system brings many advantages to politicians, to lawyers, to judges ...; and politicians (...) have obviously behaved very badly to maintain the system for **more than 25 years already** ]; and (2) what I would call the *Technical problems* [like the problems created by the *legal, budgetary and organizational constraints* of a LA system...]; and the UN could and should play **an important role (a)** in the resolution of **both types** of problems and **(b)** in the implementation of fair and efficient LA (and justice) systems everywhere. For example, the UN *Human Rights up Front Initiative* should be used to encourage France to resolve its LA system problems and to (help) punish the politicians, lawyers, and judges who were mainly responsible for maintaining the dishonest system **during 25 years**. And, the UN should have a coordination role to help resolve the LA systems' **technical** problems and to develop an efficient LA system as we will see it now.

*A The UN Human Up Front Initiative is (and should have been) the perfect tool to point out the LA system problems in France and to discourage the dishonest behaviors we have seen in France.*

56. The UN Secretariat's idea of pledging its support for those who take '*a principled stance*' and '*act with moral courage to prevent serious and large scale (human rights) violations*', is **a great idea**; and many of the UN member states representatives have expressed their support for the *Human Rights Up Front Initiative*, it seems, but it is important to make sure that this initiative **applies also** to individuals living **in rich countries** and for large scale human rights violations taking place **in rich countries** [like the one I described you above when I discussed the *unconstitutionality of the French legal aid system which affects more than 14 million poor in France*] because if a rich country like France has **a systemic problem** that arms millions of its citizens, then there are strong possibilities that other countries have the same problems (as it is the case for LA systems in many countries). So the UN should **not** have passed on this LA system issue when I wrote to talk about it - and it should **not** pass on it now - (1) if it wants (ed) to demonstrate **fairness**, (2) if it wants (ed) to fulfil its pledge to support those who take '*a principled stance*' and '*act with moral courage to prevent serious and large scale (human rights) violations*', and (3) if it wants (ed) to improve the justice systems around the world.

1) My letters to the UN in 2013-2016 and the UN's 2016 response to my letters.

57. During the past few years, I have written several times to the UN (and to Mr. Ban Ki-moon) to talk about the French LA system unconstitutionality problem; for example: (1) in my 12-20-13 letter ([exh. 17](#)), I came back on **the report of the High-level Panel of Eminent Persons** on the post 2015 development agenda and Mr. Ban Ki-moon's intermediate report **dated 7-26-13**, to stress (at no 16-21) that the platform I described **on 11-29-05** ([exh. 61.3](#)) and **on 6-14-06** ([exh. 61.2](#)) fitted perfectly in the UN strategy **between 2015-2030**; then I spend 9 pages (from no 22 to 37) on the LA system problems we have in France and in the US. Later, in my 1-18-5 letter ([exh. 12](#)), I commented the *2014 senator report* on this issue, and described the consequences of these LA problems, while giving concrete examples. Finally, last year, in my 4-11-16 letter ([exh. 55](#)), I wrote that this LA issue was **a key issue** of the *2016 UNSG selection process*, but I never received any response, except for this short letter dated 9-14-16 ([exh. 61.5](#)) in which '*your*' colleagues argued that the UN could not consider my '*proposals*' and/or remarks ('*thoughts*') because they were **not** presented by a representative of a UN member state [this is not the first time that I receive this kind of response since I received one in 2003 also ([exh. 61.6](#)), although, at the time, I was a refugee in the US and I could **not** ask France to present my remarks!].

58. In my letters [12-20-13 ([exh. 17](#)), 1-18-15 ([exh. 12](#)), 4-11-16 ([exh. 55](#)), ..], I did **not specifically** talk about *the Human Rights up Front Initiative*, **but I clearly explained** (1) that France maintained a **very dishonest** LA system that deprives **more than 14 million French poor** of their rights, including me (and this for the **past 25 years**), (2) that the high level courts had cheated to prevent the judgment of my QPC on this issue; and (3) that the French government and politicians had refused to respond to my letters on this subject. So any **honest** and **reasonably intelligent** UN manager could (**should**) have **easily** understood: (1) that it was **not possible** for me to contact the French representative at the UN and to have him explain this problem to the UN Secretariat and managers; and (2) more generally that it is **impossible** for any person (from any country) who wants to take '*a principled stance*' and to '*act with moral courage to prevent serious and large scale (human rights) violations*' to go through the representative of his/her country at the UN, because it is obvious that **either** this person has **already** contacted **the government**

(administration, politicians) of his/her country to inform them of **this serious and large scale human rights violation**, and it **(or they) did not respond**; or it did **not** contact them because he/she was fearing for his/her life or fearing to be victim of retaliations if he/she pointed out the dishonest behavior of his/her country government and administration (!).

2) The UN is basically the **only** international entity that can point out these problems and denounce the dishonesty of government members in such a situation.

59. If after contacting the French President and government (several times) and having denounced the frauds of the higher courts on this subject (see my letter dated 1-20-16, [exh. 11](#)), I explained the problem to the UN, it is precisely because they refused to respond and they continue to deprive **more than 14 million of poor** of their right. Also on **March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2015**, I sent a job application to UNOCHR ([exh. 61.7](#)) in which I explained this problem of unconstitutional LA system, I even attached my QPC on the subject, so it should have *rung some bells* at the UN. I was describing several violations of human rights that affect more than 14 million persons, including me who has suffered during many years (1) because of our **dishonest** LA system, and (2) because, despite the many proofs of the various injustices I was victim of **over more than 24 years**, **I never obtained justice** and **remained with revenues under the poverty level for more than 16 years**. I brought to Mr. Ban Ki moon (and to his colleagues) precise descriptions of the problems I encountered with the justice and the proofs that I made the effort to seize the appropriate 'courts' to ask for their help, so the UN Secretariat had all the appropriate information to take action, and to use its *Human Rights up Front Initiative*.

60. As explained at **no 5-6**, it is difficult (and even impossible) to denounce the sophisticated **corruption system** that the French LA system constitutes because the high judges and the government members are among the corrupt officials **who take advantage of it**; and because the lawyers are the corruptors, so they do not want to denounce a system that brings them so many advantages. A good example of the impossible situation I am in, is the Poitiers prosecutors' **refusal (a) to investigate on** (and to even respond to) my **20-7-14** complaint (during 3 years) and **(b) to transfer it to another court pursuant to CPP 43 because it forced me to file a LA request at the LA office in Poitiers that I am accusing of having violated criminal statutes (!)**. The result was that they cheated again and denied me the legal aid (!); and I was forced to complaint again against them, to do a lot work to explain the problem and to seize the PNF **which has not responded yet**. This is the kind of cases **where the UN can do something important**, especially when such problems take place in a rich country [like France, **again** because if France or any other rich counties has a serious justice problem like that, there is a good chance that **many other countries have it too**]. For all these reasons, the UN secretariat's **9-14-16** response is not appropriate and it is important that Mr. Guterres and the UN Secretariat point out the problem **now** (see no 70-71).

*B The UN's role in the implementation of fair and efficient LA (and justice) systems around the world.*

1) The UN should oversee the functioning of the **National LA Office judging the LA requests and of the National LA Agency defending the poor in court in cooperation with countries' administrations**.

61. As seen above, because (a) of the **very high cost** of rendering justice (and of giving a fair trial to everyone, and in particular to the poor who cannot afford to pay their own lawyers and whose cases are therefore more expensive for the community) and (b) of the legal (*constitutional*), budgetary, and organizational **constraints**, we have only **one possible** organization to implement an efficient and low cost LA system which is : (1) to create **a National LA Office** (N-LAO) made up of dedicated-to-LA **judges** to judge (fairly) the LA demands and to oversee the mediation efforts to decrease the number of cases that are sent to the regular justice system; (2) to create a **National LA Agency** (N-LAA) made up of dedicated-to-LA **lawyers** to defend the poor during mediation and in Court (if mediation has failed); and (3) to develop (in cooperation with as many countries as possible) **2 (global internet) computer applications** necessary (a) to manage these two **new** (for most of countries) entities and (b) to implement the system in all the countries that want it. But, even with what seems to be an **efficient organization**, **several things can go wrong** and make the system inefficient or not efficient enough.

62. For example, the judges of the N-LAO must do the best they can to make the poor who request the legal aid, obtain justice against *the rich* (administrations, large corporations,); this means that they cannot cheat or lie to deny the LA on a perfectly motivated LA request **as it happens now in France regularly**; and, at the same time, they cannot grant the legal aid when the case has no chance of winning; otherwise it would give too much work for the lawyers and make the system inefficient even for the one who has a well-motivated case (but **they should use every possible cause of action in the interest of the poor**). To avoid these problems we must

have: (1) the proper number of judges, (2) well-trained and motivated judges, (3) an efficient work methodology, (4) powerful software and hardware to help the judges do their work well, and (5) efficient supervisors and information systems. This is why I suggested that the UNOHCHR supervised - **in cooperation** with countries' administrations - these *National LA Offices*. The UNOCHR could also be in charge of producing the international statistics and analysis (on this LA system) to continue to improve the system.

**63.** For the group of dedicated-to-LA lawyers, we have the same problems; we need to have the appropriate number of lawyers, otherwise they could rapidly be overworked and the system would lose its efficiency; we need to have **motivated** and **efficient** lawyers who want to help the poor win their cases, and we need to have the proper work methodology, an appropriate computer system to help them in their work, and experienced supervisors. Here again I believe that the UNOHCHR could supervise these groups of lawyers - **in cooperation with countries' administrations** [perhaps have one high level lawyer in the country who splits his time between the management (and supervision) duties, the defense of some cases, and the reporting to the UNOHCHR]. As explained in my letters 11-17-14 ([exh. 13](#)) and 1-18-15 letters ([exh. 12](#)), **time is a key issue**, so we need to record the time spent on every case precisely, because we will have to estimate as precisely as possible the time needed to resolve the different types of cases [(criminal, civil, administrative,), taking into account the specific difficulty of some case, the level of experience of the lawyers, and the other aspects that may have an influence on the cost] and because this estimation is key to be more efficient in managing the system and the lawyers (and the LA judges).

[63.1 The objective of a LA system is **not** to interfere in the local legal system (outside the possibilities given by the local laws) or to force a country to change its laws; for example, a public LA system would **not** change the existence of the death penalty in the US, only the US government, senators and representatives can do that ; the LA system will **only** make sure that the existing laws are applied in the same manner to the poor and to the rich. In France, the justice system allows anyone - **since 2010** - to question the constitutionality of a law, - or at least **in theory** -, so the lawyers (and their clients, or anyone victim of a dishonest law) have the possibility to help improve the laws that do not respect the rights of anyone (including the poor), but, as seen above, in practice, this new possibility is – at this time - **not** really given to the poor; an efficient LA system should change that and could have also (in countries that have such a possibility to question the legality of laws) an important impact on the quality of the laws (for the poor).].

**2) The UN should also play an important role in the development of the two computer applications to help the countries (that want it) implement the new LA system.**

**64.** As seen above, to decrease the high cost of guarantying a fair trial to everyone, we must mutualize the common spending [like the cost of developing and maintaining **the computer applications** necessary to implement our strategy, and even, if possible, use the same hardware to increase the volume purchased and obtain lower prices ...]; and this requires **an important coordination work** that only the UN can do (with the help of the UNOHCHR; and it would be easier to do if we created a new Internet International organization that would be in charge of developing and maintaining global computer applications, as the ones I describe you here). The computer application **necessary to manage and judge the LA requests** must include (1) a system that allows the poor or his lawyer (at the new LA Agency) to file online the request for LA (and eventual additional documents), (2) a system to follow the discovery phase and the possible mediation effort, and (3) a system to manage the time used to judge the LA request, to record the strategy chosen and an estimation of the cost of judging the case. Also, an advantage of this *N-LA Office* is that the LA judges will be able **to follow the cases** (they have ruled on at the beginning of the process) during trial as they go from the 1st instance court to a higher level courts (appeal and supreme court), which should **save money** because the analysis of the LA request for an appeal (for example) will be easier to do and there will be a possibility to try mediation again before an appeal.

**65.** The computer application to help the lawyers manage their LA missions must include (1) a system to manage the documents of the case (legal aid request related documents, pleadings, ) and (2) a system to evaluate the time used to resolve the case (time to write the pleading, to do research, to go hearing, ) and to record the extra cost other than the cost due to the intellectual work (travel expenses to go to the court ...); because to have the precise evaluation of the time and the expense necessary to resolve each type of cases (civil, criminal, administrative, ) is critical to improve the efficiency of our LA and justice systems (and the system must be capable of recording the level of experiences of the lawyers who work on the cases, and the eventual intervention of other lawyers like supervisors or experts of some kind). Of course, the two new entities (N-LA office and LA agency) should make an extensive use of video-conference system to communicate between each other, with the court and judges and with prison inmates (for criminal cases) to decrease the cost and record the different hearings (this is already done in the US). The UNOHCHR could play an important role in analyzing the users need and a role of interface between the Country users and the organization in charge of developing and maintaining the systems.

C The role that the US (and other) Universities could play and **conclusion** on the UN's role in the implementation of fair and efficient LA (and justice) systems.

1) **Universities do have a position on truth and value of reason in dealing with social problems.**

66. In a 9-27-17 interview, Mr. Bollinger talked about *the role of universities* and explained this : 'Columbia doesn't have a position on issues like trade policy. **But as a university we do have a position on truth and value of reason in dealing with social problems...**', and he explains also that 'the school participates in litigation on Trump administration's revised travel ban' for example. Here, the US (and others) Universities could help **point out the truth** in the different important issues I discussed in this letter, and encourage the UN and the different parties (France, US,) **to use reason** to find the best solution to *the social problems* I address. Also, given the fact that the US universities you preside over are ranked - **almost every year** - in (or close to) **the top ten** in the various international rankings, I believe it is fair to say that **your influence is not limited** to the frontier of the US, but is really **international**, and that you can intervene and help resolve *the French LA system problems* I describe here, and find the best possible (solution for the) LA system that could be implemented everywhere around the world. And, finally, since I wrote to you **in 2002** (to ask for *your intellectual support* in my asylum application), you are well placed to point out some of **the lies that have been used to hurt me** in the US and then after that in France (I did not exaggerate the LA system problems we had **in 2002**; and everything that happened to me **since 2011** in France has confirmed the well-founded of my refugee status in the US in 2002).

67. In particular, it would be great if you could **(1) point out** the lies that were written and told during my asylum related proceeding and to deport me (you certainly can certify that I applied for asylum and that I asked for your help to defend my case, at least); **(2) describe** the dishonest strategies used by the public (and private) lawyers, and judges to avoid addressing the important issues of my cases and to make sure that the truth on what really happened would not be discovered (based on my remarks, the pleadings, and judgments) and the obvious errors that I described on my various court cases in the US; **(3) verify and confirm** the validity of the allegations of frauds I made **against the highest judges** in France (from the Cour de cassation, Conseil d'Etat, and Conseil Constitutionnel, see [exh. 43, no 15-29](#)) to prevent the judgment – **on the merits** - of my QPC on the LA law (and of course also the validity of my arguments justifying that our LA law violates the H-rights of the poor) ; **(4) verify and confirm** all the obvious lies told and written and errors made to make sure that the truth would not be known in my criminal complaint against the CA (and its top managers and board members); **and finally (5) point out** the information and arguments that have (deliberately) been ignored in various decision processes to come up to incorrect solutions or decisions

68. For point **(5)**, I am referring to **(a) the decision** to maintain the dishonest LA system in France, and, among others, the information that the Cour of accounts has forgotten to consider in its **12-23-16** référé ([exh. 4.2](#)), and the errors made by the Justice Minister and his lies in his **3-15-17** response ([exh. 4.3](#)) described in my **4-5-17** letter ([exh. 4.1](#)); and the highest courts' treacheries to avoid judging the law unconstitutional ([exh. 43, no 15-29](#), [exh. 11](#)); and **(b) the decision process that led to transfer of the Internet governance to ICANN** (or to the multistakeholder Internet community) **in 2016**, and that I will discuss **in part V**. For the Internet governance, you know that it is a critical issue for the entire planet, so it is important to make sure that all the available and pertinent information and arguments be taken into consideration, and your contribution would be important for everyone; and for the LA system problems, you could help the UN Secretariat and M. Guterres who should use *the Human Rights up front initiative* to point out the very dishonest behavior of French politicians, lawyers and judges (and prosecutors) and make sure that punishments are imposed upon the main protagonists of *this large scale corruption scandal*.

\*\*\* 69 Since 'an estimated four billion people live outside the protection of the law and those that live at or below the poverty line face institutional, legal and administrative barriers ...', it is obvious that you cannot help every poor who is victim of an injustice, **but, if you find that the dishonesty of the French LA system and the development of an efficient LA system** are subjects **important enough for you to get involved** ; or if you find it important to point out the justice efforts in France and in the US **to hurt one individual over a 20 years period** because he dares to denounce the obvious injustices he has been victim of, then please don't hesitate **(1)** to study my case, perhaps obtain the help of universities **in the UK** that may have experts **on their LA system**, and **(2)** to help the UN address the issues I discussed here.\*\*\*

2) **The use of the human right up front initiative.**

70. Mr. Guterres, above I have given you a fairly precise description of certain justice problems I encountered in France and in the US; as you could see, as soon as I obtained the refugee status in the US **on**

9-5-02, the different administrations (INS, LA County, justice,) did everything they could (cheat, lie, committed criminal offences,) to deprive me of my rights, to hurt me, to harass me - **for 10 years almost** -, and to steal me the refugee status I had obtained on the paper and according to an AL judge and the INS National Refugee Center Director, at least (!) before they eventually lied in their deportation order to put me in home detention (in 2008) and then to deport me (in 2011), **under the eye and with the consent of the highest judges in the Country** (us supreme court,) and **highest level civil servants** (solicitor general,). Then, **not even 3 days** after I arrived in France **after 10 years** of absence, some people were already doing research to find *some fault* I would have **committed in the past**; and they found a debt made on my name **in May 1987** that had not been reimbursed **since 1990**; but the problem is that I did not do and could have not done this debt since I was in the US at the time trying to finish my studies (and in a hospital and then at home **with casts on my leg and on my arm, incapable of walking properly!**).

71. I explained this situation, but the **French administration** (in particular the justice), and the **Bank's top managers** (and employees) did **not** care about that, about the truth, and about the fact that they (or the concerned banks) had necessarily committed several criminal offences; they just saw an opportunity to hurt me even more than they had done already [and **since March 2011**, they have been cheating, lying and pretending they do not understand the situation to harass me, to hurt me and to cover up the bank (and its top managers) criminal wrongdoings]. And my letters to the government, press and media, and representatives (and NGO, intellectuals,) pointing out these problems were **ignored** also to cover up the wrongdoings and to maintain the dishonest LA system (despite the many evidences they had of the well-founded of my accusations). So I think you should use your *Human Rights up Front Initiative* to point out – **publicly** - France's LA system dishonesty and French politicians' (*and society*) dishonest behavior [and **not** close your eyes as Mr. Ban Ki-moon has done it]; and as '*form of protection given to those who took a stance*', I would be grateful if you (and the UN Secretariat) **could help me obtain justice** against **France and the US**; and also help the UN member states implement new efficient LA systems.

## V The two main proposals of my platform.

72. Even though I have addressed these issues in quite a lot of details in **my 2005-2006** letters ([exh. 61.3](#), [exh. 61.2](#)), and my **12-20-13** ([exh. 17](#)), **4-11-16** ([exh. 55](#)), and **8-25-16** ([exh. 58](#), [exh. 57](#)) letters (among others), I must come back briefly on my platform's two main proposals and encourage '*you*' (including **Mr. Guterres** who has the possibility to act on these issues) again to start these two important projects as soon as possible if we want to have a chance to reach the SDGs (in particular *eradicating poverty*, building efficient justice systems, *decrease inequalities*), to bring peace around the world and to fight more efficiently global warming. But I will only summarize the arguments I gave you last year and mention some recent research articles arguments on these subjects.

### A The proposal to create a new Internet International organization.

73. Many important (critical even) arguments were **not** taken into consideration during the debate on the Internet Governance; and this is why (I believe) the US (and indirectly the world) ended up taking a bad decision that several US senators and representatives tried to prevent. Here also, the UN Secretariat **should have** done more to make sure that the deciding parties (the US government and the US Congress, and through them the public opinion) use all the available information and arguments in their decision process. And I personally believe that I have done everything I could do to inform **the French government** and **the UN Secretariat** that some important information and arguments were **not** taken into consideration, including the many flaws of the multistakeholder model, and the many benefits of giving the Internet Governance to the UN.

#### 1) The flaws of the multistakeholder model of Internet governance.

74. **First, an important problem** of the multistakeholder model is the fact that **many different organizations** (private businesses, non-profit organizations, universities,) **(a)** are running **small part** of the Internet (like root name servers,) and **(b)** are doing sometimes identical tasks that are necessary for the Internet to run properly (like selling and collecting the fee for the domain names, managing registries,) because : **(1)** the management of the Internet is **not optimized**, many different organizations do exactly the same work that could be done more efficiently and **for less money** by just one organization; **(2)** **a lot of money and resources** that **could be used** to improve the Internet functioning, is **wasted**; **(3)** it is **very difficult** to know fairly precisely how much it cost to run the Internet; and **(4)** it is impossible to put in place a fair and *coherent global Internet fee system* that is based on the use of the Internet resources and on the revenues and profits generated by this use. Also, **(5)** the *multistakeholder model* **prevents us**

from having a **coherent and performant information system on the Internet** that would bring many benefits to the Internet, the countries, the businesses and the people and society in general.

75. The entities who sell the domain names do **not have the authorities and the necessary the resources** to collect the important information required to build this information and to verify its accuracy [most of the organizations (registry, registrar) selling the domain names are **private or non-profit organizations**, so they cannot collect certain information that would be very useful for the community and they cannot verify the accuracy of the information they collect **in cooperation with national administrations**]. For example, we do not have a lot of information on the website owners (not to say that we have almost no information on the website owners, especially from the big corporations), although collecting certain information (from website owners) would allow us, **among others: (1) to design and develop a fairer Internet fee system, (2) to monitor the performance of the Internet Industry, (2) to promote and support economic growth in this industry, and (3) to fight more efficiently (a) the promotion of terrorism and violent extremism on the Internet, and (b) cyber-criminality.** Finally, **(6) the multistakeholder model makes it impossible (or very difficult) to use the Internet more efficiently and to develop global computer applications** that could help us resolve some specific problems like the ones I proposed to implement new and more efficient LA systems everywhere around the world.

76. On the other hand, giving the governance the Internet to the UN and creating a new Internet IO present **many advantages** for everyone, **including the US**, since it would allow us to resolve all the problems we have just identified for the old multistakeholder model.

**2) The many advantages of creating a new Internet International Organization.**

77. A new Internet IO - that would perform the *Internet related functions* of ICANN, IANA, IAB, IETF, ISOC, registries, registrars (...) - would allow us **to manage and to use the Internet more efficiently** and to resolve some of our important global problems because this new IO would allow us **(a) to develop and maintain a computer application that calculates the appropriate fee for each type of sites owners** (based on the use of the Internet resources and on the revenues and profits generated by the uses of the Internet); **(b) to organize the verification of the information it collects from site owners in cooperation with the national administrations;** and **(c) to develop some dedicated global computer applications** (like the ones I proposed to develop in the justice area). This new IO **could and would be allowed** to generate revenues **more important** than what ICANN receives, and revenues based on the use of the (Internet) resources and on the revenues and profits generated by this Internet use, so it would have the resources that ICANN does **not** have to improve **(1) the Internet functioning and (2) the services it renders to the users**, including the large corporations that are websites owners, and to the international community (like fighting more efficiently cyber-criminality and the promotion of violent extremism and terrorism online, ...).

78. As explained last year, if rich countries develop global computer applications **(a) to resolve certain specific global problems and (b) to help many countries at the same time**, then they would be able save money on ODA because the money they spent to develop a global application that can be used by both rich and poor countries, could be deduced **from their ODA obligations**. Such way of working **puts us in a WIN-WIN situation** [rich countries spend money to resolve **one of their own problems**; and at the same time they **decrease their ODA obligations**; and poor countries benefit from **(1) the new advanced administrative, justice, economic ... systems and processes rich countries have developed** (in cooperation with poor countries), and from **(2) the related global computer applications to implement them at no or at little cost for them**]. Also, as mentioned already, if we want to develop the **alternative to market capitalism** [the second proposal of my platform], we need to have a very efficient *international information system*, and to develop this *international information system* (and the necessary Internet applications to create it), we need this new Internet IO [see below **no 80-83**]. In my **8-25-16** letters ([exh. 58](#), [exh. 57](#)) I have mentioned the benefits we could gain also in term of fight against the cyber-criminality and fight against the promotion of terrorism online, so I would like to come back briefly on this issue.

79. A recent article from the IMF dated **10-26-17** and titled '*Cyber Defense Must Be Global*', talks about the cyberattacks on financial institutions that are becoming '*more common and considerably more sophisticated*' according to the authors. They writes also '*banks of all sizes experience cyberattacks every days*', '*IO like Bank for International settlements, the financial stability board, and the IMF can play a key role in supporting information sharing, designing coordinated policies, helping resolve disputes, and containing systemic risk*', and '*Cyber risk has no geographical borders, and the threat is global, so the role of International institutions is crucial*'. All these

remarks and arguments are important, of course, but the creation of a new IO to govern the Internet would open also new doors to resolve some of the problems described here with technical solutions, to coordinate the efforts made in the various international and national entities, and to decide on certain important issues at the General Assembly level. Also, it is important to improve significantly our *Internet Information systems* if we want to fight efficiently cyber-criminality and the promotion of terrorism online, and this is a difficult work that needs to be done by *a dedicated organization* that can cooperate with national institutions.

*B. The proposal to design and develop the alternative to market capitalism.*

**80.** The second proposal I presented in my **2016 plate-form** ([exh. 59](#)) was to develop the *alternative to market capitalism*, our old economic system that creates automatically grave inequalities. The highest paid celebrity made **\$170 million in 2015**, about **340 times** what the US President made, and about **500 times** what a US Senator or a Representative made; this is a very significant difference that is not based on the relative contribution of the artist to society's progress. I believe it is clear that the US President's work and your work (as senators, representatives, UN member states representatives and UN officials like Mr. Guterres,) are difficult and important for everyone, and that they are **more important** for the community - when it comes to improving the living conditions of the people in the US and around the world - **than the work of Taylor Swift**, the musician and singer who made **\$170 million** [or the work of the highest paid soccer player (**\$88 million**)]; and that these important **differences** in salaries amount to a **degrading treatment - a violation of human rights** [also, even if it is difficult to develop a new system, these differences show a **lack of courage** on the part of politicians around the world and a form of corruption because their role is **to improve our society and systems, so we must change that rapidly**].

[**81.** In my **12-20-13** letter ([exh. 17](#)) **at no 17**, I wrote 'The jurisprudence of the European Court (ECHR) states the following in French : 'l'article 3 stipule que nul ne peut être soumis à 'la torture ni à des peines ou **traitements inhumains ou dégradants**'. Prise dans ce contexte, l'expression '**traitements inhumains ou dégradants**' montre que cette disposition vise en général à **empêcher les atteintes particulièrement graves à la dignité humaine**. Par conséquent, **une mesure qui abaisse une personne dans son rang, sa situation ou sa réputation, ne peut être considérée comme 'traitement dégradant' au sens de l'article 3 que si elle atteint un certain degré de gravité.**' Meaning, a system or an action which lowers a person in his/her rank, situation or reputation can be considered to be '**a degrading treatment in the sense of article 3**' only if it reaches a high degree of gravity; and I believe that **an economic system** that can pay an individual (Mr. Zuckerberg) **\$2,28 billion in a year** while it pays the President of the US **\$400 000 a year about or 5 700 times less than \$2,28 billions**, and an individual receiving the minimum revenue (in Germany, 8,5 euros /hour) of **about 16 320 euros a year or about 139 705 times less** than this rich person (Mr. Zuckerberg) **is a system that creates so much differences** that it **lowers** the value of the work of the **US President** (or other presidents) and of an ordinary person receiving the minimum revenue so much that it can be considered a **degrading treatment** in the sense of the article 3 of the ECHR because it **lowers them (1)** in their rank (relative rank in term of viewed importance of their work by society), **(2)** their situation (relative fortune in term of viewed importance of their relative contribution to society's progress) and **(3)** their reputation (image,) with a **high degree of gravity ...**].

**82.** We can – now - develop a better and more efficient economic system **(1)** because the Internet **allow** us to develop **more precise international and national information systems**; **(2)** because we can build a new Internet IO that will allow us to develop more precise *international and national information systems*; **(3)** because we have **the UN** that can organize the development of this new economic system and make sure that every country in the world participates in this difficult task, and that the new system is accepted by (and good for) everyone; **(4)** because we will be the ones writing **the specification** of this new economic system, so we can chose **(a)** to design a system that will help us **(i)** reduce the inequalities and pay everyone according to his/her relative contribution to society progress, **(ii)** fight global warming, **(iii)** promote economic growth (...), and more generally **(b)** to design a system that is more compatible with our political system, democracy than the old one was and more in phase with our more advanced form of society.

**83.** In a recent IMF article **dated 10-11-17** and titled *Inequalities : Fiscal Policy can make the difference*; the authors are trying to convince the reader that *Fiscal Policy* can make the difference in tackling inequality, and to me there is no doubt that it can help, but also that it is **not** a good **long term solution (1)** because *Fiscal Policy* does **not** entirely resolve the inequalities' problem and does not address certain consequences of the problem of our old economic system like **(a) the wrong perception** certain persons have of their **real relative contribution to society's progress** when they receive salaries that are not in direct relation to their relative level of contribution to society's progress; and **(b)** the fact that these differences constitute a *degrading treatment*; and **(2)** because it cannot easily help us resolve other problems like global

warming and the respect of human rights for everyone while a new better designed economic system could do that I believe, and help us resolve other global problems as well.

### C. Conclusion on the two main proposals of my platform.

**84.** Here again, I believe that the 8 US Universities I mentioned (and others too) could help us have an *honest debate* on these issues; and they could point out the obvious arguments and information that were not taken into consideration during the debate on the Internet governance (as seen above), for example, and when the decision to transfer the governance of the Internet to the ICANN (...) was taken. I think they should also give their point of view on the fact that our actual economic system (market capitalism) creates differences in salaries that constitute *a degrading treatment*, and therefore a violation of human rights. This is a key issue, and if 'we' all (or a large majority of lawmakers, intellectuals, ...) agree it is the case, then there will be no doubt that we must act **urgently** on this subject for everyone benefits. Of course, the UN Secretariat and **Mr. Guterres** should (1) defend these proposals in front of countries and UN members states representatives because they are key proposals to achieve the SDG and they fit perfectly in the ongoing UN programs (Addis Ababa, Vienna, Istanbul, I believe; and (2) make sure that the North-Korea crisis is not used to avoid making progress on these important issues and projects (for the world and to achieve the SDG), and instead is used to resolve certain important problems for the UN as we are going to see it now.

## **VI The North Korea crisis.**

**85.** An important lesson we can learn from what I just talked about is that **important** decisions (at the national and international levels) are often taken **without considering all the important information and arguments available** (either by mistake or negligence, or willfully); this was true for the decision to maintain the LA system in France over many years (as we saw it and for example, even the *Cour des comptes* **that is picky**, forgot several important information and arguments **in its critics** of the actual LA system; and the Justice Minister made deliberate errors and hide some information and arguments to say the least); and it was also true for the decision to transfer the Internet governance to ICANN (...) **in 2016** [transfer which presented no interest for the US and for the UN and its members states]; and I believe that it is also the reason why a **Peace Treaty** was **never** signed between N-Korea and S-Kora and the US, and why we now have what I will call the '**North Korea crisis**'. So since many countries have had a chance to express themselves on this subject at the UN in September, and then during the different international summits, and in the press and media, I would like to go back on the different arguments that were presented by the different parties involved, and present some arguments and information that have **never** been discussed (or that have been minimized).

### A. The use and effect of nuclear weapons.

#### **1) The important role that nuclear-weapons have plaid in the maintenance of Peace.**

**86.** Before I start on the subject of the actual dispute between the US (its allies) and N-Korea, I must make some remarks on the subject of nuclear weapons because, to me, the analysis made by some on this subject is not correct. About **220 000 persons** died, I believe, **in Hiroshima and Nagasaki** as the result of the two nuclear bombs that were dropped by the US [Japan may have different numbers, but it is **in this range** I believe], the only ones ever used, I believe (except for test). This was a great tragedy, there is no doubt about that, and we must do everything we can to make sure it never happens again, but it is also important to put this number **into perspective**; namely (1) this number is only **about 1% of the total number of persons** who died during **World War II**; (2) last year - **alone** - about **9 million persons** died of **causes related to our environment problems**, and **4,5 million out of the 9 million** died of **causes related to the pollution of the air** that is **man-made** (according to *the Lancet*, a well-known and trustworthy medical magazine; **WHO gives even greater numbers 12.6 million and 6.5 million!**).

**87.** Also, recently, an accountant, not a soldier or a policeman, killed in less **than 10 minutes** more than **50 innocent people** and wounded **more than 500 persons** (in the US), just with *small weapons*, and we know that, since World War II, millions (if not tens of millions, or **even hundreds of millions**) died from the use of *small weapons* (in Africa in particular). Finally, some people would probably argue that dropping the 2 nuclear bombs on Japan has allowed the US to end the war sooner and to save a **significant number** of American and Japanese soldiers (and civilians) lives [an estimation gives between **500 000 and 1 million of US soldiers' lives saved** because of the 2 nuclear bombs, I believe; and possibly as much, if not more, of **Japanese soldiers and civilians lives**, including women and

children]; and, to me – at least -, the nuclear weapons most probably played **an important role** in the fact that we only had what we call a '**cold war**' between *the East* and *the West*, and **not** a real war that could have killed millions [the soviet union tanks could have been Paris in few weeks probably if we had not had nuclear weapons, and not much could have stopped them probably], so if we make a comparison with the other means we have available to kill people, I would say that nuclear weapons have killed a much smaller number of persons than small weapons and than *the pollution of the air that is man-made* (there is no more doubt about that, I believe), and that there are strong evidence that nuclear weapons may have saved millions of lives **in their 70 years of existence**.

\*\*\* **87.1** I believe that my remark on this issue of *the role of nuclear of weapons in the maintenance of peace*, is supported by the comment of **Mr. Lavrov** made at the UN September summit ([exh. 103](#)), when he said that '*the attempts to 'outlaw' the nuclear weapons without taking into account modern realities and turning a blind eye to all the factors that impact the strategic stability today only make this common goal ('the common goal of achieving a nuclear-weapon free world') more distant and undermine the consensus regimes of NPT and CTBT*'; even if I think that '**achieving a nuclear-weapon free world**' should not be a common goal of humanity as I will explain it now. \*\*\*

**2) Nuclear-weapons can probably still play an important role for humanity.**

**88.** These remarks make me believe that those who try to '**abolish**' the nuclear weapons are using *the wrong word* and make *an intellectual mistake*. To me, it is important to '**abolish**' **(1) the reasons** why a country would want to use the nuclear weapons against another country or to threaten another country to use them; **(2) the reasons** why a country would want to develop a nuclear bomb to defend itself against (or attack) another country; **(3) the reasons** why the countries that have them **(a) would refuse to diminish the number they have**, **(b) would want to keep them for their personal use** and **(c) would refuse to work together with other countries to determine the ways these weapons can be used to serve humanity** (and not one country), how they should be improved and handled to make sure they best serve humanity. As an example of **what I mean**, I would like to say this; it seems *scientifically understood* that it is an asteroid that caused **the end of dinosaurs** when it hit the earth (**at the wrong place**, it seems now), so even though it happened **a long time ago** and it may not happen again before a long time, it seems reasonable that we start thinking about the means of preventing such disaster to happen again, and *the use of nuclear weapons* in space to deviate the trajectory of the asteroid or to destroy it, if possible (...), seems one of the possible solutions to avoid such a tragedy.

**89.** The nuclear weapons we have now may not have the strength sufficient to do that, but at least we could start working **together** on this subject to see if there is not some ways we can use our existing weapons, and/or make them stronger and more efficient to address such a threat. This could be an obvious use for nuclear weapons that is *in the interest of humanity*, but there may be other that I cannot think of now, especially when some countries are already planning to establish a permanent base **on the Moon** and to send people **on Mars**; and others would like to land on asteroids to be able to extract the different minerals they have. To justify its objective *to abolish nuclear weapons*, ICAN (the 2017 Nobel Prize) talks about the humanitarian aspect, and in particular the consequences of these weapons use and the disastrous effects on the people (with pictures), but it ignores completely the arguments I presented above about **the estimated number of lives they have saved** over 70 years; it talks also about the environmental consequences, but it forgets to talk about the consequences that a large asteroid would have if it hit the earth (...). I am not trying to do the promotion of nuclear-weapons, I just think that we must be **precise** on these very important (**for the world**) subjects.

*B Why a peace treaty has not been signed in the Korea Peninsula during the past 64 years, and the responsibility of S-Korea and Japan in the actual problems and in the North Korea crisis.*

**1) South-Korea and Japan leaders make no mention of any effort to sign a Peace Treaty.**

**90.** In his September UN speech, President Moon Jae-in ([exh. 105](#)) said the following : '*the War has yet to come to a complete end. The Korean War is a war that began as an offshoot of the larger Cold War conflict, continues to this day. Though the Cold War ended, and 64 years have passed since the conclusion of the Armistice Agreement, the War remain ongoing in the form of an uneasy ceasefire on the Peninsula, the last residual Cold War in Northeast Asia*' and then '*For me, the President of the only divided country, peace is a calling and historical duty*', **but**, if you read in detail both the speech of President Moon Jae-in and of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe ([exh. 101](#)) - in which he gave a precise description of the efforts that were made (by the US, S-Korea and Japan) to have N-Korea abandoned its nuclear-weapons program -, **you will see** that they do **not** mention any attempt to sign

a Peace Treaty between the US, S-Korea and N-Korea, and that President Moon Jae-in does **not** ask **precisely** the United Nations to help S-Korea and N-Korea **sign a Peace Treaty since** he talks about *measures*, and not about diplomacy : '*We need the United Nations to play a more active role on the Korean Peninsula. The most important role the United Nations is asked to play today is to come up with fundamental *measures* to stop the vicious cycle of *increases provocations* and *heightened sanctions*'.*

\*\*\* 90.1 During ten years, we had - as UNSG - Mr. Ban Ki-moon, a South-Korea national and former foreign minister who knew necessarily well this subject, but, to my knowledge, he **never** made any effort to have the different parties sign a **Peace Treaty** although as UNSG he could have use his '*good office*' **prerogatives** to do so.\*\*\*

91. It is important to ask ourselves : Why S-Korea, the US and Japan have **never** (really or officially) tried to sign a **Peace Treaty** with N-Korea in which **all the important issues** could have been addressed, including, of course, **the Security** of the S-Korean, of the Japanese and of the North Korean **people**; an issue that would have **necessarily** included also talks about the N-Korea nuclear-weapons program and the withdrawal of US troops from S-Korea and from Japan, and of the North and S-Korean troops from the frontier ('Demilitarized Zone') ? And why they do not ask – **precisely** - for the help of the UN **to sign a Peace Treaty**, instead of trying to address **only** the *N-Korea nuclear-weapons and missiles programs issues* ? An explanation **may be (1)** that it is **convenient** (or that it presents **several important advantages**) for S-Korea, for Japan, and for the US **to keep the about 28 000 or 30 000 US soldiers** in both S-Korea and Japan, and **(2)** therefore that they do not want to sign a **Peace Treaty** that would force them to talk about **the withdrawal of the US troops** from both S-Korea and Japan. Also, time plays in favor of S-Korea, Japan, and the US because the war status (absence of a Peace Treaty) hurts more N-Korea whose enemy (the US,) is much *richer & stronger*.

[91.1 It is possible that there are (or that some of you see) **some benefits** for N-Korea in the fact that **no Peace Treaty** has been signed, but, given that N-Korea is one of the poorest countries in the World, and that it is under very harsh sanctions, me, I do not see any benefits for N-Korea.].

2) **The benefits for S-Korea, Japan and the US to have US troops in S-Korea and Japan.**

92. In his speech Prime Minister Abe ([exh. 101.](#)) talks about *the location* of N-Korea ('*North Korea is in a truly fortunate location, adjoining the growth region of Asia and the Pacific*') as **an advantage** for N-Korea, but he forgot the grave problems that *this location* causes to N-Korea. N-Korea has for neighbors **China** (with one of the 3 strongest armies in the World and nuclear-weapons), **Russia** (with one of the 3 strongest armies in the World and nuclear-weapons), and **S-Korea and the 28 000 US soldiers**, and therefore indirectly the US (with a **700 billion dollars military budget**, one of the 3 strongest armies in the World, if not the strongest, and nuclear-weapons), so *this location* is **not comfortable** for N-Korea (**militarily speaking and if it wants to stay independent**); and it means also that S-Korea and Japan **are very close** to China and to Russia (having two of the 3 strongest armies in the world); and that, if Japan and S-Korea [that are two of the richest countries in the world; the third richest for Japan, and with huge worldwide conglomerate like Samsung for South-Korea] want to maintain **some military and diplomatic equilibrium** with their two powerful neighbors (China and Russia), they either need **(1)** to keep the US troops who have **nuclear-weapons** at their disposal on their soil; or **(2) perhaps** to develop nuclear-weapons for themselves to match China and Russia strength, and by doing so violating the NPT; or **(3)** to obtain the guarantees from their powerful neighbors that they will not be bullied, pressured, or even attacked which may **not** be so easy to do.

[92.1 Mr. Lavrov said in his UN speech ([exh. 103.](#)) : '*it is necessary to stop relying on military alliances, and provide support and security guarantees to the states that opted for neutrality*.'; it is a **good idea** and the **right spirit** (going in the direction of President Trump's remarks on the need to have **strong independent** UN member states), I believe, but the words '*opted for neutrality*' are **ambiguous** or **vague**; and the words '*security guarantees*' are not going to be easy to define. How can China, Russia and N-Korea give **security guarantees** to S-Korea and Japan, if the US troops return home ...? *Powerful (and nuclear) countries* cannot even - **demonstrate a very active cooperation work** to resolve **all the important** problems of **humanity** like the environment problem (including the global warming problem), poverty, inequalities, the *general* lack of respect for human rights, **the need to diminish the number of nuclear-weapons** ...; so it is difficult for them '*to guarantee*' the **Safety** of other countries.].

93. **So far**, S-Korea and Japan have chosen **the first option** (business as usual) which is **the worst possible option** for N-Korea **and for the world**; and, at the same time, they have used various technics to weaken N-Korea and to prevent it from obtaining the nuclear-weapons that would be the only guaranty it could have not to be attacked by the US [after the US used false information in front of the UNSC to start the Iraq war in 2003 ...]. S-Korea and Japan pay each, it seems, between **800 million dollars** and **1,3 billion dollars** (may be more altogether) for the **28 000 to 30 000 US soldiers** about [and get for free as a bonus for S-Korea, **the new advanced US anti-missile system**]; and the US does not have

to pay the full amount it would pay if it kept these about 60 000 soldiers on US soil; it can protect the **financial interests** it has in Japan and in S-Korea **at a low cost**; it is necessarily *the primary business partner* of these two countries; and **it keeps** its '*two main enemies*' or, more precisely, '*adversaries*' or '*competitors*' close [you know as the saying goes: '*keep you friends close and your enemies even closer*']. But this solution creates many serious problems for everyone, not just for N-Korea, so I believe that **it should be reconsidered by everyone**.

3) **The problems of having US soldiers in S-Korea and Japan (and Germany).**

94. As President Trump said it in his September's UN speech ([exh. 102](#)) : '*The success of the United Nations depends upon the independent strength of its members*'; and I believe that he is right; and that one of the main problems of having US soldiers in S-Korea and Japan is that these two UN member states are **not independent** (with the US soldiers) and **not strong** [**enough militarily or diplomatically** in comparison to Russia and China without the US soldiers, **and without safety guaranties from their neighbors R-C-N-K**]. We could almost say that S-Korea and Japan are the **51<sup>st</sup> and 52<sup>nd</sup> states** of the United States of America; that President Trump is *their Defense Minister*; that the Pentagon is *their Defense Ministry*; that S-Korea and Japan are using the US troops to get around the NPT (and to avoid facing the critics that North-Korea faces for its N-program), and that they are hiding behind the US while (at the same time) sanctioning N-Korea for wanting to have nuclear-weapons to match the US strength and to defend itself! Independently from hurting N-Korea, this situation creates also **a form of distrust** toward their 2 powerful neighbors China and Russia, even though they never mention that an important reason for having US soldiers is to be protected from them or to match their (military) strength.

95. Another problem of having US soldiers in S-Korea, Japan (and even in Germany) is that **it prevents the reform of the UN Security Council**, I believe. Prime Minister Abe said at the beginning of his UN speech ([exh. 101](#)): '*the world certainly holds high expectation toward the UN as the flag bearer upholding these ('the free liberal, open, international order and multilateral frameworks')*. That is exactly why the **Security Council should be reformed without delay**, in response of the demand of the times'. And I agree with him that we must reform the Security Council without delay, and that we must find **a way to bring in** Japan, Germany, Brazil, India, perhaps Canada also, and 2 African (...) countries **as permanent members**, but if Japan (and Germany) stays **so evidently dependent on the US military**, it will be difficult to justify a change at the UNSC. To reform the UNSC, we must **turn the page on World War II and the Korean War**, not forget them, **but turn the page**; and establish a **higher level of trust** between the nations, and in particular the ones that are and will be UNSC permanent members; and again having US troops in Japan, Germany and South Korea expresses necessarily a form of distrust **toward China and Russia**, so it is important to address all the important issues of the North Korea crisis, and to resolve **peacefully** this crisis entirely; meaning to sign a **Peace Treaty** and to resolve all the 'Security' issues.

### C. President Trump September UN Speech and the US position on the North-Korea crisis.

1) **It is unfair to put all the blame on N-Korea for the actual crisis and the US contribution during World War II.**

96. In his speech Prime Minister Abe talks also about the efforts made by *the US, S-Korea and Japan* to discourage N-Korea from pursuing its nuclear-weapons program, like **the creation of Kedo**, and he argues that '*from the start, N-Korea had never intended to abandon its nuclear ambitions*', but at the same time, **some could also say that 'from the start the US, S-Korea and Japan had never intended to sign a Peace Treaty and to facilitate the economic development of N-Korea'**; and that their objective was really to weaken N-Korea (as much as possible) **to eventually 'finish the job'** and win the war militarily. I am **not** saying that N-Korea does **not** have **a part** of responsibilities in the actual situation (or crisis) and in the fact that N-Korea remains one of the poorest countries in the world; but I find it is unfair that the very harsh UN sanctions have for objectives to put **all the blame** on N-Korea, and (at the same time) to hurt dearly the N-Korean people and their chance of achieving the SDG, when obviously a part of the blame should also be put on S-Korea, Japan, the US, France, the UK, China and Russia. I will look now at President Trump's positions.

97. First, it is true that *the North-Korea crisis* has been going on for too long and that we must find a peaceful solution and resolve **all the problems urgently**; and for that we must study all the possible solutions and arguments that have **not** been discussed. In his UN speech ([exh. 102](#)), President Trump talks about the role that the US plaid during **World War II** and then at the end of the War with **the Marshall plan**; and of course everyone should be grateful to the US for *its contribution* at that time. But the world has changed

tremendously since the 1940s; and the *great challenges* of our time are different from the ones the Roosevelt, Eisenhower, Truman (...) had to face. We need to resolve our **environment problems** (including global warming; that kills **9 million persons every year** and that will destroy the planet if we do not change); we need to **eradicate poverty**, to find ways to **respect the human rights** of everyone on the planet, to **improve our economic and political systems**, to find the best and right governance system for the Internet; and, in these areas, the actual US' contribution is not at its World WAR II's contribution's level, I believe.

2) **President's Trump strong critics toward N-Korea, Iran, Cuba and Venezuela, and the corruption problem.**

**98.** President Trump is (1) very critic toward N-Korea when it says that the N-Korean regime '*is responsible for the starvation deaths of millions of North-Korean, for the imprisonment, torture, killing and oppression of countless more*'; (2) he gives specific example like: the case of the American student who died on his return to the US, the kidnapping of a **13 years old** Japanese girl, and the death of Mr. Kim Jong Un's brother; (3) he criticizes the pursuit of nuclear-weapons and ballistic missiles that he qualifies as a **threat to the entire world**; and (4) he finishes by threatening to **totally destroy N-Korea** if it is forced to defend itself [then he is also very critic toward Iran that he qualifies as a **corrupt** dictatorship (and toward '*the Iran Deal*' on its nuclear program), and toward **Venezuela and Cuba** that he qualifies also a **corrupt regimes**]; **SO I hope he won't mind if I make a small critic of the US. It is a miracle if I did not end up like this American student after what happened to me in the US between 2002 and 2011**; and, as a citizen of France, I was not in **an enemy country** when I came to the US to ask for asylum (for protection and intellectual help to obtain justice against France), but I was still sent **16 times** in the street **between 08-2002 to 11-2003**; and then (during 8 years) the administrations and justice have lied, cheated, and even committed criminal offences to prevent me from resettling, to harass me, to prevent me from obtaining justice, and to deport me with a **full of lies deportation order (!)**.

**99.** Concerning the accusations of **corruption**; is it possible that there is corruption in Iran, Cuba, and Venezuela, I would be surprised if I heard otherwise **because corruption is important everywhere**, in all countries, **even in the richest countries** like the US and in France. It may take a different form in different countries; as mentioned in one of my previous letters, in the US, former **Vice-President Al Gore** talks about '*institutionalized corruption*', the system chosen advantages few people and disadvantages a great many others [for example in the US, the **top 1% richest** collect **more than 20 % of the yearly revenues** and own **more than 40%** of the wealth; the justice system is very corrupt also, as we have seen it above; ..., **no 99.1**]; in one of US allies, **S-Korea**, the last President was forced to resign **because of a corruption scandal**, and one big conglomerate's top manager (Samsung) was sent to jail because of this corruption scandal; and, in **France**, I just described you what I called a **large scale corruption system** to deprive systematically **14 million poor** of their right to a fair trial (...), while, at the same time, bringing many benefits for lawyers, politicians and judges [it is not because it is very difficult to have the French justice denounce the problem and prosecute the guilty parties that this corruption system does not exist; or because **Mr. Ban Ki-moon** has closed his eyes on it that there is no problem], so we cannot seriously argue that corruption is just a problem in Iran, Cuba and Venezuela.

[**99.1** In the US, the Supreme Court has had **9 judges** since **1869**, I believe (the number varied from 5 to 10 **between 1783 and 1869**, it seems), although the US population has grown from **about 30 millions in the 1860s** to **more than 330 million today**, and the number of courts '*and cases*' depending on the Supreme court has also grown **significantly**. And the organization of the justice system and the way the cases are judged have **not** really changed, so only a **handful of cases** are properly judged (with precisely written decisions ...), and most people do not have a fair trial, especially the poor. My different cases described above have shown you that the judges (**in the US and France**) have completely forgotten the meaning of the word **justice** and **the importance of truth** when one renders justice and writes a justice decision (!), and this is necessarily a serious cause of corruption in the US and France.].

3) **Many countries have troubled history and the objective of the SDG is to address some of these problems.**

**100.** Concerning the harsh critics toward N-Korea, there are serious problems in N-Korea, it is true; but many countries have troubled past and have made grave **mistakes** that had grave consequences for many people. I think Venezuela and Iran have pointed out in their UN speeches, that the US had used false information in front of the UN Security Council to justify its military intervention in Iraq **in 2003**, and to overthrow Saddam Hussein; and we **cannot** really say that these accusations are false accusations since, at least, some in the US have admitted that; and it has also been confirmed (I believe) that the US (CIA) has established a **network of torture centers** in Iraq and that many '*opponents*' have been killed and tortured there; and I think that we can also say that, even though *Saddam Hussein* was **not at all** what we could call a **good leader** (respectful of the rights of the citizens of his country), it is obvious that **Daesh** (or *Isil*) that came after **was even worse than he was** [they cut the head of US, Japanese ...citizens in front of the camera for the fun of it, they rape women on a large scale basis, they have

launched a series of terrorist attacks in Europe, the US, and other part of the world **that have been deadly and destabilizing**], and, **14 years after the 2003 war**, Iraq is not yet at peace, and it may have to deal with Daesh people for many years to come even if they (Daesh) do not control any more cities.

**101.** France, that has been the leading country in the effort to overthrow Kaddafi, did **not** obtain better results since it has been the chaos there since the war started; they now use the migrants **as slaves** in Libya; and they send **tens of thousands of people** to their death in the Mediterranean and tens of thousands of other to Europe as refugees (!) that we are not able to accommodate properly and that have caused great political problems like the Brexit, in part [it seems obvious that the questionable war in Iraq, then Libya and Syria, **have caused a massive flow of refugees** in Europe, and **several deadly terrorist attacks** that have contributed - in part - **to the Brexit**; and all these were **the results of bad political decisions** on these Iraq, Libya (...) issues]. It is good that the US be concerned by **the corruption's problem** in other countries and **with the human rights violations and poverty problems** in N-Korea, but the objective of the SDG is to address these problems between 2015-2030; and these countries like the others **have agreed to make progress** in these areas, so it is important to give them a chance to **(and to help them) achieve these goals**; and **not** to sanction them to prevent them from achieving them. The US, Japan, and S-Korea's Governments and Congress are **some of the few** governments and congresses that can do **a lot** to tackle these global problems by launching or supporting world-wide actions that address **them** [like the actions **to strengthen and improve our justice systems**, including **our LA systems** (described above); create a new Internet IO; develop a new economic system;...], so they can (and should) help resolve the N-Korea crisis **peacefully**, without sanction, and **in the context of the SDG efforts**.

**4) N-Korea nuclear-weapons program and its justified fear of the US power.**

**102.** For the N-Korea nuclear-weapons and missiles programs, N-Korea has a point when it says that **it feels threaten by the US and its military power**, including its nuclear weapons, because if the US has a 700 billion military budget, it is because it wants to be feared; and if it threatens to destroy N-Korea completely, it wants to be feared. As seen above, the US has means to decrease this fear for N-Korea and to take away its main argument for developing N-weapons; and it could help S-Korea and Japan obtain **Security guaranties** from their neighbors R-C-N-K. Also, N-Korea's N-program is **mainly a threat to the S-Korean people, to the US soldiers** (situated in South-Korea and Japan), and to the Japanese people, but **not a grave threat for the world or even for the US people** because it seems clear that, even if N-Korea were capable of launching its estimated 10 nuclear-weapons with long range missiles, they would most certainly **never reach the US** because of its **very advanced anti-missile system**; and because within ten minutes to an hour of the launch of these missiles, N-Korea would be hit by nuclear-weapons and other conventional weapons that would destroy most of its ability to launch any other attacks; **so it can be addressed with a Peace Treaty negotiation**.

\*\*\* **102.1** It is **not** because the N-Korean nuclear-weapons and missiles programs are **mainly a threat** to the S-Korean and Japanese people and to the US soldiers in these 2 countries, that **this threat should not be a serious concern for the world and for the UN members states**; I believe this threat is a serious concern for all the countries of the world; I am just saying that it is important to be **precise** in our analysis of the situation if we want to find the best solution for everyone. \*\*\*

**103.** Here again, the US, Japan and S-Korea must help resolve this N-issue **peacefully and in a way that will be beneficial for everyone**; and the negotiations on **the signing of Peace Treaty** would give a chance to N-Korea, S-Korea, Japan, the US, China, and Russia to address all the important issues like: **(1) the Security of the S-Korean people, of the N-Korean people and of the Japanese people**; **(2) N-Korean nuclear-weapons program**; **(3) the withdrawal of the US troops** from S-Korea and Japan, and **of the N- and S-Korean troops** and of **'big guns'** from the border (South-North); **(4) the Safety guaranties** given by China, Russia, and N-Korea to S-Korea and Japan (...); and **(5) the strategy and actions** necessary to have N-Korea **reach its SDG** [it is critical that **N-Korea present a reasonable strategy** (a) **to take its people out of poverty**, (b) **to end hunger, malnutrition** that seems to be an important problems, and (c) to achieve the other SDGs, because **it is important to have strong and independent UN member states**, and **not starving and sick member states population**]. [Again, the withdrawal of US troops will make N-Korea **number one argument** to pursue its nuclear-weapons program **useless** because it will withdraw the US nuclear threat (and its 700 billion dollars military budget threat !), so **it should facilitate** the resolution of this N-issue, and be an important goal; and of course **the safety and independence** of S-Korea and Japan without US troops on their soil **should also be an important subject that is very important for the world** because other countries may now (or will) face a similar situation and because every country should have to the right **to be independent and safe**.]

#### D Conclusion on the North-Korea crisis.

**104.** President **Moon Jae-in** and Prime Minister **Shinzo Abe**, when you pay **28 000 US soldiers** [*mercenaries with nuclear weapons*] to stay on your soil and to insure your **Security**, **(1)** you are not *independent* UN member states; **(2)** you allow your 2 countries to **get around the NPT** (you rely on the US nuclear-weapons without having to be held accountable for *the indirect use* of these weapons for your protection); **(3)** you have a dishonest position toward your neighbor, N-Korea, that you criticize and sanction for developing nuclear-weapons to counter the threat created by the US soldiers on your soil although, at the same time, you recognize the need you have for these N-weapons **by paying and keeping the US soldiers (!)**; **(4)** you show a **bad example** to the rest of the world because you – indirectly - tell to the non-nuclear countries that if they want to be protected against a nuclear-weapon country (without having to develop their own nuclear-weapons and risking sanctions under the NPT), they must **(a)** find another nuclear-weapon country, **(b) accept to lose their independence**, and **(c) pay for having their soldiers on their soil (!)**; and finally, **(5)** you make it difficult to reform the UN Security Council. We do **not** want to create a world where (non-nuclear) **countries** have to choose one of the few nuclear-weapons countries and to rely on them for their Security while at the time **losing their independence**.

**104.1** This is a key issue of the N-Korea crisis we face today; so it is critical that **you accept and demand** immediately negotiations on a **Peace Treaty** with N-Korea [and the other parties to this conflict and crisis, the US, China, Russia, ...]; and demand that these negotiations include **discussions (1) on the Security** of S-Korea, Japan (without US troops), and N-Korea; and therefore also **(2)** on the N-Korea nuclear-weapons programs, and **(3) on the withdrawal of US troops** from South-Korea and Japan, and of **the N-Korean and S-Korean soldiers and big guns** from the frontier between the north and the South. I believe that these discussions should include also talks on **N-Korea's strategy to achieve the SDG**, and the practical actions it plans to take to eradicate poverty, to end hunger, to respect human rights (...). It is critical that President **Kim Jong Un** also accept to negotiate a **Peace Treaty** with the other parties, and to present a strategy to achieve the SDG [on this subject I would like to remind N-Korea that *communism* did not prevent China from taking **more than 600 million** of its people out of poverty **in a relatively short time**, and therefore **that it should act urgently to improve the living conditions of its citizens**].

**104.2** Of course, as explained above, this North-Korea crisis concerns also all the UN member states and the UN secretariat; so it is critical that Mr. Guterres, the UN Secretariat and the UN members states encourage a **peaceful resolution** of the crisis, make sure that all the important issues of the crisis **are addressed and resolved**, and remind everyone that **we must achieve the SDG and take care of our environment**.

\*\*\* **104.3** The Press and Media have reported that President Trump and Prime Minister Abe like golf, so I would like to end this part **with a golf story**. After World War II, some US soldiers stayed in France, and some stayed in Poitiers, my hometown (a small to middle size town, 70 or 80 000 inhabitants, perhaps 30 000 or less **in 1945**), but there were not much to do there at the time; no baseball, no American football, just few bars downtown, 1 or 2 movie theaters perhaps, and soccer; so the US soldiers were bored probably; and since they were stationed just at the limit of the city, in a place surrounded by trees and fields, they decided to build a golf to play on week-end; it was **not a fancy** golf, just a 9 holes golf, with very small greens (you had to be Severiano Ballesteros or Bernhard Langer to keep 'your approach' on the green from anywhere on the course); and when they left to go back to the US, *'we'* (the town) *inherited* the golf course and the compounds they were using; the town put a **hospital** in their former compounds; and the people got to play golf (for a very cheap fee for the kids and the students), and I can say that *'we'* had a lot of fun on this golf course, so *'we'* keep a good souvenir of the stay of the US soldiers in Poitiers, even though *'we'* never met them, and they probably left before many of us were born! My point is that President Trump and Prime Minister Abe **should help build golfs** where the US soldiers are stationed (and where the N-Korean soldiers are stationed near the frontier) **before they leave**; and then help put hospitals in the compounds they have used; and you can be sure that the kids there will be grateful that the Soldiers were there and that they thought about building golfs before they left. \*\*\*

## **VII Conclusion.**

*The two main problems of our LA system, their consequences and the solutions to resolve them.*

**105.** The French LA system's **dishonesty** (for the **more than 14 million poor**) is **unquestionable**. There are two main types of problems : **(1)** problems during the legal aid attribution process [in particular, the fact that judges do **not** base their decisions on the contents of the file, **no 3-3.1**]; and **(2)** problems linked to the remuneration and realization of the legal aid missions [in particular, the fact the LA remuneration system does **not** take into account the technical and factual difficulty of cases, and the competence and notoriety of designated lawyers; and the fact that it assigns a number of hours to resolve the different types of cases, that is **well below** the number of hours **necessary** to defend the poor efficiently, **no 3-4**]. These problems have **(1) grave legal consequences** : **(a)** violations of the poor constitutional rights [right to a fair trial, right to have day in court, right to be free from discrimination, among other, see QPC ([exh. 65](#))] and **(b)** violations of criminal code statutes [betrayal of trust, obstruction to justice, moral harassment, see my criminal complaint ([exh. 30](#), [exh. 32](#), [exh. 31](#))], and also the violation of statutes used to prosecute corruption cases listed in **CPP 705**, see my letters to the PNF ([exh. 2](#), [exh. 3](#)); **(2) grave LA system management consequences** [impossibility to calculate and control the legal aid total cost; the management costs; the mechanisms put in place to recover the money to do not work, **no 7**]; and **(3) grave societal consequences** [increase of poverty, inequalities, corruption, **no 8**].

[105.1 Also it is important to note (1) that it is impossible for a poor to complain about the system or the ones who run it (lawyers, judges,) for several different reasons, see **no 5**; and (2) that the statutes imposing *the obligation to have a lawyer in court* are also *unconstitutional* when the LA law is *unconstitutional*, **no 4** !]

**106.** These problems have been well-known for a long time since several parliamentary and experts reports have been written on the subject during **the past 17 years** (see exh. 81-89), the Court of accounts has criticized the management of the system (most recently at the **end 2016**, [exh 4.2](#), see justice minister **2017** response, [exh. 4.3](#), and my comments [exh. 4.1](#)), and I made several efforts to point out the problems also **between 1999 to 2017**. And there are possible '*technical*' solutions to resolve the problems: (1) the creation of a dedicated *National LA Agency* made up of dedicated-to-LA lawyers [similar to **the one in the UK**; proposal also made by the Court of accounts; this agency would help us defend the poor more efficiently in court, and calculate more precisely and control the system's different costs]; (2) the creation of a separate *National LA Office* made up of judges specialized in **LA and mediation** and in charge (a) of judging all the LA demands (for each level of jurisdiction) and (b) of encouraging **mediation** whenever possible [this entity would help us judge the LA demands **more honestly**; facilitate mediation before the cases even start; lower the cost of our justice system; and improve its efficiency, see **no 9-11**]; (3) the development of two Internet computer applications to support the work of these two agencies (if possible **in cooperation with other countries** to lower the cost for everyone); and (4) finally, I also recommended to let the IRS make the poor financial resources evaluation to determine their eligibility for legal aid; but so far the government has ignored my remarks.

*My efforts to denounce the French LA system dishonesty and the large scale corruption system it constitutes.*

**107.** Since **1999**, I have written **several times** to politicians (government members, presidents, representatives,) to denounce the LA system's dishonesty for the poor; and I also started several legal procedures to point out the problems to judges and prosecutors; but it is obvious (1) that the politicians I contacted have done everything they could to ignore my remarks and **to maintain the very dishonest LA system** that brings **many advantages** to them, to the lawyers, and to the judges, while, at the same time, hurting the poor; and (2) **that the highest judges in the country have cheated and committed fraud** to make sure that my 2 QPC on the LA law would not be judged **on the merits** (see [exh. 43, no 29-36](#)), to maintain the dishonest LA system and **to rob the millions of poor** who have been victims of the LA system and law during **the past 25 years** [the QPC proceeding allows the Constitutional Court to order the – **retroactive** - compensation of the victims of a dishonest law, so the frauds on my QPC did not just rob me, but they robbed also the millions of other poor victims of this law !].

**108.** Finally, the prosecutors in Poitiers **have refused to start an investigation** on (or even to respond to) my **7-20-14** criminal complaint against the LA judges, lawyers (...); and they refused **to transfer the case** to another court pursuant to **CPP 43** to violate my right to a fair trial. As the result, I was forced (1) to file, **on 4-28-16**, a supplement to my **20-7-14** criminal complaint and to extend it with the violations of criminal statutes used to characterize *large scale corruption systems*; (2) to write, **on 8-7-17**, the *Parquet National Financier* (PNF) to explain why my **20-7-14** criminal complaint (and its supplement, against the LA offices' employees, the lawyers ...) could be legally characterized with the criminal statutes listed in **CPP 705** (that gives jurisdiction to the PNF for large scale and complex corruption system); and (3) to ask the PNF *to exercise its national jurisdiction* over my cases [I mentioned that I believed it should **also have jurisdiction** over my criminal complaint against the CA (...) because it is closely linked to my criminal complaint (related to LA); I have also asked the Cour de cassation (criminal Supreme Court) to transfer the case to them as well]. **On 11-10-17**, I also wrote to the *députés* and senators (and the press and media, [exh. 1.3](#)) to explain them why the LA system constitutes *a large scale corruption system* and why I am **in an impossible situation** [I am forced to ask the judges that I accused of wrongdoings to judge their own faults in some way], and asked them to act **urgently** on this LA system's dishonesty issue, but, obviously, at this time, the issue has not been discussed **publicly** and the députés and senators did not respond (again).

*The importance of the French LA issue and of the development of an efficient LA system for the UN (and its member states).*

**109.** The French LA law unconstitutionality issue and the development of an efficient LA system are **not** just important for France; they are also **extremely important** for **the UN and its members states** for several reasons **including**: (1) the fact that, if we want to achieve the SDG (and in particular **SDG no 1, 10, and 16**), **we must** find a way for every country to implement *an efficient LA system* at a cost as low as possible; and (2) the fact that having an efficient LA system is a **key step** to fight corruption, to improve administrations' efficiency (and including the justice), and to decrease the overall cost of our justice systems. When we know that '*an estimated four billion people live outside the protection of the law and those that live at or below the poverty line face institutional, legal and administrative barriers ...*' [according to the background note of the **6<sup>th</sup> 2014 UN high-level event on the post-2015 dev. Agenda**], **the cost issue** is definitely a **very important issue** for everyone. Above, I have given you practical examples of the

judgment of few cases to point out that the dishonest behavior and strategy of judges, prosecutors and adversaries, and few (factual or legal) twists in a standard case could make the judgment and/or resolution of what should be a simple case **much more expensive** than the normal or standard case.

**110.** The examples of my immigration case in the US and of the different lawsuits I filed to try to resolve the problems that a series of lies, negligence's, and grave faults from several civil servants had created; and the example of my criminal case against the Credit Agricole (CA) in France, have shown you that our justice systems (in France, the US,) have **fairly similar problems** and that the judges and prosecutors' behavioral problems are **in part systemic** problems that could be addressed with few changes like: (1) asking the judges, prosecutors,..., to take into consideration **the cost** of resolving the cases **as early as possible** in the proceeding to make sure that **their strategy aims** at resolving cases **honestly** and at **the lowest cost possible** for the community and the different parties; (2) making them more **responsible and accountable** for the damage they cause to the parties (and the community) when they lie in their decisions and commit faults or negligence that affect the parties well-being, and financial and professional situation, and their right to a fair trial; and, (3) [since the number of cases involving poor is still significant **in many countries** (in France, it is about ¼ of the total number of cases judged every years) and will stay that way for a while], **implementing efficient LA systems** in as many countries as possible to decrease the judges' workload and to build justice systems as efficient and as low cost as possible (no 25-54).

*The UN's role in the implementation of efficient LA (and justice) systems everywhere around the world.*

**111.** As seen above, we have **two types** of problems to address if we want to improve our justice systems (and in particular our LA systems); **first**, what I call the **Integrity problems** (or 'lack of will to reform'); and I gave you a good example of this type of problems when I described you **the many efforts** to maintain the dishonest LA system made: (1) **by French politicians** (government members,) who ignored the parliamentary reports pointing out serious problems in the LA law, who refused to respond to my letters on this subject, and who covered the judges who did not judge honestly the LA law QPC; (2) **by high level judges** who lied, cheated (...) to avoid judging – **on the merits** - my QPCs on the LA law; (3) **by lawyers** who admitted the LA system does not pay enough to defend the poor, but refused to admit that their rights are violated, and refused to respond to my criminal complaint on the subject; (4) **by the prosecutors in Poitiers** who refused to start an investigation on my accusations and who - at the same time - refused to transfer the case to another jurisdiction (**with CPP 43**) to avoid the conflict of interest due to the fact that judges and lawyers were mentioned in the complaint; and (5) **by the journalists**, human rights ONG, and intellectuals that I contacted and who remained silent also although they had obvious proofs of the veracity of my accusations.

**112.** And **second**, what I called the **technical problems** (the problems linked to the legal, budgetary, and organizational constraints); and I also gave you several examples of these problems. The UN has an important role to play to help countries resolve these two types of problems, I believe. For example, it can use its **Human Rights up Front initiative** to denounce **the large scale corruption problems** that affect millions of people and that are brought to its attention as I have done it (several times) in a very detailed manner for the LA system problems we have in France. And it can also play a **key coordination role** (1) for the development of common legal systems (like the development of an efficient LA system that could be used everywhere around the world) and (2) for the development and implementation of **global computer applications** that could be used by every country in the world to support the implementation of these common justice sub-systems. This work would require (or be made much easier with) the creation of new Internet IO to govern the Internet and to develop and maintain global computer applications used to resolve certain common problems as I explained it above and will summarize it below.

*My 5-29-02 letter to 8 US University Presidents and the role they could play in helping the UN and its member states address the issues I discuss here.*

**113.** In **part II**, I made a parenthesis about the letter I wrote **on 5-29-02** to 8 US University Presidents to obtain **their intellectual support** for asylum application in the US; and, **in part III**, I described in detail the grave injustices that I was victim of after I was informed that I had been granted refugee status. As seen above, there is a **strong possibility** that one of these 8 University Presidents did support my asylum application and that **this is the reason why I was granted refugee status**; if it is the case, **I would like to stress again** (1) that this person did not violate any law (and that my case was **complicated, well-founded, and required an expert's intervention**); (2) that the INS official who granted me the refugee status did not violate the law either, (3) that he did not try to hide himself (it seems) since **the date** (and most **probably** or perhaps his name) **were mentioned on the INS record**; and (4) that, even if it was **already obvious** – **at the time** - that the French LA system violated the

poor rights in 2002 and that my refugee status was well-founded, I have **now** brought you **additional detailed evidences** confirming the well-founded of my refugee status [as well as the fact that our LA system violated (es) the poor rights **systematically**; and that the French politicians, lawyers, and judges have maintained it to preserve **the many advantages** it brings them and to continue violate the poor's rights and obviously also to persecute me and harass me for the efforts I made to denounce their dishonest behavior and the dishonest system].

**114.** This is why I would be grateful to the President who has intervened for me, - **if any intervened** – to **speak up today**, and **to give me some details** about **this intervention** to help me correct the grave injustices I have been victim of. And, if none of them intervened, I would still be grateful to the 8 Universities I contacted, if **they** (perhaps with the help of other universities in the UK ...) could find a **way (1)** to study in detail the issues of my cases (immigration, civil lawsuits,) in the US and (criminal complaints, QPC,) in France; and in particular the French LA system unconstitutionality **issue** which is, I believe, an **important issue for everyone**; and **(2)** to point out the grave errors, frauds, and violations of **criminal, administrative, and civil statutes** that have been made or committed (in France and in the US) against me to help **(a) the UN** (and its member states) **on the LA system subject**, **(b)** the many poor around the world who deserve to be protected by efficient LA systems, and **(c)** me to end the madness I am victim of for many years now. Also, as Mr. Bollinger stated it, '*you have a position on truth and value of reason in dealing with social problems*', and here, I believe you can help the world identify the truth and encourage the UN and its member states to use reason in dealing with important social problems.

*The two main proposals of my platform to help countries achieve the SDG.*

**115.** Above, I also came back on my two main proposals to help countries achieve their SDGs; namely **(1)** the proposal to create **a new Internet IO** to govern the Internet and to organize the development and maintenance of global computer applications that could help all the countries resolve certain specific problems; and **(2)** the proposal to search for and to develop the **alternative to market capitalism** (our old economic system which has become inefficient and which systematically creates important inequalities). As seen above, some important arguments have **not** been considered when the decision to transfer the Internet governance to ICANN (...) was taken; and the UN has missed an opportunity to act on this issue; but it is possible **(1)** to correct the errors made, and **(2)** to start using the Internet more efficiently **(a)** to resolve our global problems, and **(b)** to help the UN member states achieve their SDGs. For that, **we must act as soon as possible** because the creation of a new Internet IO is a long term project, and even if the effects could be important and rapid, it is necessary to give us some time to build up the organization and to develop the software that will help it do its work efficiently.

**116.** Concerning the development of **the alternative to market capitalism**, this is also a **fundamental proposal** that could have a tremendous positive effect on our efforts to defeat poverty, to decrease the inequalities, to fight corruption, to tackle the global warming problem, and more generally to achieve the SDG. **If we all agree** (or at least a significant number of lawmakers and intellectuals around the world agree) that our actual and very old economic system, market capitalism, leads '**to a degrading treatment**', meaning to huge differences in income that lower large groups of persons in their rank, situation or reputation, then **we know we have to act urgently**; and I believe that now is one of the best time to do it because **(with a new Internet IO)** we have the possibility to develop **an efficient international information system** which, to me, is a **key to successfully develop a new economic system** that will remunerate everyone according to his/her relative contribution to society progress. Also, it is a great opportunity to search for such a new economic system at the time we are working hard to resolve our environment, poverty (and other SDGs) problems because we can design our economic system in a way that will help us tackle certain of these grave problems.

*The North Korea crisis.*

**117.** I could not talk about our LA and justice systems problems and about the proposals to help all the countries achieve their SDGs without talking about **North-Korea crisis** that has taken everyone's attention and **diverted** the UN General Assembly debate from its initial intended objective '**focusing on people: striving for peace and a decent life for all on a sustainable planet**'. Here again, it seems that some important arguments have been ignored and that some critical actions have not been launched; for example, it seems that **no serious efforts** were made to **have** the different parties in the North-Korea crisis or War; **(1) sign a Peace Treaty** (although it should be the number one objective); or **(2) start talks (a) on the withdrawal of the combat troops** (and of big guns) from the border (the so called '**demilitarized zone**'); **(b) on the withdrawal of US troops from S-Korea and Japan**; **(c) on the Security of S-Korea and Japan without the US troops**; and **(d) on N-Korea's nuclear-weapons program in**

the context of the withdrawal of US troops from S-Korea and Japan. The S-Korean and N-Korean people should not live under the threats of big guns and armed soldiers ready to move on a short notice.

**118.** The withdrawal of US troops will make N-Korea's **number one argument** to pursue its nuclear-weapon program **useless**, and therefore **facilitate the resolution of this N-problem**; but it raises the question of the **Security** of S-Korea and Japan, even with a friendly and non-nuclear N-Korea; so President **Moon Jae-in** and Prime Minister **Shinzo Abe** must **(1) demand** immediate negotiations on a Peace Treaty and **(2)** make sure that all the important issues are addressed properly and that their two countries can be - **at the same time** - **independent** (without having to rely on US or foreign troops) and **safe** (free from any threat or pressure); and they must show the example and resolve this crisis **peacefully**. A good and peaceful solution to the N-Korea crisis could facilitate *the reform of the Security Council* because it would strengthen the trust between nations in the region and **part of the actual and future UNSC**, and show our capacities to resolve grave problems without resorting to military strength. It is critical also that Mr. Guterres, the UN Secretariat and the UN member states encourage a **peaceful resolution** of the crisis, make sure that all the important issues of the crisis **are addressed and resolved**, and remind everyone that we must achieve the SDG and take care of our environment.

**119.** As you know it is difficult for me to send a copy of my letter to everyone **(1)** of the UN member states representatives and **(2)** of the US senators and representatives, so I would be grateful to those of 'you' who will receive this letter **by email** or **by mail** (and in particular Mr. Lajcak, and the US Senate and House of Representative leaders), if they could make sure that **this new letter is received** by all the other representatives of member states and by all the US senators and representatives; and also by Mr. Lajcak and Mr. Guterres (if for some reason, my letter was not delivered to them). I also would be **grateful (1)** to you if you could forward this letter to the **Heads of State** or of **Government** of your countries, so that they can eventually contribute to the resolution of the different problems addressed here; and **(2)** to the UNSC permanent representatives as well as N-Korea and S-Korea representatives if they could read this letter and consider the arguments presented **before their 12-11-17 and 12-15-17 meetings on North-Korea**, I believe. I had hoped to finish this letter in early November, but I could not, so I now use the opportunity given by this involuntary delay to wish you a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year, and, of course, I look forward to hearing from you and remain

Yours sincerely,

---

Pierre Geneviev

## Exhibits.

### *Lettres et documents de procédures récentes juillet et août 2017.*

- Exh. 1 : Lettre à M. Macron, M. Philippe ..., **du 28-6-17** ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-press-politi-27-6-17.pdf> ].  
Réponse de M. Le Maire du **6-7-17 (1.2)**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rep-lemaire-6-7-17.pdf> ].  
Lettre to députés and senators, **11-10-17** (1.3); [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-press-politi-7-11-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 2 : Ma lettre **du 7-8-17** au PNF, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-PNF-7-8-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 3 : Ma lettre **du 15-9-17** au PNF, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-PNF-no2-15-9-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 4 : Lettre envoyée à M. Migaud et M. Urvoas **le 7-4-17 (4.1)**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-migaud-urvoas-AJ-5-4-17.pdf> ].  
Référé de M. Migaud sur la gestion de l'AJ **23-12-16 (4.2)**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/ref-cc-gest-fin-aj-23-12-16.pdf> ].  
Réponse de M. Urvoas du **15-3-17 (4.3)**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/ref-cc-gest-fin-aj-rep-urvoas-15-3-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 5 : Requête en renvoi (**CPP 43**) vs *BAJ* (...), déposée **le 24-7-17**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-proc-gen-et-proc-rep-18-7-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 6 : 3ème requête (PG) en renvoi (**CPP 665**) **du 18-7-17** vs CA, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-pro-gen-665-vs-ca-3-18-7-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 7 : 3ème requête (CC) en renvoi (**CPP 665**) **du 7-8-17** vs CA, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-CC-665-vs-ca-3-7-8-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 8 : 3ème requête (CC) en renvoi (**CPP 662**) **du 7-8-17** vs CA, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-CC-662-vs-ca-3-7-8-17.pdf> ].
- Lettres adressées aux gouvernements, aux politiciens, et à l'ONU de 2013 à 2017.*
- Exh. 9 : Lettre adressée aux députés et sénateurs du **27-2-17**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-cand-pres-politi-gov-27-2-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 10 : Lettre adressée aux députés et sénateurs, **17-5-16**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-polit-press-media-17-5-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 11 : Lettre à M. Hollande, aux avocats ..., **du 20-1-16**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-err-mat-OPC-2-20-1-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 12 : Lettre à l'ONU du **1-18-15**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/letunga-7-1-18-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 13 : Letter to M. Hollande (...) dated **17-11-14**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-etc-7-17-11-14.pdf> ].  
Réponse de Mme Duquet **du 10-7-15** (13.2); [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-justice-duquet-10-7-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 14 : Lettre à M. Hollande, M. Valls...UNGA, **du 30-6-14** ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-UN-6-30-6-14.pdf> ].
- Exh. 15 : Lettre envoyée à M. Hollande, ... **du 23-4-14**, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-min-5-23-4-14.pdf> ].

- Exh. 16 : Lettre du 18-2-14 aux Députés et Sénateurs, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-dep-sen-aut-4-18-2-14.pdf> ].
- Exh. 17 : Lettre envoyée à l'AGNU le 12-20-13, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/letunga-v2-20-12-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 18 : Lettre à MM. Hollande and Obama, 9-13-13; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-holla-obama-3-13-9-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 19 : Lettre à MM. Hollande, Ayrault..., 28-8-13; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-sap-2-28-8-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 20 : Lettre à Mme Taubira, 18-6-13, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/lettaubira-3-18-6-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 21 : Lettre à MM. Hollande and Ayrault, 25-4-13, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-1-25-4-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 22 : Lettre à Mme Taubira..., 25-4-13; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-ministre-depute-2-25-4-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 23 : Lettre à Libération, 25-4-13, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-liberation-2-25-4-13.pdf> ];
- Exh. 24 : Lettre à Mme Taubira ..., 18-3-13 (24.1), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/lettaubira-18-3-13.pdf> ],  
Réponse de Mr. Chassaigne 15-4-13 (2'.2), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/repchassaigne-15-4-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 25 : Proposition au programme INCO (25), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/incoproposal7-1-11.pdf> ].  
Évaluation de la Commission, et quelques lettres d'intérêt pour le projet (20 p.)  
(26.1) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/incoproandletsup1.pdf> ]  
et (26.2) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/incoletsup2.pdf> ].
- Documents liés à ma procédure de licenciement de L'Essonne en 93 et à celle contre Pôle Emploi en 2012.**
- Exh. 27 : Jugement du TA de Poitiers, 17-7-13 (27.1, 6 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/jug-ta-vs-pe-17-7-13.pdf> ].  
Décision du Conseil d'Etat datée 16-7-15 (27.2), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-CE-vsPE-16-7-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 28 : Jugement du TA de Versailles, 10-8-98 (28.1, 5 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dectav10-8-98.pdf> ];  
supplément du 16-12-98 (28.2, 3 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dectav10-8-98-sup.pdf> ].  
Décision de la CAA de Paris datée 4-6-00 (28.3), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-caa-pa-vsCG91-5-6-00.pdf> ].  
Décision du Conseil d'Etat datée 29-3-01 (28.4), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-CE-vsCG91-29-3-01.pdf> ].
- Exh. 29 : Feuille de note au Département de 'Essonne, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/finotation-11-91.pdf> ].
- Documents liés à ma plainte du 20-7-14 contre les employés de BAJs, des Ordres des avocats ...**
- Exh. 30 : Plainte pour harcèlement ...du 21-7-14 (9.1, 21 p.); [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/plainte-harc-moral-proc-repu-20-7-14-2.pdf> ].
- Exh. 31 : Supplément à ma plainte du 20-7-14 datée du 27-4-17, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Sup-14-16-plainte-vs-BAJ-26-4-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 32 : Plainte du 20-7-14 réorganisée (format du supp.) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Pl-vs-BAJ-20-7-14-updated-7-8-17.pdf> ].
- Exh. 33 : Demande d'AJ du 9-9-15 pour PACPC vs BAJ (33.1), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dem-AJ-vsBAJ-7-9-15.pdf> ];  
Décision du BAJ sur cette demande du 15-4-16 (33.2), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-AJ-vsBAJ-15-4-16.pdf> ];  
Mon appel de cette décision du 2-5-16 (33.3), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/appel-15-4-16-rejet-AJ-2-5-16.pdf> ];  
Décision de Mme Couhé du 29-6-16 (33.4), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-couhe-app-BAJ-rej-29-6-16.pdf> ];
- Exh. 34 : Convocation du Cap. Monteil du 7-11-16 (34.1), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/convoc-cap-monteil-7-11-16.pdf> ];  
Lettre adressée au Cap. Monteil le 18-11-16 (34.7), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Cap-monteil-17-11-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 35 : Demande d'AJ de Mme Roudière du 10-7-13 (3 p.); [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dem-AJ-roudiere-10-7-13.pdf> ].
- Exh. 36 : Demande d'AJ de Mme Roudière du 22-10-15 (3 p.) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dem-AJ-roudiere-22-10-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 37 : Lettre de Me Gand du 26-11-15 (1 p.) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-gand-26-11-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 38 : Lettre à Me Gand du 7-12-15 (6 p.) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Gand-7-12-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 39 : Réponse de Me Gand du 24-12-15 (1 p.) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-gand-2-24-12-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 40 : Lettre de Me Gand à la juge du 8-2-16 (1 p.) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-gand-26-11-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 41 : Lettre adressée à Me de Beaumont du 7-11-16; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/debeaumont-7-7-12-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 42 : Lettre de Me de Beaumont du 28-11-16; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-debeaumont-28-12-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 43 : Lettre aux membres du Conseil de l'Ordre des avocats du 7-12-16, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/conseil-ordre-avo-7-12-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 44 : Lettre adressée au bâtonnier de Poitiers 7-5-16, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-bat-drouineau-7-5-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 45 : Lettre aux membres du Conseil de l'Ordre du 10-5-17, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/conseil-ordre-avo-2-10-5-17.pdf> ].
- Documents liés à ma PACPC du 3-12-12 contre le CA, ses dirigeants (...).**
- Exh. 46 : PACPC du 3-12-12, pages 1, 5, 24 et 25 (43.1), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/plainte-acpc-p1-5-24-25-depo-3-12-12.pdf> ];  
Plan et pièces jointes (43.2); [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Table-matiere-PACPC-29-11-12.pdf> ].
- Exh. 47 : Réquisitoire introductif du 5-1-15 (D91), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/req-intro-vsCA-5-1-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 48 : Commentaires sur le réquisitoire introductif du 30-5-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-JI-11-rep-req-28-5-15-2.pdf> ].
- Exh. 49 : Décisions de la CC sur 1ère req. en renvoi du 18-2-14, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-c-cass-req-suspi-leg-18-2-14.pdf> ].
- Exh. 50 : Réquisitions de transmission du Proc. Général du 14-9-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-planquelle-req-ren-14-9-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 51 : 2ème Requête en renvoi CPP 662 (contre le CA...) du 21-9-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/req-CC-662-vs-ca-2-21-9-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 52 : Requête renvoi vs BAJ, CPP 662 du 21-9-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/req-CC-662-vs-BAJ-21-9-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 53 : Décision de la CC sur la 2ème requête en renvoi du 19-1-16 (12.2), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-CC-renvoi-19-1-16.pdf> ].
- Lettres liées à m candidature au poste d'UNSG.**
- Exh. 54 : Lettre envoyée à M. Hollande le 3-17-16, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-Hollande-cand-UN-17-3-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 55 : Lettre envoyée à l'ONU du 11-4-16, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/UN-cand-UNSG-11-4-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 56 : Lettre envoyée à l'ONU du 7-5-16, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/UN-cand-UNSG-2-5-7-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 57 : lettre adressée au congrès américain le 25-8-16; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-us-congress-23-8-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 58 : Lettre adressée à l'ONU le 23-8-16, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/UN-cand-UNSG-3-23-8-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 59 : Vision statement, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/vision-8-4-16.pdf> ].
- Exh. 60 : Brève biographie, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/bio-SG-can-17-3-16.pdf> ].  
Mr. Kruger's Internet research report dated 6-10-16 (60.1), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/uscong-internet-gov-res-10-6-16.pdf> ].  
Mr. Kruger's Internet research report dated 3-23-16(60.2), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/uscong-internet-gov-res-23-3-16.pdf> ].  
China, Russia (...) Internet Code of conduct, 1-13-15 (60.3), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/China-Russia-int-cod-conduc-1-13-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 61 : 2nd UNSG application du 1-12-11 (61.1); [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/letungaBP-Pre1-12-11-4.pdf> ],  
1st UNSG application du 6-14-06 (61.2), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/ungeneralassemb.pdf> ],  
Lettre envoyée à l'ONU du 11-29-05 (61.3); [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/uscongress10-20.pdf> ],  
Letter to the UNGA dated 23-6-10 (61.4) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/letunga6-23-10.pdf> ].  
Response form the UN dated 9-14-16 (61.5) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rep-UN-14-9-16.pdf> ].  
Response form the UN dated 2-27-03 (61.6) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/repun2-27-03.pdf> ].  
UNOHCHR job application dated 3-16-15 (61.7), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OHCHR-cand-Dir-RRDD-16-3-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 62 : Lettre au US Représentative Becerra du 5-23-16; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-Becerra-25-4-16.pdf> ].
- Décisions et documents de la procédure de OPC sur l'AJ devant le Conseil constitutionnel.**

- Exh. 63 : La décision du Conseil constitutionnel du 11-12-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-c-constit-OPC-AJ-2-11-12-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 64 : Dem. rectification d'erreur matérielle du 29-10-14 (15 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OPC-AJ-c-cons-er-mat-28-10-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 64 : La décision du Conseil constitutionnel du 14-10-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-c-constit-OPC-AJ-14-10-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 65 : **QPC du 3-3-15** (11 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OPC-AJ-cont-no-trans-CE-3-3-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 66 : Ma lettre de saisine du Conseil du 6-9-15 (6 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OPC-AJ-c-constit-via-CE-9-6-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 67 : Lettre du Conseil Constitutionnel du 7-17-15 (1 p.) [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-c-constit-OPC-OK-17-7-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 68 : **Mes observations du 5-8-15** (16 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OPC-AJ-c-constit-observ-5-8-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 69 : **Les observations du PM sur la QPC, 8-10-15** (3 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rep-premier-ministre-OPC-10-8-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 70 : **Ma réponse aux observations du PM du 8-20-15** (16 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OPC-AJ-c-co-repli-obs-PM-21-8-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 71 : Notification du Conseil, possibilité d'irrecevabilité du 2-10-15 (1 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/c-co-notif-art7-2-10-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 72 : Réponse du PM, possibilité d'irrecevabilité du 5-10-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rep-pm-OPC-moy-art7-5-10-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 73 : Ma réponse, possibilité d'irrecevabilité du 5-10-15 (1 p.), [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OPC-AJ-c-co-let-moy-art7-5-10-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 74 : Circulaire CV/04/2010 , [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/cir-CIV-04-10-24-2-10.pdf> ].
- Exh. 75 : Décision de la CC du 2-10-14 sur le pourvoi, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-CC-pourvoi-2-10-14.pdf> ].
- Exh. 76 : Décision de la CC du sur la QPC 2-10-14, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-CC-OPC-2-10-14.pdf> ].
- Exh. 77 : Contestation non-transmission **QPC 30-7-14** (14 p.); [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/OPC-AJ-contest-trans-co-cass-30-7-14.pdf> ].
- Exh. 78 : Demande de récusation de Jospin du 5-8-15, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/recusa-c-constit-jospin-5-8-15.pdf> ].
- Exh. 79 : Lettre adressée à M. Jospin le 13 juillet 2001, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-jospin-13-7-01.pdf> ].
- Exh. 34 : Décision de Mme Fombeur du 16-7-15 ; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-CE-vsPE-16-7-15.pdf> ].
- Les rapports récents sur l'AJ et des statistiques et articles important*
- Exh. 81 : Rapport du Député Le Bouillonnet 2014; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-lebouillonnet-9-2014.pdf> ].
- Exh. 82 : Rapport des Sénateurs Joissains et Mézard 2014; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-joissains-7-2014.pdf> ].
- Exh. 83 : Rapport de la mission MAP 2013; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-MAP-11-2013.pdf> ].
- Exh. 84 : Rapport des députés Gosselin et Pau-Langevin 2011; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-gosselin-4-2011.pdf> ].
- Exh. 85 : Rapport Darrois 2009; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-darrois-3-2009.pdf> ].
- Exh. 86 : Rapport du Sénateur du Luart 2007; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapportduluart.pdf> ].
- Exh. 87 : Rapport Bouchet 2001; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-bouchet-5-2001.pdf> ].
- Exh. 88 : Statistiques CNB sur les revenus des avocats ; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/stat-CNB-2012.pdf> ].
- Exh. 89 : Article du New York Times 9-12-2014; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/art-nytimes-AJ-9-25-14.pdf> ].
- Documents liés à ma demande d'asile aux USA en 2012 and Un speeches.*
- Exh. 90 : AR de ma demande d'asile politique du 14-5-02, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/asylumappliakreci5-14-2.pdf> ].
- Exh. 91 : Vérification de mon statut de réfugié du 5-9-02, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/verifstat9-5-02s.pdf> ];  
Altered verification of status, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/altered-verif-of-status.pdf> ];  
8 CFR 207.9 procedure, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/pdf/jpg/8CFR207-9.pdf> ].
- Exh. 92 : Décision administrative confirmant mon statut de réfugié du 5-2-03, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/aljtolentinodec2-5-03-2.pdf> ].
- Exh. 93 : Premier permis de travail de réfugié (A3) du 12-10-04, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/pdf/eacard12-10-04+explanation.pdf> ].
- Exh. 94 : (A03) permis de travail de réfugié du 12-3-08, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/refeacard12-3-08-2.pdf> ];
- Exh. 95 : Ordre d'expulsion rempli de mensonges du 10-1-08, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/deportorder1-11-08.pdf> ].
- Exh. 96 : First civil lawsuit vs US, CA, LAC, 2-4-04, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/lawsuit1vsuscalac.htm> ].
- Exh. 97 : 2nd civil lawsuit vs US, CA, LAC, 10-25-05, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/lawsuit2vsuslacs.htm> ].
- Exh. 98 : New civil lawsuit va CA 9-30-05, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/deceitcadss9-30-05.htm> ].
- Exh. 99 : 3<sup>rd</sup> civil lawsuit VS LA County 1-12-07, [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/lacneglicomp2.htm> ].
- Exh. 100 : Letter sent to 8 Universty Presidents, 5-29-02; [ <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/unipres05-29-02.pdf> ].
- Exh. 101 : UN-Speech ABE, 09-2017, [ [http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/abe-un-speech-20-9-17-jp\\_en.pdf](http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/abe-un-speech-20-9-17-jp_en.pdf) ].
- Exh. 102 : UN-Speech Trump, 09-2017, [ [http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/trump-un-speech-19-9-17-us\\_en.pdf](http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/trump-un-speech-19-9-17-us_en.pdf) ].
- Exh. 103 : UN-Speech Lavrov, 09-2017, [ [http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/lavrov-un-speech-21-9-17-ru\\_en.pdf](http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/lavrov-un-speech-21-9-17-ru_en.pdf) ].
- Exh. 104 : UN-Speech N-Korea, 09-2017, [ [http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/n-korea-speech-un-23-9-17-kp\\_en.pdf](http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/n-korea-speech-un-23-9-17-kp_en.pdf) ].
- Exh. 105 : UN-Speech Moon-jay In, 09-2017, [ [http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/moon-jay-in-un-speech-21-9-19-kr\\_en.pdf](http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/moon-jay-in-un-speech-21-9-19-kr_en.pdf) ].

## Table of contents

<b>I The unconstitutionality of the French LA system, evidence of a large scale corruption system.</b>	P. 2
<i>A The poor loose (almost) systematically the cases they try to present to the justice.</i>	P. 2
<i>B The system is designed to prevent any efficient complaint against the system and those who run it.</i>	P. 2
<i>C The consequences of these LA problems for the justice system, for the French society, and for the poor.</i>	P. 3
<i>D The recent Court of accounts report on the management and financing of the LA system and the proposals to fix the system.</i>	P. 3
<i>E Conclusion on the LA system flaws, their consequences and the possible solution to fix them.</i>	P. 4
<b>II My efforts to denounce the unconstitutionality of the French LA system (from 1999 to 2017) and why our LA system constitutes a large scale corruption system.</b>	P. 5
<i>A The first LA problems I encountered in 1999, my 1<sup>st</sup> complaints, and my asylum application in the US.</i>	P. 5
<i>B My letters to the French governments, the 'députés', the senators &amp; the press and media from 2011 to 2017.</i>	P. 6
<i>C The proceedings I started to denounce the dishonesty of the legal aid system since 2011.</i>	P. 7
1) A QPCs against the legal aid law and a criminal complaint against the LA offices employees, lawyers (...).	
2) My 3 <sup>rd</sup> request for a change of venue (filed in July and August 2017) and my letters to the PNF (Parquet National Financier).	
<i>D Conclusion on my efforts to denounce the dishonesty of LA system.</i>	P. 9
<b>III The development of an efficient LA system is an issue of critical importance for the UN and is member states for many reasons.</b>	P. 9
<i>A Few twists and the dishonest behavior of an adversary can make simple cases much more complicated and much more expensive to resolve.</i>	P. 10
1) A 'typical identity theft case' made more much complicated by few little twists.	
2) The impact these few changes have on the cost of resolving the case.	
<i>B The dishonest behavior or the dishonest legal strategy of prosecutors and judges can also increase significantly the cost of resolving or judging a case !</i>	P. 11
1) My asylum proceeding is fairly interesting case from a factual and legal point of view.	
2) My first civil lawsuit against the LA County, California, and the US (immigration service) in February 2004.	
3) Conclusion on the asylum proceeding and the related lawsuits.	
<i>C These problems are in part systemic problems because I faced similar problems in France and why the development of a more efficient LA system could help resolve these problems.</i>	P. 17
1) Similar problems and similar dishonest behaviors from judges and prosecutors I faced in France.	
2) The first magistrate to see a case should not just do - a legal analysis of the case - , but also a fairly detailed cost analysis of its resolution; and an efficient legal aid system should do that.	
<i>D Conclusion on the importance for the UN and is member states to develop an efficient LA system.</i>	P. 19
<b>IV The UN's role in the implementation of fair and efficient LA (and justice) systems.</b>	P. 20
<i>A The UN Human Up Front Initiative is (and should have been) the perfect tool to point out the legal aid problem in France and to discourage the type of dishonest behaviors we have seen in France (to maintain the dishonest legal aid system over 25 years).</i>	P. 20
1) My letters to the UN in 2013-2016, the UN's 2016 response.	
2) The UN is basically the only international entity that can point the problem and denounce the dishonesty of government members in such a situation.	
<i>B The UN's role in the implementation of fair and efficient legal aid and justice systems around the world.</i>	P. 21
1) The UN should oversee the functioning of the national legal aid office judging the LA demands and of the national legal aid agency defending the poor in court in cooperation with countries' administrations.	
2) The UN should also play an important role in the development of the two computer applications to help the countries that want to implement the new legal aid system.	
<i>C The role that the US universities could play and conclusion on the UN's role in the implementation of a fair and efficient LA system.</i>	P. 23
1) Universities do have a position on truth and value of reason in dealing with social problems.	
2) The use of the human right up front initiative.	
<b>V The two main proposals of my platform.</b>	P. 24
<i>A The proposal to create a new Internet International organization.</i>	P. 24
1) The flaws of the multistakeholder model of Internet governance.	
2) The many advantages of creating a new Internet International Organization.	
<i>B The proposal to design and develop the alternative to market capitalism.</i>	P. 26
<i>C Conclusion on the two main proposals of my platform.</i>	P. 27
<b>VI The North Korea crisis.</b>	P. 27
<i>A The use and effect of nuclear weapons.</i>	P. 27
1) The important role that nuclear-weapons have plaid in the maintenance of Peace.	
2) Nuclear-weapons can probably still play an important role for humanity.	
<i>B Why a peace treaty has not been signed during the past 64 years and the responsibility of S-Korea and Japan in the actual problems and North Korea crisis.</i>	P. 28
1) South-Korea and Japan leaders make no mention of any effort to sign a Peace Treaty.	
2) The benefits for South-Korea, Japan and the US for having US troops in South-Korea and Japan.	
3) The problems of having US soldiers in South-Korea and Japan (and Germany).	
<i>C President Trump September UN Speech and the US position on the North-Korea crisis.</i>	P. 30
1) It is unfair to put all the blame on North-Korea for the actual crisis and the US contribution during World War II.	
2) President's Trump strong critics toward North-Korea, Iran, Cuba and Venezuela, and the corruption problem.	
3) Many countries have troubled history.	
4) The role of the US to resolve the global problems and the North-Korea crisis.	
<i>D Conclusion on the North-Korea crisis.</i>	P. 33
<b>VII Conclusion.</b>	P. 33
<b>Exhibits.</b>	P. 37